

We heard the people when they told us that they, not some tax collector or career bureaucrat in Washington, know what is best for their families and how to spend their money which they worked so hard for.

The Government has never raised a child—it does not pay the dental bills when the kids need braces, or buy the groceries for the dinner table, or write the checks for the college tuition.

Parents make those decisions, and with more of their own money in their wallets, parents will be empowered to raise their children as only parents can.

Unlike the preceding Congress, which built its reputation by attempting to expand the reach of Government into our lives, the 104th Congress has made middle-class tax relief the centerpiece of our American agenda of returning power to the people.

And we have pledged to continue our efforts—to strengthen our efforts—in the 105th.

We offered middle-class families the \$500 per-child tax credit.

Under the blueprint for economic renewal proposed by our former colleague, Bob Dole, the child tax credit would return more than \$1,800 to the average Minnesota family of four. With a Republican President in the Oval Office, we will enact the \$500 per-child tax credit into law.

Congress cut the capital gains tax, too, to protect small investors, seniors, farmers, and families from having their savings and investments unfairly penalized.

With a Republican President, our reduction in the capital gains tax will become law as well, and so will tax credits for families caring for elderly relatives and an end to the marriage penalty in our IRS Tax Code.

Here is the bottom line, Mr. President: By enacting each of these ideas today, we have the power to inspire dramatic change for tomorrow's families. Cutting taxes puts money back into the community and directly into the hands of working Americans, where it belongs in the first place, and where it ought to stay.

It stands to reason that once we train the Federal Government to run itself more efficiently, it will need fewer tax dollars to accomplish the people's work.

The public's desire for less interference from Washington, therefore, translates into a smaller, more efficient government, reduced bureaucracy, and, ultimately, less waste of the Nation's precious financial resources.

When we achieve that, we can begin fulfilling what I consider to be our most solemn obligation: erasing our deficit and finally eliminating our cancerous national debt. The future we envision for our children and grandchildren is one free of debt imposed by this generation. No generation before in this country has left the next generation a debt. This generation will be the first to do that, and we should take

every step possible to make sure we eradicate that responsibility.

With our eye on that promise, Congress has made great progress, cutting spending by more than \$50 billion over these past two years, eliminating more than 270 wasteful programs, and privatizing four major governmental agencies.

Most importantly, our budgets balance—a sure sign of our commitment to ushering in a new era of fiscal responsibility.

Still, Americans say we can do better, and my colleagues and I agree. We must do better.

But I am not sure the people understand that if we are going to fully carry out their agenda, it will likely take a different President to lead us there.

Our third goal for the future—more and better jobs—will follow once we have energized the economy by freeing America's families and job providers from the burden of high taxes and once we have reduced the mountains of regulations and overhauled the Tax Code to forever end the IRS as we know it.

Without a Federal bureaucracy blocking the path to success, wage earners and investors will find the freedom to do what a free-market economy encourages them to do: spend their own dollars, stimulate growth, and create new, better-paying jobs.

When my colleagues and I think to the future, we envision a hopeful, vibrant place. It is an America where any citizen who wants to achieve prosperity for themselves and their families—whatever their background and however they define that prosperity—is given the opportunity to succeed.

It is an America where government enables their success, and does not stand in its way. Mr. President, I am proud of the progress we have made in this Congress toward opening those doors, toward fulfilling the American agenda of lower taxes, less government, and more jobs.

I can say with certainty that our work is not finished. But I say with equal certainty that we have not wavered in our commitment to seeing it through. We will make every attempt as we enter the 105th Congress to finish the job we have started in the 104th.

I thank the Chair. I see there is no other Senator in the Chamber so 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. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT
FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS IN
IRAQ

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, a week ago, I was the only Member of this

body to vote against a mild resolution of support for our military operations in Iraq last week. I did so, Mr. President, because it seemed to me that our response fell between two more appropriate responses and, as a consequence, was totally ineffective and inappropriate.

Mr. President, I felt last week—and I continue to feel the same way today—that we could have determined that in a civil conflict between two groups of fighting Kurds, one backed by Iraq and the other by Iran, that we had no interest, simply that we had no dog in that fight.

On the other hand, by reason of the protection that we have provided for Kurds, however uncivil in their conduct to one another, we could also have responded militarily. Almost without exception, however, Mr. President, thoughtful academics, military scholars, and national security experts have felt that the United States should not use its Armed Forces in combat in response to a challenge from another nation without doing so disproportionately.

What does that mean, Mr. President? It means that we should make absolutely certain when we use our Armed Forces that the cost exacted of an aggressor, of an enemy, is considerably greater, measurably greater, than the gains sought by that aggressor. If we don't use it with that philosophy, we almost certainly will be disappointed in the results of the use of our armed services and, of course, with respect to our national prestige.

I was convinced, Mr. President, that what we did last week was 5 cents worth of damage in response to a dollar's worth of gain on the part of Saddam Hussein and his Iraqi forces.

We launched 44 cruise missiles against Iraq last week in response to military adventures on the part of Iraq in a northern protected zone in Kurdistan. The act, as I have said, came in the midst of a civil war between two Kurdish factions, one backed by Iran and one by Iraq. We responded not only inadequately, but we responded in the south part of Iraq, while the fighting and the brutality was occurring in the north. The result, according to the administration, was a U.S. victory. As one administration official described it, "We really whacked him." Now, a little more than a week later, the reality is considerably different.

Saddam Hussein has regained control over the northern part of his country. After many years of oppression of its people, whom he has bitterly oppressed, thousands of whom he has killed, he is continuing to fire at U.S. warplanes in the south. The administration is in the midst of a review of its policy. Under most circumstances, Mr. President, when you are victorious, when you really whack them, it is the other guy who changes what he is doing—not us.

But this is precisely the flaw in the administration's policy; rather than respond to Iraq's military adventure in a manner that ensures that any such adventure costs far more than it is worth, we offered Band Aid solutions. The result has been less than glowing. Almost certainly at this point a reaction which will cost Iraq more than it has gained will require a greater investment and a greater risk than the investment and the risk which we engaged in a week ago.

Let us reflect for just a moment on what last week's military response achieved. Is Saddam Hussein treating his people better? Has he been compelled to abide by a U.N. cease-fire? Has Iraq been contained? Is the United States better off now than it was before the military action? Do we have solid support from the allies and the anti-Iraq coalition? The answer to each one of these questions is clearly no.

The coalition, masterfully constructed during the gulf war by President Bush, is frayed, if not defunct. Saddam Hussein is brazenly flaunting both U.S. and U.N. warnings and is scurrying to rebuild the very sites we destroyed last week and told him not to rebuild. In the last 2 or 3 days he has fired missiles at the aircraft patrolling the no-fly zone.

My friend, the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, said night before last that "decisions about the dimensions of our response are, of course, the President's to make."

Yet, the confusion continues. The day before yesterday the Secretary of Defense said that our response would be "disproportionate." Yesterday the Department of Defense says that the response will be "measured." Perhaps today we will have action that is "disproportionately measured."

In any event, Mr. President, it seems to me that it is vitally important, first, that the President consult with our allies in the Mideast in the coalition—something that he did not do earlier—second, that he follow the War Powers Act and consult with the Congress. Whether he believes the War Powers Act to be constitutional or not, he would be extremely wise to consult with the representatives of the people of the United States before such an action rather than simply to ask for ratification after that action.

We are worse off than we were a week ago, Mr. President. We face very serious dilemmas. We are almost without bases from which to mount any military attack. The President is simply going to have to pay much more attention to the issue than he has in the past and build a much broader coalition if we are not to lose everything that we gained at such high cost during the gulf war.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, with respect to the Interior appropriations bill, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment on page 49, line 19, through page 50, line 8, as amended, be regarded for the purposes of amendment as original text.

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

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO BILL MONROE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the music world lost one of its most devoted artists on Monday when the legendary Bill Monroe passed away at the age of 84. The Bible says:

The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away.

Bill Monroe lived to be 84.

His bluegrass music—the hybrid of folk, country, blues, and gospel styles—originated in the United States more than 60 years ago and continues to be popular across the country. Nowhere is this more true than in the Appalachian States, where it embraces the spirit of that region. Bluegrass is brought to life by combining high tenor vocals with instruments like the mandolin, fiddle—or violin—guitar, banjo, and bass, and is most often associated with Monroe, the creator and master of the style.

I was fortunate to have been able to play my fiddle with Bill Monroe in Boone County, West Virginia, when he appeared there years ago. I remember how enlivening it was to make music with such a first-rate musician. Monroe's stage performance exuded the passion and dedication he had for music. He told me how he believed in a, "good, clean show." Bill Monroe was a true gentleman. He never drank, smoked, or used offensive language. I remember he referred to liquor as "slop," and would tell aspiring musicians to go onto the stage, "looking right and smelling right," meaning that they should have no traces of whiskey on their breath. Indeed, Monroe was a role model for the more than 200 performers who played with The Blue Grass Boys throughout all of their Saturday evening appearances at the Opry. Musicians would travel to Nashville just to be able to say they had had

a chance to work with the legendary performer.

And I would imagine that the Senator who is presently presiding over this great body has been out to the Grand Ole Opry himself on a few occasions, being fortunate in that the Grand Ole Opry was in his native State of Tennessee.

Musicians would travel to Nashville just to be able to say they had had a chance to work with this legendary performer.

William Smith Monroe was born in Rosine, Kentucky, on September 13, 1911. His parents died when he was still young, and he went to live with his Uncle Pen, a fiddle player.

There is a tune called "Uncle Pen," and I am sure that it was the product of Bill Monroe's prolific musical mind and written in honor of his uncle, Uncle Pen.

As the youngest of eight children in a musical family, Monroe learned about music early on, influenced by secular and religious folk traditions, gospel, blues, and Scottish and Irish fiddle tunes. He would later tell people that his mastery of the mandolin stemmed from the fact that his older siblings took their first pick of other instruments. Later on, this proved to be a blessing, since much of Monroe's success is attributed to his mandolin's unique sound which became the signature instrument of his bluegrass music. Monroe and two of his brothers—Charlie, who played the guitar, and Birch, who played the fiddle—moved to Chicago in 1930. The music they played there for dances and house parties was a traditional country style, but even in those early years, it was characterized by a faster tempo and the high-pitched harmonies that later evolved into Monroe's bluegrass trademark.

In 1938, Monroe auditioned for the Grand Ole Opry. The audition with Opry chief George Hay—the solemn old judge—was such a success that when Hay signed Monroe and the Blue Grass Boys, he told them, "If you ever leave the Opry, it'll be because you fired yourself!" Monroe's debut at the Opry marked the first time in the hall's history that the audience demanded an encore.

By the 1940's, Monroe's style was moving further from traditional country music and toward its own distinct sound. The country music scene considered his music too old fashioned to be called country music and the folk music scene wanted to maintain its image as a more affluent style. Monroe finally found a place for his music where he always wanted it—in its own class. His style became known as Bluegrass, as identified with his band, the Blue Grass Boys. In the late 1940's, the classic Blue Grass Boys lineup featured Lester Flatt on the guitar, and Earl Scruggs, who mastered the three-finger-roll banjo technique which added to their distinct sound.

As a boy, I used to listen to people in West Virginia play the banjo. They