

I think the best science ought to be used.

Now you come to the issue of whether or not you are going to have a recovery plan to try to save the species. And here, only the species counts. If you cannot come up with a recovery plan under the present law, if you cannot come up with a recovery plan that will save the species, or, to put it the other way around, if every recovery plan that you can think of by the best scientific evidence will lead to the extinction of the species, then nothing else counts. People do not count. Revenues to counties do not count. Whether or not the schools have enough money to keep going does not count. Nothing counts but the species, and that is where this act is not balanced.

So, Mr. President, I am glad to join a number of my fellow Senators in introducing amendments to the Endangered Species Act. We think these amendments are a balance. We are not getting rid of the act. We are not getting rid of science. As a matter of fact, we are asking for stronger science, for better science, for better review. But this act finally allows people to be considered as much as bugs. And that has been the failing of the present law.

I hope the Senate will favorably consider this. I am proud to join as a cosponsor.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues as an original cosponsor of the Endangered Species Act Reform Amendments of 1995.

This bill is the result of several years' work.

The bill represents the culmination of broad grassroots efforts to bring balance to the Endangered Species Act.

This broad grassroots coalition consists of miners, ranchers, loggers, farmers, manufacturers, the fisheries industry, and organized labor.

PROBLEMS WITH CURRENT ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

The Endangered Species Act is an act gone awry. The act is wreaking havoc on our communities and economies, particularly in the Pacific Northwest, but increasingly nationwide. The act is devastating entire industries and regions.

In the Pacific Northwest alone, since the spotted owl was listed as threatened in 1990, millions of acres of Federal timberland and thousands of private acres have been set aside for owls.

The act has impacted tens of thousands of human beings and hundreds of rural communities.

Estimates of the number of jobs lost as a result of the listing range anywhere from 35,000 to 150,000.

The act was originally intended to ensure the survival of species that were threatened by site-specific projects, such as roads, dams, and sewer systems.

The act is now being used as a tool by environmental groups to further their agenda of locking up not only all public land, but private land as well.

Private property owners are increasingly losing the right to use their property as they intended.

ECONOMIC COSTS OF ESA

Edward O. Wilson, a renowned entomologist at Harvard observes that there may be something on the order of 100 million species.

Yet only 1.4 million have been named.

How many billions of dollars are we willing to spend attempting to save: fungi, insects, and bacteria we've never heard of, and species for which there may be little or no chance of recovery in any case.

SOCIAL COSTS OF ESA

While the economic costs of protecting species is great, the social impacts are no less devastating.

Robert Lee, sociologist with the University of Washington College of Forest Resources, has done extensive research on the social trauma afflicting timber towns. He points to the destruction of families and long-lasting social fallout in the form of suicide, homicide, divorce, juvenile delinquency, drug abuse, and spousal and child abuse.

It is ironic that for years we considered the needs of humans as though nothing else mattered.

Now, under the Endangered Species Act, we are considering the needs of fish, wildlife, and plants as though nothing else matters.

Both policies are short-sighted and flawed.

CURRENT EFFORTS

We need a process which not only protects plants and animals, but one which recognizes legitimate human needs as well.

That is why, in the last Congress, I joined with Senators GORTON, SHELBY and others in introducing legislation to bring balance to the Endangered Species Act.

This year, with even stronger bipartisan support, we have again introduced legislation to require that the economic and social impacts of Federal efforts to protect species be fully considered.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Our bill contains several components essential to meaningful reform.

The bill reforms the process by which species are listed as threatened or endangered:

Requires independent scientific peer review of the science;

Requires better data collection.

Provides for broader participation by affected States and the public;

Requires judicial review of listing decisions;

In place of intensive Federal management, the bill includes incentives to encourage private landowners to protect species, such as:

Encouraging the exchange of private land for Federal land to provide habitat for affected species; and

Establishing a Federal cost-share program for any direct costs imposed on a private person.

Our bill requires the Secretary to set a "conservation objective," ranging from full recovery of the species to solely protecting the species from actions which would directly injure or kill the species.

In other words, the Secretary could decide to allow a species to go extinct.

Our bill requires that economic and social impacts are fully considered in the development of conservation measures.

Our bill changes the statutory definition of "harm" and "take" to mean the actual injury or killing of a member of a species.

"Harm" will no longer apply to the modification of a species' habitat as the courts have broadly interpreted current law.

Our bill minimizes the impacts to private property.

CONCLUSION

It is not our goal to abandon our national commitment to the protection of endangered species; however, we cannot protect every imaginable species.

We can do a better job of balancing jobs and economic opportunity with species protection.

While this bill does not go as far as I would like, it will begin the debate which is long overdue.

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

PRESIDENT CLINTON BRINGS HOME NOTHING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, President Clinton has gone to Moscow, and he has come home with nothing. I repeat: President Clinton has gone to Moscow, and he has come home with nothing.

There has not been much coverage yet of the summit over there in Russia, but it is pretty clear that President Clinton has in effect gone to Moscow, given President Yeltsin an opportunity to show that he can deliver the President of the United States for a celebration of the end of World War II, and we have had no progress on stopping the sale of nuclear material to Iran, no apologies about the slaughter of 25,000 people in Chechnya.

In summary, Mr. President, very little, if anything, has been accomplished at this summit that would benefit this country.

Now, arguably, our President showing up over there has helped President

Yeltsin and the Russians, but typically we think of these summits as producing something beneficial for our side. It does not seem to me there has been one single step in the direction that we would like to see us go as a result of this summit.

The issue, of course, is not whether we have a relationship with Russia. We all want to have a relationship with Russia. The question is, What kind of relationship is it going to be?

During the past 2 years, we have seen a real change in the makeup of President Yeltsin's inner circle or kitchen cabinet. He has fired reformers and replaced them with hard-line reactionary advisers who are suspicious of free market reforms and suspicious of democracy. Some observers have said there is only one reformer left in the cabinet and he is the one they sent over here to the United States to talk to people in the Senate.

In a recent hearing, I asked Deputy Secretary Talbott to identify a single voice of reason in the kitchen cabinet; just one. Secretary Talbott changed the subject.

Yeltsin's decisions are making it very difficult to sustain support for assistance to Russia.

In February, Secretary Christopher said the President would not go to Moscow for a summit if Chechnya were unresolved. Well, the President is there and Chechnya is unresolved. Almost as soon as that line was drawn in the sand by President Clinton, he backed down.

Current Russian policy test United States interests and principles. In fact, current Russian policy makes no sense at all, Mr. President.

In Chechnya, basic principles of democracy and human rights are under siege. It really begs the question: Does a democratic government turn its guns on its civilians, killing 25,000 men, women, and children?

Preliminary indications are we have accepted Yeltsin's determination that this is basically an internal matter and is none of our business. Essentially, that is what President Yeltsin said: "This is our affair. You butt out, President Clinton."

Both our security interests and our allies are threatened by the pending sale of nuclear technology to Iran. The biggest current issue between ourselves and the Russians is the pending sale of nuclear technology to Iran. And the President has said earlier in the year he would not go to Moscow for this celebration of V-E Day unless there was progress on that issue. Well, there has been no progress. The nuclear sale continues to go forward.

This agreement that the administration has announced that there will be no sale of the centrifuge technology is simply not adequate. That is a figleaf to allow President Clinton to claim somehow that progress was made on deterring the nuclear transfer to Iran when, in fact, no real progress has been made.

In addition to that, Mr. President, nothing has changed on the issue of NATO expansion and other European security questions. Everyone was surprised by the Russian reversal last December when Yeltsin and Kozyrev denounced NATO plans to enlarge itself and rejected the Partnership for Peace program. Combined with recent statements that Moscow has the right to use force to protect Russian minorities in the Soviet Republics, leaders across the region are justifiably concerned. It should have been essential for the summit to produce a concrete commitment by Yeltsin to respect the political, economic and territorial sovereignty of those countries that used to make up the Soviet Union.

In summary, Mr. President, what is going on here is the Russians are saying, "We don't want you to expand NATO. And, oh, by the way, all the countries that we used to dominate, that used to be part of the Soviet Union, are our business and none of yours."

No progress has been made at this summit on any of these issues; not a single shred of evidence of any progress whatsoever on any of these issues.

Mr. President, I, like many Members of the Senate, want to get along with the Russians. Obviously, we have a better relationship than we did during the cold war, but some days I wonder where this relationship is going. It seems to me, by pursuing this Moscow myopia, this view that whatever Yeltsin wants Yeltsin gets, by pursuing that particular point of view, we stand no chance of having the opportunity to build a genuinely constructive relationship with the Russians.

So let me just, in sum, Mr. President, say that I think this summit has been a disappointment. I am sorry that President Yeltsin has been unable to commit to any of the progress that we had hoped for, but mostly I am sorry that President Clinton chose to go. Why is he there?

At virtually every summit in my memory, something has been brought back that was arguably in the interest of the United States. President Clinton has gone to Moscow, gone to Moscow at President Yeltsin's request, given President Yeltsin an opportunity to look good, made no progress on the nuclear sale to Iran, made no progress on the expansion of NATO, and comes home emptyhanded. So, by any standard, Mr. President, this summit is a disappointment.

I yield the floor.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate today has turned its attention relatively early in

the session to a bill of primary importance to my State of Indiana and to many other States in this Nation. It is a bill that the Senate is very familiar with, one to allow States to limit the importation of out-of-State waste. We have discussed it on numerous occasions.

I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, and the chairman of the full committee, Senator CHAFFEE, for bringing this bill to the floor, as well as the ranking member, Senator BAUCUS, and, of course, Senator DOLE for scheduling this legislation.

Early in my Senate career, which has not been that long, I observed a phenomenon in Indiana as I was driving through the State. All across the State homemade signs posted on telephone poles or stuck in the ground appeared that said, "Don't dump on us."

I began to inquire what the subject was. We checked into that and found that the citizens throughout Indiana, many small towns in particular, found that, instead of the local garbage dump which received a truck or two of local community waste, garbage, a day, suddenly they discovered that 18-wheelers were lined up for blocks waiting to enter the local dump to dump their waste. And people said, "Where is all this coming from?"

You really cannot call these facilities landfills, because they were designed for receipt of small amounts of everyday household trash, waste, that was picked up maybe a couple of times a week at most and delivered to the local dump.

In a little more than a year, our State saw negligible volumes of out-of-State trash that were coming into the State explode to more than 20 percent of our total waste disposal. Virtually overnight, the State of Indiana became a target for out-of-State trash.

The statistics do not begin to tell the story. Because, as I said, the trash parade targeted many small communities in rural areas in Indiana. So the magnitude of the change was dramatic for the citizens of those communities.

Let me just tell you one story, the story of Center Point. This small town in Indiana, a town of 250 people, had a local garbage dump. Not a landfill, it was not certified as a big landfill. It was just a place where the local citizens were able to dispose of their local trash. A couple of trucks picked up the trash in the community and surrounding areas and disposed of it in this area.

In 1989, the local landfill was purchased by out-of-State investors, and the site was doubled. Ads began appearing in national magazines that said: "Send us your trash." Narrow country lanes were clogged with 18-wheelers loaded with trash and garbage from other States. Local citizens, rightfully so, I believe, began to keep a watch on a daily basis, on a 24-hour-a-day basis. They would log in the license plates of the trucks coming to bring the trash,