

"willful inspection or disclosure or an inspection or disclosure".

(3) Subsection (f) of section 7431 of such Code, as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended to read as follows:

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms 'inspect', 'inspection', 'return', and 'return information' have the respective meanings given such terms by section 6103(b)."

(4) The section heading for section 7431 of such Code is amended by inserting "INSPECTION OR" before "DISCLOSURE".

(5) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 76 of such Code is amended by inserting "inspection or" before "disclosure" in the item relating to section 7431.

(6) Paragraph (2) of section 7431(g) of such Code, as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended by striking "any use" and inserting "any inspection or use".

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to inspections and disclosures occurring on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1306(c)(1) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(c)(1)) is amended by striking "30" and inserting "15".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be construed to have taken effect on January 1, 1997, and shall expire June 30, 1997.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill, as amended, was passed.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to announce officially—as most Senators know, but in case they missed it—that that was the last recorded vote for the day. We are discussing some other issues that we hope to get agreement on today and tomorrow. We will keep the Members informed on that.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— SENATE RESOLUTION 73

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to now propound a unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of a Senate resolution submitted by myself regarding the sense of the Senate relating to tax relief for the American people. I further ask unanimous-consent that there be 10 minutes for debate on the resolution equally divided in the usual form, and following that debate the Senate proceed to a vote on the adoption of the resolution to be followed by a vote on the preamble, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I might take just a moment so that there can be a response to that unanimous-consent request. This is a sense of the Senate which just declares a need for tax relief for the American people, and condemns the abuses of power and authority committed by the Internal Revenue Service.

We have discussed this with a number of Senators. We have provided it to the other side of the aisle.

So I propound that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to—before I propound the unanimous-consent request, let me explain my objection to the resolution offered by the Senate majority leader and then indicate that I would intend to offer a resolution of my own.

Some of the provisions that are in the resolution offered by the Senator from Mississippi, the majority leader, are not troublesome, but there are some provisions and some language that are very troublesome to some of us in this resolution.

It is clearly a partisan resolution written in a manner that suggests that one side is no good, the other side is all bad, and for that reason I object to it.

In the spirit of discussing the taxes, tax burden on the American citizens and the ability to address meaningful tax reform for American families and to do so in a budget process that has a requirement that the Congress bring to the floor of the Senate and pass a budget today on April 15, I would offer a unanimous-consent request and will do so, and the resolution that I will offer is a resolution that talks some about the tax burden that we face in this country and our desire to offer meaningful tax relief to American families but to do so in the context of a budget that reaches balance, and that we do it in a process as described by law in this country, that a budget be brought to the Congress, be passed by April 15.

It is unusual that we have not even started a budget process at this point. April 15 is two deadlines. One, people will line up at the post office this evening in a traffic jam trying to file their income tax return and get an April 15 postmark because people at the post office want to meet their obligation.

There is a second obligation today, and that is the obligation of the Congress to pass a budget resolution, by law, on April 15. Obviously, we are far from that position of being able to pass a budget resolution. No budget resolution has come from the Budget Committee. There is not an indication that such a budget resolution will be forthcoming.

In the resolution that I will ask unanimous consent to offer we ask that the majority party take up without delay a budget resolution that balances the budget by the year 2002 and targets its tax relief to working and middle-class families to the same degree as the proposal offered by the President and, at the same time, protects important domestic priorities such as Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

I might say there is a difference with respect to our interest in tax relief. There are those who propose tax relief but do it in a way that says what they would like to do is especially exempt income from investment, which means there is more of a burden on income from work. It is an approach that says let us tax work but let us exempt investment. Guess who has all the investment income in the country. The upper-income folks.

And so you have a proposal that essentially says let us exempt the folks at the upper-income scale, and then we will shift the burden, and what we will end up doing is taxing work.

Some of us think that is the wrong way to offer tax relief, that overburdened working families deserve some tax relief in this country, and we believe a responsible budget that allows for some tax relief to working families but still protects important priorities, and, importantly, balances the budget in 2002, is a responsibility of this Congress. And it so happens that today is the day by which that is supposed to be done.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— SENATE RESOLUTION 74

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a resolution I will send to the desk submitted by myself and on behalf of Senator DASCHLE regarding the sense of the Senate relating to the budget deficit reduction and tax relief for working families.

I further ask there be 10 minutes for debate on the resolution equally divided in the usual form, and, following that debate, without intervening action, the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the resolution, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Also, I must say it is regrettable that the objection was heard on the earlier unanimous-consent request for a sense-of-the-Senate resolution in this area. I had hoped the Senate would be able to adopt the resolution in a timely manner, considering this is April 15, tax day, the day that most Americans have the worst feeling about in the entire year. This is a

sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and as a matter of fact I would assume that we could probably come together on language that would make it clear we feel that working Americans should have and deserve some tax relief and we need to do it today, not May 9, which is how long the American people have to work to pay their taxes for the year. Until May the 9th we all work for the Government, and then after that we get to keep the money we have been earning because we have paid off the tax burden that the American people are saddled with.

I know of examples of young Americans who are working making \$30,000 a year and their tax burden, when you add it all up, is probably 40 percent. Others, like my own young son who is a young entrepreneur, creating jobs, trying to help people get a job, keep a job, make a living, get some basic training, move on, are paying over 50 percent. We now have probably the highest tax burden on working Americans in history. It is very high. It is oppressive.

With regard to the budget itself, as a matter of fact, Congress has only met the April 15 deadline for budget resolutions once in 15 years. That is not to say we should not do it. I had hoped we would meet that deadline this year, and I will work toward that goal in the future. One of the reasons we have not is because we have been working in good faith with the administration to see if we could come together on agreement of a package that would take us to balance by the year 2002 with tax relief for working Americans.

I remind Senators, as a matter of fact, that there has been bipartisan support for tax relief for working Americans. Senator BREAUX and Senator LIEBERMAN have supported capital gains tax rate cuts. I think maybe the Senator from North Dakota was referring to that a moment ago. Senator TORRICELLI joined Senators BREAUX, NICKLES, CRAIG, and I in saying the estate tax, the death tax, clearly is one of the worst things we have in the Tax Code because it undermines the American dream of working and saving up something, producing something and leaving something to your children but now the tax law takes 44 percent, minimum, of a life's work above certain levels, once you get above the exemption, and up to 55 percent under certain conditions.

We should raise that exemption for individuals, for small businesses, farmers, and ranchers, in the Senator's State, in the North Dakota area, in my State and all across America.

So we should come up with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution today, April 15, that makes a commitment to reducing the burden. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons why we need to do it, the Senator will recall we had the largest tax increase in history that was passed in the first year of the Clinton administration, 1993. We need to give back a little bit of that to families with chil-

dren, and to the capital gains area where a lot of people are not selling or not being able to get the benefit of their lands or stocks or what they own because they do not want to have to pay the excessive capital gains tax rate.

But without saying OK, you did it, we did it, they did it, what I am advocating this afternoon is we get a sense-of-the-Senate resolution in a bipartisan way in which we agree that the American people deserve some relief. And that is what the title says here—declare the need for tax relief for the American people and condemn the abuses of power and authority committed by the Internal Revenue Service. We have already done that today. We have already said that their snooping around through files is wrong, and we put some penalties in the law for that. We worked together on that one.

So it seems that while there has been objection heard on both sides I guess so far this afternoon, I think we ought to see if we cannot come to an agreement on something where the American people can say, yes, look, they really are committed to doing their job in controlling the rate of growth in the Federal Government and giving some tax relief to the American people. So I would be constrained at this point to object to that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Without belaboring this at great length, the Senator from Mississippi said we will not go through "you said, they said, we said," having already done that. The fact is I would not have objected, nor would other Members on this side of the aisle have objected to this resolution except this is not a resolution you bring to the floor and say, by the way, let us be bipartisan.

Let me give you an example. This is a resolution that says page 1, sub 5, "President proposed and Democratic-controlled Congress enacted a \$241 billion tax increase on the American people in 1993, the largest in history," and on and on and on. It was not the largest in history. The largest in history came during the Reagan administration in 1982, the largest tax increase in history documented by the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Tax Committee, but that is beside the point.

In 1993, a provision that I voted for was a deficit reduction provision, and guess what happened as a result of that? Yes, the deficit was reduced. Contest that? Well, even Alan Greenspan says it was reduced as a result of that action. The deficit was reduced because we had the courage to reduce spending and increase some revenue. The deficit has been reduced over 60 percent since 1993. We have had economic growth. We have had job creation. We have had

lower interest rates. And the fact is this country was put back on track because the deficits were being reduced and we were moving in the right direction.

Now, was it controversial to do that? Yes, of course, it was. Why was it controversial? Because it lends itself to this sort of nonsense, someone coming to the floor of the Senate and saying, well, gee, look at the Democrats over on the other side of the aisle. This resolution says, well, the Democrats did it. The Democrats passed the largest tax increase in history.

Some of what the majority leader said I agree with, and we can draft a bipartisan resolution that talks about the common interests here. Should we try to do some tax relief for working families? Of course, we should. Let us do that in the context of a balanced budget. Can we do something that allows people to pass businesses and family farms from one generation to the other without inheriting the business and the farm and the estate tax obligation? Yes, let us do that. Should we, however, agree to some of the other proposals on the other side that say let's have a zero tax on estates, exempt all estates and have no estate tax, and, by the way, let us decide there be a zero tax for the capital gains that someone has?

Kevin Phillips, a Republican commentator, today on NPR talked about that issue, and I will read it again in the Chamber tomorrow. I read it today. It makes no sense to decide we are going to have a tax system, and there are four streams of income in this country and we decide to treat a couple streams of income by exempting them and the other streams will bear a tax burden. So we will create a situation where someone would propose, let's tax those people who are recipients of income from investments and decide then, all right, we have taxed them at half the rate they used to be taxed. Now we will exempt them altogether. Let us just have a total tax exemption for people who have their income from investments, but people who get their income by working, let's go ahead and keep taxing those folks.

Guess what. It is like squeezing a balloon. When you exempt a class of income over here from any tax obligation, the people who are over here remaining to pay the tax are going to pay a higher burden. It is saying let's exempt people who are investors and we will ask people who work to pay a higher tax.

Does that make any sense? Tax work but exempt investment? Capital gains tax—I proposed a capital gains tax proposal that says if you hold a capital asset for 10 years, maybe you should be able to take \$250,000 with a zero tax rate during your lifetime; tax free \$250,000 during your lifetime. But should we go back to the good old days where you have a tax shelter industry with tens of thousands of people doing nothing but help people convert ordinary income to capital gains so they

end up paying no tax so the people who go to work every day end up paying a certain tax. I do not think so. It does not make sense to me.

If the Senator from Mississippi wants to pass a bipartisan resolution and takes these kinds of things, especially, out of it, write a resolution and we will pass it. I have no problem with that. But you cannot call this bipartisan, bringing this to the floor and throwing out sort of an in-your-face admonition about what Democrats did in 1993. Most of us feel good about what we did in 1993. We turned this country around, and passed a piece of legislation that substantially reduced the Federal deficit, substantially reduced the Federal budget deficit, helped create new jobs, put us on a course to economic growth and reduced interest rates. That is what we did, and we did not get one vote to help us. All we got was criticism then and now, 4 years later, we slip papers under the doors and over the transom, to say, "Here is what they did, here is what they did back in 1993."

That is not the way to do business. If you want to do a resolution, let us do one. Let us just take all this backbiting out of it and do a resolution that reaches the consensus that I think we could reach on some of the things that we think should be done with respect to our Tax Code.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could, I have a brief unanimous-consent request that I do not think will be a problem. I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for morning business with Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, as I noted, there will be no further rollcall votes. We are working on a time agreement for tomorrow on the assisted suicide legislation that has already passed the other body. I would expect that rollcall to occur mid to late afternoon, and we are still working on the situation with regard to the nominee to be Secretary of Labor. So there could be at least one and maybe two votes tomorrow. We will give Senators the exact time once we have information.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Who seeks time?

TAXES

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I compliment my distinguished friend from North Dakota on his very prescient remarks, which I think are right on target. I listened to a lot of the debate today on the question of taxation, and I must say I find it puzzling. I do not really mean this, but I say quite often

that I wish everybody had the opportunity to live through the Depression. My brother and sister and I were lucky. We had something to eat. We also had devoted parents and that makes up for a multitude of problems. However, not everyone is as fortunate. Some people need a helping hand.

Nobody likes the idea of taxes. I coughed up a sizable amount yesterday to the IRS. I did not particularly enjoy it. But I have never begrudged the taxes I paid, even though, as a U.S. Senator, I see a lot of waste. I see money misspent. I see priorities misplaced. And sometimes it is kind of a bitter pill to swallow. But I can not accept the idea that some Senators that have propounded today that somehow there is something unholy and evil about paying taxes. As Justice Holmes said, taxes are necessary "to make our society a civilized one." To complain about the taxes we pay in order to live in a civilized society is unfathomable to me.

My brother, who is my best friend, does not like to pay taxes. I keep reminding him the thing he and my sister and I had that a lot of children did not have when we were growing up, is that we chose our parents well. A lot of children do not have that luxury. The fact is that the Federal Government has done a tremendous amount of good with our tax funds. I think about the house we lived in and the fact that the water well was only about 10 steps away from the outhouse, and people died of typhoid fever in the summertime and we could not figure out why. All of a sudden, Franklin Roosevelt was elected President, the first President of the United States who began to treat the South as a part of the United States and not as a conquered nation. So, we began to get paved streets, running water, indoor plumbing, electricity, natural gas, housing, medical help, free shots against typhoid fever and smallpox at the schoolhouse, by a nurse paid for by those insidious taxes that we pay.

Mr. President, if I could just list all of the things that have happened since I was 10 years old, that have made us the great Nation we are, not one single Member of the U.S. Senate would take any of them back—not one. I am thinking about the housing programs we have, the farm programs we have, the medical research that we do, the medical help we give people. I think about the bank insurance fund. If we had not had the FSLIC fund when the S&L's were all going broke, you think about what a catastrophe that would have been in this country. That is what happened during the Depression, the banks went broke. And my mother, who had carefully saved \$1,100 selling cream and eggs and chickens on Saturday, lost every nickel of it when the bank went under. And she grieved about it until her dying day.

Who would turn their back on the environmental improvements we have made in this country? Mr. President, 65

percent of the streams were unfishable and unswimmable. Now 65 percent are swimmable and fishable, and nobody here wants to do anything but go to 100 percent clean water and air for our children and grandchildren yet to come.

I could go on with many other things the Government has done to benefit us all. For instance, we have dammed the rivers that used to flood every spring. My mother and father used to go down to the Arkansas River every April, see people straggling along the road who had lost their homes and all their possessions, pick them up, take them home, keep them for a couple of nights until the water receded, and take them back to the area they had called their homes. We dammed the Arkansas River. It not only provides navigation but recreation and flood control. And people in those same areas of Arbuckle Island do not have to worry about it anymore.

And now some in Congress want a constitutional amendment that would require a two-thirds vote to raise taxes. You could not even correct a mistake with less than two-thirds of the vote. You could not close a tax loophole with less than two-thirds of the vote. It would favor the wealthy, who would be assured their taxes would never go up. And it would be a terrible disservice to the people who rely on Government services—yes, even welfare recipients. Like I say, everybody did not have Bill and Lattie Bumpers for parents.

We talk about family values. I have the three greatest children and the greatest family a man could have. I know all about family values. I put mine up against those of anybody in the world. Yet you and I know there are a lot of children in this country who would be better off almost anywhere than where they are.

So, I believe in helping these children. We keep on building more prisons and spending \$25,000 a year for every person we incarcerate, and if we had given that child an education at roughly half the cost, he would not be in prison. When I was Governor I used to go to the prisons and talk, sit and have lunch with them, interview them, talk to them. I never met one with a college degree, though there probably were a few. I never met one who owned his own home. I didn't meet very many who did not come from a broken home.

Mr. President, I stand here on April 15 and we are still without a budget. Instead, we are wasting the peoples' time with a debate between the Democrats and Republicans about taxes. So far as I am concerned, the whole country loses with that debate. If you really want to restore confidence in the American political system and you want to stop the alienation of people's attitudes toward Congress and what goes on here, do two things: Balance the budget and change the way you finance campaigns. Anybody who thinks a democracy can survive when the laws