carry out the commerce and the activity that keep this country strong. I thank these negotiators for their work.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for those very kind comments. I am glad we are able to be of help.

I will say she is a tenacious battler for Illinois, so I was particularly glad we were able to be of some help in the particular situation Illinois faced.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has some comments. How much time do I have? Is the proponents' time—perhaps you could give us an account of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the proponents has expired. The Senator from Rhode Island has 53 minutes.

Mr. CHAFEE. I yield such time as the Senator from Arkansas needs.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I appreciate this indulgence. I ask consent to speak in morning business. I am going to speak on a different subject. If the chairman would like that not to count against his time——

Mr. CHAFEE. That is fine. How long will my colleague be, roughly?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Up to 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAFEE. Fine.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask consent to speak 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, may I just say one other thing? I would like to say to all Senators who are listening that now is your chance to come over and speak against the amendment if you so choose. Time is running out here and, frankly, at the conclusion of the comments of the Senator from Arkansas and then a couple of minutes that the Senator from Ohio wants, unless there are people present wanting to speak, it is my intention to yield back the remainder of our time and have the Senate go out.

So, anybody who wants to speak about this amendment—they will have a half-hour tomorrow, that is true. But now is the time to come over. We have some 50 minutes. The Senator will be taking 15, so there will be 35 or 40 minutes left. Now is the time to speak against the measure if anybody wishes to.

If the Senator will proceed?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I take a moment to commend the Senator from Rhode Island and compliment him for the outstanding leadership he provided the Environment and Public Works Committee on the ISTEA II bill.

It has been suggested he should be nominated, if you have not been, for a Nobel Peace Prize for bringing all the various factions together in what is, I think, a very worthwhile bill that will be to the benefit of all Americans. I commend the Senator.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STATEMENT CONCERNING THE TAX CODE TERMINATION ACT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, yesterday, while millions of American households across the country were struggling to understand which of the 480 separate IRS tax forms applied to them, while they were trudging along, trying to read through the accompanying 280 supplemental explanatory IRS pamphlets, while their tax accountants and tax attorneys worked hard to keep them abreast of the more than 800,000 words which make up this country's Tax Code, and while families nervously anticipated the impending IRS deadline of April 15, which is now less than 6 weeks away, President Clinton had the audacity to call my efforts to sunset this country's incomprehensible maze that we call a Tax Code in the year 2001—irresponsible.

Following his speech, President Clinton's chief economic adviser Gene Sperling equated my bill, the Tax Code Termination Act, with ''reckless river boat gambling.'' Worse yet, President Clinton's Deputy Treasury Secretary stated, ''We have a Tax Code today that works better for Americans as they do what is crucial to them in their lives.'' He said that the Tax Code works for Americans.

No; Americans may feel they work for the Tax Code. They surely do not believe that the Tax Code works for them. In short, the President and his advisers were telling the American people in the midst of their ''tax season migraines,'' that this Tax Code works just fine. Are the American people to believe that President Clinton and his economic advisers do not see anything wrong with Americans spending a combined total of 5.4 billion hours—the equivalent of 2 full work weeks—complying with tax provisions? Are Americans to believe that their President does not see anything wrong with the Tax Code that costs this country more than $157 billion per year? Is it possible that the President and his key advisers see nothing wrong with spending $13.7 billion per year enforcing the Tax Code, yet the IRS fails to provide correct answers to taxpayers seeking assistance almost one-quarter of the time?

I think the American people will be able to decide who is being irresponsible and will be able to easily separate the ''river boat gamblers'' from the sincere legislators working to better their everyday lives.

President Clinton's criticism of the Tax Code Termination Act centers around the notion that one should not set a date to sunset a law until a new law is written and ready to replace it. Doing so, in President Clinton's eyes, would be irresponsible. Well, is it irresponsible to sunset this country's transportation programs, which spend over $23 billion per year, before a new transportation program is written and ready to be put into law? Is it irresponsible to sunset this country's higher education programs before a new law is drafted? Of course not. In fact, right now this Congress is in the midst of debating a new transportation spending program and a new higher education program for one simple reason. When these major spending bills were passed and signed into law, they contained sunset provisions which terminated these programs 5 years after they were implemented. In fact, every major spending program currently on the books contains similar sunset language.

The truth of the matter is that President Clinton doesn't mind sunsetting provisions when the law allows the Government to spend billions of dollars in taxpayers' money. The President does not mind sunsetting Head Start, doesn't mind sunsetting Pell grants or school lunches. Sunsetting only becomes irresponsible to this President when the law being sunset deals with provisions which take money from the pockets of hard-working Americans.

The Tax Code Termination Act is anything but ''irresponsible.'' This act simply sets a date certain, well into the future, when the Tax Code will need to be reauthorized, which will simply place taxes and spending on equal footing. This bill will force Congress to completely rethink how we collect hard-earned taxpayer money and, as with major spending programs, it will allow a healthy debate to ensue on the merits, effectiveness and efficiency of the law as it is currently written.

Why is the President afraid to treat taxes and spending equally? Why should sunset provisions only apply to one but not the other? Maybe it is because the President knows that this tax system cannot withstand close scrutiny—that it can't even stand cursory scrutiny. Maybe the President is afraid that Americans will feel empowered to force this Congress to rethink the amount and methods used to take their hard-earned money. Maybe the President is afraid that he will lose the power to hide tax provisions that benefit favored special-interest groups deep within this large and complex Tax Code? Finally, the President stated yesterday that the Tax Code Termination Act would create uncertainty—skillfully noting that ''uncertainty is the enemy of economic growth.'' Mr. President, is there any certainty in this system? Can one be sure that despite trying diligently to comply with this complex and incomprehensible tax system, one still won't be dragged into court and fined for failure to accurately comply with every jot and every tittle of the Tax Code? Can one be certain that they haven't overpaid or underpaid, that they haven't missed a deduction that is owed them or claimed a deduction for which they don't qualify?

No; the only thing certain about this system is that it guarantees one's rights can be trampled by an overempowered IRS and that one's economic freedom can be jeopardized by overzealous tax collectors.

While the President claims that his opposition to the Tax Code Termination Act is to protect business by ensuring them a long-term landscape on which to make major business investment decisions, most business-led tax organizations actually support our efforts to terminate this Tax Code. The National Federation of Independent Business, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and others know firsthand how many billions of dollars per year they waste trying to understand this Tax Code, much less comply with the Tax Code. They see their profits eaten up by tax lawyers and tax accountants. They know full well that the real uncertainty is in the current code, not in any distant sunset of the current code, and they know that the Tax Code Termination Act will create a clean slate on which a fairer, simpler Tax Code can be built.

I am certain that when and if President Clinton attempts to take this debate outside the beltway, he will quickly learn who is being irresponsible; he will quickly see where the American people stand on this important issue.

Finally, the Tax Code Termination Act, sponsored by myself and Senator BROWNBACK of Kansas, is currently supported by the entire Senate Republican leadership and is being cosponsored by 26 fellow Senators. I urge the President to rethink his position, and I urge my fellow Members to get behind this effort and take the first step in simplifying our Tax Code by setting a date certain that this code will expire.

It is one thing, Mr. President, to be cautious. It is one thing to be prudent. It is quite another to be controlled by timidity and frozen into inaction. As my colleagues have said, the Tax Code has had its place in history, now we need to make it a part of history. I ask my colleagues to join me in that effort.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. The Senator from North Dakota wants to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield 10 minutes, I will try not to use all 10.

Mr. CHAFEE. That is fine, 10 minutes, from the time of the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I rise today to support the Lautenberg amendment. I intend to vote for it, and I am pleased to support a piece of legislation I think will be important in saving lives in our country.

Before I do, I want to talk about three quick items. One is the amendment that has just been adopted, the McCain amendment. I would then like to talk about the Lautenberg amendment and then, finally, an amendment I am going to offer following the disposition of the Lautenberg amendment.

The McCain amendment which has been adopted now contains a provision I want to call attention to dealing with high-speed police pursuit. It is an issue I have been involved with for some long while. I care a great deal about it, and I have introduced legislation for a number of years, part of which has now been included in the McCain amendment dealing with safety.

There are in this country many instances in which high-speed police pursuits are not only necessary but virtually mandatory, and I understand that. There are other circumstances in this country, where high-speed police pursuits are inappropriate and result in the death of innocent people. Nearly 400 people a year are killed and many others are injured in high-speed police pursuits.

One ought to be able to expect all across this country, no matter where one is driving, that law enforcement jurisdictions are given good training and have good policies dealing with high-speed police pursuits. That is my intention with the legislation.

I also feel that I would like to do more. I would like to make sure that in the future, with respect to high-speed police pursuits, that we have a provision that anyone who believes they should be able to flee from law enforcement when law enforcement attempts to apprehend them will lose their vehicle and will have certain jail time. We ought to send the message to all people in this country that you are the villain in high-speed police pursuits. If you don't stop when a law enforcement officer attempts to stop you, there are going to be consequences, and significant consequences. We can save lives by that. And the McCain amendment just adopted includes my provision dealing with high-speed police pursuits and incentives for more training and uniform policies. I think that is a step forward.

Second, the Lautenberg amendment, which I am pleased to support, and I hope will have the support of a majority of Members in the U.S. Senate. I understand that some can quibble here or there about .08 or .10 or .12—this, that, or the other thing. I do not think anyone will quibble with the statement made earlier today by one of my colleagues in which he asked the question: Would you like to put your son or daughter in a car with someone who had four drinks in the last hour and has a .08 blood alcohol content?

Under current law, that person is not drunk. But is that the car you would like your son or daughter in? I think not. Mr. President, .08, I am told, relates to the blood alcohol content of a man roughly 170 pounds who has had four drinks in an hour.

In this country, we license people to drive. No one in this country should be empowered to drive and drink at the same time. It can turn an automobile into an instrument of murder and does every 30 minutes, causing someone else to die on America's roads and streets because someone decided to drink alcohol and drive.

We have had incentive programs previously dealing with drunk driving. Some have worked, some have worked a bit, some have worked well, and some have not worked at all. The Senator's amendment is very simple. The proposition of this amendment is to say that our road programs in this country are national programs. We know they are national because we come here and talk about roads being a national priority. Even the smallest, the most remote, and the least populated areas of our country have roads because those roads allow people to get from one place to another.

Yes, my State is a smaller State, and less populated, but as they move frozen shrimp and fresh fish from coast to coast, guess what? They truck that through North Dakota, and we need roads in all parts of our country to have a first-class economy. A country with a first-class economy needs good infrastructure, and that means good roads.

Because roads represent a national priority and are a national program, it seems to me perfectly logical to understand that anyone driving in this country ought to have some assurance that they are not going to run into someone coming down the other lane who is driving in a jurisdiction or a State where they are told it's OK to have .10 or .12. No one in this country should expect to meet someone at the next intersection, in the next State, or the next county where the driver is drinking. So I am going to support this amendment that calls for a national standard of .08.

Let me tell you about the other amendment I am going to offer following this amendment, which I hope my colleagues will support as well.

Mr. President, did you know there are five States in this country where you can put a fist around a bottle of whiskey and the other around the steering wheel, and you are perfectly legal? There is not one jurisdiction in America where that ought to be legal—not one city, one county, one township where it ought to be legal for anyone to get behind the wheel of a car and drink. Five States now allow that.

Over 20 States allow, if not the driver to drink, the rest of the people in the car to have a party. They can get plenty of whiskey and plenty of beer, and they can go down the road and have a great old party. Over 20 States say that is fine, as long as the driver doesn't drink, and in five of them the driver can drink as well. There is not one jurisdiction that ought to allow that.

My amendment has the same sanction as the amendment proposed by the