

me the best that the legal profession has to offer. If every lawyer would only emulate the reasonableness and wisdom of Senator SARBANES, the country's legal profession would be held in much higher esteem than it is today!

Mr. President, I am sure I speak for all my colleagues when I wish my esteemed colleague Senator SARBANES the happiest of birthdays. The words of Senator SARBANES' classical forebear, Aristophanes, seem particularly appropriate today: "Blest the man who possesses a keen intelligent mind."

TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION'S 100 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I call upon my colleagues today to recognize an organization that has been very valuable not only to the hard working ranchers and farmers that I represent in Colorado, but to everyone in America whose livelihood depends upon the cattle industry.

Founded in 1898, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association is the marketing and trade association for America's one million cattle farmers and ranchers.

Small businesses, like cattle farms and ranches, are the heart of the American economy. The U.S. cattle industry is comprised of more than one million individual farms or ranches that provide our nation with a steady supply of safe, nutritious beef. Living on a small ranch in Ignacio, Colorado, I know the vast majority of U.S. cattlemen are family farmers and ranchers who are skilled stewards of their natural resources and trained caretakers of the animals under their care. Eighty percent of cattle businesses have been in the same family for more than 25 years and 10 percent for more than 100 years.

Cattle ranchers form the largest part of the U.S. food and fiber industry, which, in turn, is the largest segment of the U.S. economy—nearly 17.5 percent of the gross national product. Doing business in all 50 states, cattlemen contribute to thousands of rural economies and, directly and indirectly, add \$153 billion to the national economy. It is also important to recognize that the beef industry provides 1.6 million American jobs, and the U.S. annually produces nearly 25 percent of the world's beef supply with less than 10 percent of the world's cattle inventory.

In Denver, where the industry is commemorating 100 years of the cattlemen's association history, we have a unique opportunity for people all across America to join in celebrating the labor of generations of America's cattlemen and women.

Since this historic event is taking place in my home state of Colorado, I would like to take this time also to recognize the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, which is one of the nation's oldest cattlemen's associations, founded in 1867, even before Colorado became a state. I am proud to say that with

hard working grass-roots organizations like the National Cattlemen's Association and the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, issues that directly affect the West and across this country can be addressed in Washington with great success.

In 1996, I joined Senator DOMENICI on the Senate floor in support of the grazing reform bill in the 104th Congress. It was a moving sight to see so many cattlemen and women in the Senate gallery and the halls of Congress working with their senators to help ensure passage of this vital legislation. Currently, grazing legislation is pending in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on which I serve. With endorsements from strong grass-roots organizations like the National Cattlemen's Beef Association and the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, we will continue to fight to get this legislation enacted into law.

Once again I commend the National Cattlemen's Beef Association for 100 years of dedicated service to America's ranchers and farmers.

Mr. HAGEL. 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. GRAMM. 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. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, as many of our colleagues are aware, there has been a problem in America since roughly 1990 in that we have collected taxes on gasoline. Those taxes, as anyone knows who has ever stood and read the gasoline pump as they are filling up their car or truck, are dedicated to building highways. But, yet, since 1990, over 25 cents out of every dollar we have collected in gasoline taxes has not gone to building highways. It has instead gone to fund general government.

This produces a real problem. If you read the sign on the gasoline pump, it basically gives you good news and bad news. The bad news is that about a third of the cost of a gallon of gasoline is taxes. The good news is that every penny you pay in gasoline taxes is supposed to go to build roads. The problem since roughly 1990 has been that the bad news is true and the good news is not true.

Senator BYRD, I, and others set about last year to try to correct this problem to basically try to bring honesty to Government by having a program that in reality conforms to what we tell the American people. And that program is

that if you collect money on gasoline taxes to spend on roads that you spend the money on roads and nothing else. We have done it in two parts. One part is complete.

I offered an amendment to last year's tax bill which was adopted in the Senate, adopted in the House, and became law when the President signed the tax bill into law. It took the 4.3 cents a gallon tax on gasoline that in 1993 the President had dedicated permanently to general revenues—the first time in American history that such a designation had ever occurred—and it put that gasoline tax back into the highway trust fund. You can imagine how surprised we were when the President's budget came out and not one penny of that gasoline tax is proposed to be spent on highways.

Senator BYRD, I, and others have put together an amendment which now has, I believe, 52 cosponsors. I want today to outline what the amendment does and what it does not do, what the result of adopting the amendment would do, and what it would not do. I also want to address two other issues that people have talked about as reasons of not being for the amendment.

First of all, our amendment is on an authorization bill. It basically would change the highway bill to assure that the 4.3-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline would be authorized to be spent on highways. Our amendment does not, nor could it, change the spending caps in the budget. Nothing in our amendment would in any way change the total amount of funds that are currently available to be spent under the budget agreement which we adopted last year. In fact, our amendment specifically states that nothing in the amendment will bridge or break those caps. So we are not debating how much total money is going to be spent next year. That debate is going to occur in the budget and probably to some extent in the appropriations process and perhaps in the Finance Committee with taxes and user fees.

My position is longstanding, and I don't intend to change it under any circumstances. And that position is that we should not raise the spending caps; that we made an agreement last year with the President. We took that agreement to the American people. We made a promise. I think we ought to live up to that promise.

The Byrd-Grass amendment simply allows highways to compete with every other use of money within the budget agreement. If we do not adopt the Byrd-Grass amendment, it means that for the next 6 years we are going to be spending less than 75 cents out of every dollar collected in gasoline taxes on highways, and we are going to continue to perpetuate an untruth where people were told when they buy gasoline that the money is going to build highways when in reality over 25 cents out of every dollar is going to general government. If you believe that when we have a dedicated revenue source—a

"user fee," as some call it—that we have an obligation, in fact, a moral obligation, to the American people to use the revenue for the purpose that it is collected for, then I believe that you should be for the Byrd-Gramm amendment.

We have, I believe now, 52 cosponsors. I don't have any doubt about the fact that if we voted on the Byrd-Gramm amendment today as an amendment to the highway bill it would be adopted and it would probably get 75 or 80 votes.

Here is the problem. Those who oppose the amendment would like to delay its consideration and consider it in the context of the budget. When we are considering the budget we are going to be considering many proposals to break the spending caps. And it is the hope of those who oppose the amendment to use that parliamentary position to try to convince people that rather than fulfilling the commitment we made to the American people about spending gasoline taxes on roads that we should not do that so we can raise spending in other areas.

In fact, the strategy is to commingle this effort to allow highways to compete in an effort to break the budget entirely. I didn't think that is where we ought to consider this amendment. This is not a budget amendment. Our amendment does not break the spending caps. All we do is authorize highways at a level that would allow the spending of every penny collected in the gasoline tax, or at least that new portion, 4.3 cents a gallon. It would then be up to the Appropriations Committee within their overall budget to decide how much to spend on highways.

Let me make it clear. I believe that under those circumstances we would be successful, and that we would provide the full level of funding. But in doing so we would do it within the spending caps.

A couple of additional points. Our highway bill will expire on May 1st. It would be my intention—and I believe it is the intention of Senator BYRD—that if that highway extension expires, we would want an opportunity as part of rewriting it to offer our amendment. In fact, we are preserving our right to offer our amendment, as obviously anyone can at any time to any bill. We don't want to do that. We want to have the opportunity to have the highway bill in front of us.

I hope my colleagues will join Senator BYRD and join me in urging our leadership on both sides of the aisle to come forward with the highway bill. I came over today because we are here at 3 o'clock with no business before the Senate. We could have already written the highway bill. It takes time to plan the building of roads and bridges. It takes time for States to set out their blueprint of what they are going to do. I am blessed in being with a Southern State that has a long construction cycle. But for people who live in States like North Dakota, they have a very

short construction cycle in terms of highway construction. And if the highway bill should expire, if they lose May, June, and July, they will end up not having a highway construction period this year.

So I believe that we need to get on with this bill. I think there is a solid consensus that says that within the spending caps we want to allow highways the right to compete for funds up to the amount of taxes that we collect on gasoline. If those of us who believe that the money should be spent on highways can't win that debate, then obviously we will not get the money.

But since the money was collected on gasoline taxes, people were told it was going to be used for highway construction, I believe that if we do authorize its expenditure we will be successful.

So I came over today to basically make two points. No. 1, nothing in the Byrd-Gramm amendment raises the spending caps. The amendment specifically states that the spending in the Byrd-Gramm amendment will be within the spending caps. We are going to debate spending caps and the total level of spending in the budget. The Byrd-Gramm amendment is authorization which authorizes the construction of highways at a funding level up to the expenditure of the gasoline taxes that we are now collecting. It will be up to each of us then within the spending limits that are set in the budget—and I hope they will be the spending limits that we agreed to last year and I intend to fight for, but within that we will have an opportunity to compete so that funds can be spent on highways and so that we can have truth in Government, so that when working Americans go to the filling station and stick the nozzle in their gas tank and they sit there while they are holding it reading on the gas pump that every penny of gasoline taxes goes to build roads, that will not be false advertising by the Government, that it will in fact be a reality.

The final point I wanted to reemphasize is we are running out of time. The extension of the highway bill expires on May 1. We are not going to be able to get another clean extension. We obviously have time to deal with this bill since there is no action in the Chamber here at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. It is early in the session. We were told when Congress adjourned for the Christmas recess the first item of business was going to be the highway bill. With a construction cycle beginning in May in the northern tier of the country, with the desperate need for highways and highway modernization, with the fact we told people the money they spend on gasoline taxes is a user fee to be used for highways and roads, I believe it is important that we move ahead. I urge our leadership, both on the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democratic side of the aisle, to move ahead with the highway bill. Let the Senate work its will and know that the amendment which will be offered by

Senator BYRD and by me and by 52 Members of the Senate is an amendment that does not break the spending caps.

Under no circumstance am I going to support breaking the spending caps. This is a debate about priorities. It is a debate about whether or not, when you tell people that their gasoline taxes go to build roads, it should go to build roads. This is competition for available money. It is not a debate about increasing the total level of spending. I know people get confused on this issue, and I wanted to be sure that we continue every day to reiterate that this is a debate about priorities. It is a debate about honesty in Government. But it is not a debate about the total level of spending. That decision will be made in the budget, and hopefully the decision will be made to live up to the commitment we made last year.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognition. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gorton). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1575

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, with regard to S. 1575, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 301, S. 1575, the Ronald Reagan airport legislation, and it be considered under the following agreement:

One amendment to be offered by Senator DASCHLE or his designee regarding a commission; one amendment to be offered by Senator DODD regarding a commission; one amendment to be offered by Senator DASCHLE or his designee regarding Dulles Airport naming; one amendment to be offered by Senator COVERDELL, which is a technical change amendment; one amendment to be offered by Senator REID regarding the FBI building renaming; one relevant amendment to be offered by Senator LOTT or his designee; and one relevant amendment to be offered by Senator DASCHLE or his designee.

I further ask that these amendments be the only amendments in order and they all be in the first degree and must be offered and debated prior to the close of business this evening, and any votes ordered with respect to the amendments or passage occur on Wednesday morning, at a time to be determined by the majority leader after notification of the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not