

build it, it is still not fair for you have it, and at least part of it ought to be taken away from you.

Let me explain why I reject this logic. First of all, the only thing I have ever been bequeathed or expect to be bequeathed was, when my grandmama's brother, my great uncle Bill, died, he left me a cardboard suitcase full of sports clippings. Had it been baseball cards, I would be a rich man today.

The family of our agriculture commissioner in Texas, a lady named Susan Combs, owned a ranch that had been in the family for four generations. When her father died, she was forced to sell off part of that ranch to pay death taxes. Now our Democrat colleagues would have us believe that is good because that levels society.

How did it help me? How did making Susan Combs sell off ranchland that her family had owned for four generations help me because my family didn't own a ranch or didn't own a business? I cannot see how I was helped, or how my children are helped. How does tearing down one family help build up another? How does destroying the life dream of one family build a life dream for another family? We do not believe it does. We think this is fundamentally wrong.

Granted, some rich people may benefit. But so will a lot more people who are not rich. I do not have any inherent objection to people being rich. If they didn't steal the money, if they worked hard for it, if they created jobs for people from families like I am from and they benefited from it, that is what America is about. I do not have a hate for rich people. I do not understand our Democrat colleagues who say they love capitalism but seem to hate capitalists, who claim to love progress but appear to harbor a distaste for the people who create it. We do not believe we can build up America by tearing down families. We believe we can build up America by giving people a chance to compete and use their God-given talents. But we don't want people to have to sell off their farm or sell off their business to give Government a new tax on money that has already been taxed. We do not think death ought to be a taxable event.

I congratulate those who have been involved in this debate. I think it is a good debate. I think it is a debate that defines what we stand for and what our Democrat colleagues stand for. We believe when you work a lifetime to build up a business or a family farm, it ought to be yours for keeps. If we are successful, we are going to kill the death tax—yes, you will still have to pay taxes on any gain if the business or farm is sold—but when you build up a family farm or build up a family business, it is yours for keeps. When you die, the people you built it for, your children, are going to get it. If you want to give it away, if you want to donate it to Texas A&M, that is God's work; or if you want to contribute it to trying to cure

cancer, but you ought to get to decide how it is disposed of, not the Federal Government, not some bureaucrat at the IRS, and not some politician in Congress. That is what this debate is about. It is an important debate. I urge my colleagues, when we cast our votes on this bill, to vote to kill the death tax.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 8

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 8 at the conclusion of morning votes on Thursday and it be considered under the following agreement:

That there be up to 10 amendments for each leader, with one of the 10 amendments for the minority leader described as the "Democratic alternative";

That no more than 20 amendments be in order, they be first-degree amendments only and limited to 40 minutes equally divided in the usual form, with the exception of the Democratic alternative, which would be limited to 2 hours equally divided, and an additional 90 minutes for each leader to be used at their discretion.

I further ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the amendments, the bill be advanced to third reading and passage occur, all without any intervening action or debate.

I finally ask unanimous consent that either leader be able to make this agreement null and void at any time during the consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this has been very delicately developed with a lot of careful consideration and very aggressive work with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I know Senator DASCHLE has Senators who have tax amendments they would like to offer.

I should emphasize that this is not the last effort to try to make our Tax Code fairer this year. We will have the reconciliation bill that will involve marriage penalty tax elimination, and obviously tax amendments would be offered in that area. We still have legislation that would eliminate the Spanish American telephone tax, which we probably can't get to until the first of September. But it is something we should eliminate. Obviously, there will be an opportunity for additional tax-related amendments to be offered to these two.

There may be a number of amendments on both sides that Senators would like to offer that maybe cannot be included in this type of agreement. But this is not the last train out of Dodge, thank goodness. We will have other opportunities to develop a fairer Tax Code, and Senators will have an opportunity on both sides to offer amendments.

I thank Senator DASCHLE for his effort. I did not want us to just get to a

cloture vote which might or might not pass. But if it failed, we would get no result.

I think the death tax needs to be eliminated. It needs to be phased out. There may be some modifications in the bill as we go forward. But a result is what we should always seek for the American people—not just a show vote. This could get us to that point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, while the majority leader and I have profound differences of opinion with regard to the estate tax and what to do with estate tax policy, I have been very appreciative of his willingness to work with us to accommodate the opportunity for Senators to offer amendments, which is what this agreement will allow.

This is a fair agreement. This isn't everything that our caucus or our colleagues have indicated they would like. There are far more amendments than this agreement will allow. But I underscore a comment just made by the majority leader. This is not going to be the last word on tax policy in this session of Congress. There will be other opportunities. I will do my utmost to accommodate Senators who have amendments they want to offer, if they are not going to be offered as part of this agreement.

I thank all of my caucus for their willingness to accommodate this agreement and for the opportunity to work through a very difficult set of procedural circumstances. This is far better than the old way that we were likely to be subscribing to, which is a cloture vote denying amendments of any kind, and maybe even denying an ultimate result. This will allow an ultimate result.

I hope we can have a good debate. I hope we can deal with these issues in a way that will afford us a real opportunity to consider alternatives. I think this agreement allows that.

I appreciate very much the majority leader's willingness to work with us. I appreciate especially the indulgence and the cooperation of all members of the Democratic caucus.

I yield the floor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3185

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2549, and proceed to vote in relation to the pending amendment, No. 3185.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 86, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feinstein	Lugar
Allard	Fitzgerald	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Baucus	Gorton	McConnell
Bayh	Graham	Mikulski
Bennett	Gramm	Moynihan
Biden	Grams	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grassley	Murray
Bond	Hagel	Nickles
Boxer	Harkin	Reed
Breaux	Hatch	Reid
Brownback	Hollings	Robb
Bryan	Hutchinson	Roberts
Burns	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Byrd	Inhofe	Roth
Campbell	Inouye	Santorum
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cleland	Johnson	Schumer
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Stevens
Coverdell	Kerry	Thomas
Craig	Kohl	Thurmond
Crapo	Landrieu	Torricelli
Daschle	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	

NAYS—11

Bunning	Kyl	Snowe
Collins	Sessions	Specter
DeWine	Shelby	Thompson
Feingold	Smith (NH)	

NOT VOTING—3

Dodd	Gregg	Helms
------	-------	-------

The amendment (No. 3185) was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in the presence of the assistant Democratic leader, I ask unanimous consent that, with the exception of the Byrd amendment on bilateral trade, which will be disposed of this evening, votes occur on the other amendments listed in that order beginning at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 13, 2000.

I further ask unanimous consent that, upon final passage of H.R. 4205, the Senate amendment, be printed as passed.

I further ask unanimous consent that, following disposition of H.R. 4205 and the appointment of conferees the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration en bloc of S. 2550, S. 2551, and S. 2552, Calendar Order Nos. 544, 545, and 546; that all after the enacting clause of these bills be stricken and that the appropriate portion of S. 2549, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof, as follows:

S. 2550: Insert Division A of S. 2549, as passed;

S. 2551: Insert Division B of S. 2549, as passed;

S. 2552: Insert Division C of S. 2549, as passed; that these bills be advanced to

third reading and passed; that the motion to reconsider en bloc be laid upon the table; and that the above actions occur without intervening action or debate.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent with respect to S. 2549, S. 2550, S. 2551, and S. 2552, as just passed by the Senate, that if the Senate receives a message with respect to any of these bills from the House of Representatives, the Senate disagree with the House on its amendment or amendments to the Senate-passed bill and agree to or request a conference, as appropriate, with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses; that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees; and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, it is my further understanding that there are remaining four votes that are going to be needed, and they are on amendments by Senators FEINGOLD, DURBIN, HARKIN, and KERRY of Massachusetts.

Mr. GORTON. I believe the Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Wellstone amendment No. 3772, to increase funding for emergency expenses resulting from wind storms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are finally back on the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior. We will be on it from now until 6:30 this evening, when I understand we go back to the Defense authorization bill.

We have made some very real progress in the last 24 hours in the sense that we have a finite list of amendments that can be brought up on this bill. The difficulty is that, as I count them, there are 112 of those amendments that are in order at this point. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia and I both hope and believe that many of them will not be brought up, but this is notification to Members that if they are interested in having their amendments discussed, if they want to get the views of the managers of the bill on those amendments, they should be prompt. We want to hear from everyone this afternoon because we want to finish the bill today or, more likely, tomorrow.

One amendment that is ready to go is the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Minnesota, together with the junior Senator from Minnesota, that is technically, I believe, the business of the Senate at the present time. I now see both Senators from Minnesota here, prepared to deal with that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 3772

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the pending order of business is amendment No. 3772. I can be very brief.

First, I thank my colleague, Senator GRAMS, for joining me in this effort. We have two amendments, I believe. I say to my colleague from Minnesota, I also join him in his effort.

We are both focused on the same question: a storm that happens about once every thousand years, a massive blowdown in northern Minnesota. We are both committed to helping get to the Forest Service the necessary resources to deal with the massive blowdown. There is a lot of important work to be done. This storm has been a nightmare for our State. One very positive outcome of the storm is the way in which the people in Minnesota have come together.

I thank Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD for accepting this amendment. It would restore about \$7.2 million needed in emergency funding. It is critically important, and I thank my colleagues for their support. People in northern Minnesota will appreciate their support as well.

I say to Senator GRAMS, I have to leave the floor soon, but I also support the amendment he is introducing. I have another engagement. I am proud to be a cosponsor on that amendment with my colleague.

It is my understanding this amendment will be approved. I wonder whether we could now voice vote it.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I think we want to let the other Senator from Minnesota speak.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am sorry.

Mr. GORTON. The managers are prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I join with Senator WELLSTONE to speak about the urgent need for cleanup and fire threat reduction funding in northern Minnesota. I first want to thank Senator GORTON for his willingness to work with me on this crucial issue for our state.

As many of my colleagues know, I've been working with my colleagues in the Senate, including Senator WELLSTONE, Senator GORTON and Senator STEVENS, for months to ensure that this crucial funding would be available for the Superior and Chippewa National Forests. I've made my request repeatedly, in both letters and