

Health Human Services—they get a waiver signed by the President that says you are going to have a 10-year exemption—10 years, no limit, and no work requirement. What a sham. What a shame. What a shame that this President and this administration would be so deceitful as to try to pull that over on the American people.

I am pleased that the Department of Health and Human Services realized their mistake. My guess is that the political people said, "Hey. This could come back to hurt us, or haunt us. Therefore, let us withdraw it."

I am pleased that the District of Columbia City Council, which never requested a 10-year waiver on work requirements, never requested a 10-year waiver on lifetime benefits—I am pleased that some of the council members realized that this is terrible. This would be a disaster for the District of Columbia. So I am pleased that evidently not only are they going to have some hearings but some Members think it would be a serious mistake, and they don't want the District of Columbia to become the welfare capital of the United States.

So I am pleased with the announcement of HHS today. I think the administration got caught in trying to have it both ways on welfare reform. To say "Yes, we need welfare reform with time limits and work requirements" while at the same time trying to undo welfare reform—to exempt work requirements, to exempt time limits—they should be ashamed of themselves. I am pleased they reversed themselves for about the fourth time on this issue.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

MARITIME SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. What is the pending business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1350 is the pending business.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I just wanted to advise my colleagues that we have not received any requests to submit amendments on this side. Do we have any amendments pending at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no amendments pending that the Chair is aware of.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUE. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa is conferring off the floor concerning amendments that he may offer. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. I will state to the Chair it will be about 30 minutes.

There being no objection, at 6:27 p.m., the Senate recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 7:08 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SANTORUM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1350. Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 8 minutes as in morning business.

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

FEDERAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in the United States, there are 571 Federal wildlife refuges. There is only one State that doesn't have any, and that, unfortunately, is the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

To look at a couple of States that are comparable in the size of population to my State, Oklahoma has 9, Louisiana has 16, Alabama has 7.

Mr. President, it is pretty clear that Kentucky, when it comes to Federal wildlife refuges, has not been treated properly down through the years. I have been working on this issue since 1989. I introduced the first bill to create the first Federal wildlife refuge in Kentucky. It is not easy to find appropriate spots in the east. Many of our friends out west have more public land than they want. But in the east, it is not so.

We isolated—"we," working with the Kentucky Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—identified an area in Kentucky that makes sense. I introduced a bill which was reported out of the Environment and Public Works committee to authorize this refuge. It is my hope that the Interior appropriations bill will include both the authorization and appropriation to begin the acquisition.

Let me just say that no land will be condemned under this proposal. Only land will be purchased from willing sellers. That is a little bit different from the way some Federal wildlife refuges have been created. As a result of that, there is very minor opposition in our State to the creation of our first Federal wildlife refuge.

My dear colleague from Kentucky earlier today took to the floor to point out that this was not needed, and that we had another facility called the Land Between the Lakes—which is operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority; it

is a wonderful facility; a wonderful place—but that it really needed the money; and, if he were given the opportunity to do so, would offer an amendment to take the money away from the Federal wildlife refuge and give it to the Land Between the Lakes.

Mr. President, the Land Between the Lakes has already been given all the money they asked for. I am on the appropriations Subcommittee of Energy and Water which receives the request. We gave them all they asked for. They may ask for more someplace down the road, and it may be appropriate to give them more someplace down the road. But I do not think, particularly in these tight times, that it makes sense to throw money at a group, or a project, or an activity that is not asking for it.

So, if this amendment is offered at some subsequent time, obviously I am going to oppose it. I find it somewhat astonishing that my colleague would find it inappropriate for Kentucky to finally—it came into the Union in 1792—to finally have a Federal wildlife refuge.

It was suggested by my colleague that this was an incredibly controversial proposal. In fact, it is just the opposite. There are few who may oppose it, although if they own land in the area and don't want to sell they don't have to. And a wildlife refuge is a good neighbor. If you do not want to sell, it is a great neighbor to have right next to you. There is nothing that would keep any landowner in this area from keeping this property forever in this proposal.

There are 57 conservation groups and sportsmen from Kentucky who support this.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE ENDORSED THE CREATION OF THE KENTUCKY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Appalachia Science in the Public Interest.
Association of Chenoweth Run Environmentalists.

Audubon Society of Kentucky.
Bell County Beautification Association.
Berea College Biology Club.
Brushy Fork Water Watch.
Community Farm Alliance.
Davies County Audubon Society & Kentucky Ornithological Society.
Department of Parks.
Eastern Kentucky University Wildlife Society.

Elkhorn Land & Historic Trust Inc.
Floyds Fork Environmental Association.
Friends of Mill Creek.
Gun Powder Creek Water Watch.
Harlan County Clean Community Association.

Hart County Environmental Group.
Highlands Group Cumberland Chapter Sierra Club.

Kentucky Academy of Science.
Kentucky Association for Environmental Education.

Kentucky Audubon Council.
Kentucky Citizens Accountability Project.
Kentucky Conservation Committee.

Kentucky Fish & Wildlife Education & Resource Foundation.

Kentucky Houndsmen Association.
Kentucky Native Plant Society.
Kentucky Society of Natural History.
Kentucky State Nature Preserve Commission.

Lake Cumberland Water Watch.
Land & Nature Trust of the Bluegrass.
League of Kentucky Sportsman.
League of Women Voters of Kentucky.
Leslie County KAB System.
Little River Audubon Society.
Louisville Audubon Society.
Louisville Chapter 476 of Trout Unlimited.
Louisville Nature Center.
Madison County Clean Community Committee.

Madison Environment.
Mall Interiors.
Midway Area Environmental Committee.
National Wild Turkey Federation.
Oldham Community Center & Nature Preserve, Inc.

Peterson's Fault Farm.
Pleasant Hill Recreation Association.
Pride Inc.
Quail Unlimited.
Rockcastle River Rebirth.
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.
Ruddles Mill Conservation Project.
Scenic Kentucky.
Shelby Clean Community Program.
Shelby County Clean Community Council.
Sierra Club Cumberland Chapter.
Steve & Janet Kistler.
The Nature Conservancy/Kentucky Chapter.

The Wildlife Connection.
Trout Unlimited/KYOUA Chapter.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, my colleague made reference to the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, and said that was a bunch of "foreigners" and didn't have a presence in Kentucky. He might want to know that there are several thousand supporters of this group in Kentucky. Just because it is called the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation does not mean it does not have a lot of Kentucky members. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Kentucky State chairman of the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELK FOUNDATION,
Bowling Green, KY, March 19, 1996.
Senator MITCH McCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR McCONNELL: Please accept this letter as my support of your intention to propose legislation that would establish and fund the Clark's River National Wildlife Refuge in Western Kentucky. I sincerely appreciate your efforts to establish this area as Kentucky's first National Wildlife Refuge.

I am the Kentucky State Chairman for the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. The Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation is one of the co-operating partners that have helped to establish the Elk and Bison Prairie at TVA's Land Between the Lakes. Additionally, I am the Co-Chairman for the fund raising committee charged with the effort of raising \$244,000 for the first phases of this very important project at Land Between the Lakes. I am very happy to report to you that this project is not even open to the public yet and we have already raised \$222,000 toward our goal. However, I certainly see a distinction and a need for you to create Kentucky's first Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge at the East Fork of the Clark's River. As you are aware, the NWR site evaluation team determined that not only did this site best fit the Untied States Fish and Wildlife Services biological and feasibility criteria, this area was deemed most worthy of perpetual protection from degradation and development that would be afforded by establishment of a refuge.

I am certainly one of the strongest supporters of LBL and am aware of the budget problems that this agency faces. I can assure you, as State Chairman for the RMEF that I donate hundreds of hours of my time in support of LBL and the Elk and Bison Prairie project. The bottom line is both of these projects are very worthy projects and both of these projects are worthy of your support, but in my opinion, the creation of Kentucky's first National Wildlife Refuge should be established at the Clark's River.

I would be happy to discuss this issue with you personally if you should have any other questions.

Working for Wildlife.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. BAKER,
Kentucky State Chairman.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in addition to that we worked with the Kentucky Farm Bureau. They typically don't endorse these kinds of projects. But what is interesting to note is that they chose not to oppose this one, and the reason they chose not to is because we worked with them on the "willing seller provision" so that nobody involved in agriculture in this area would be required to sell. It is very important to me that we protect farmers property rights.

Mr. President, with regard to the Land Between the Lakes, which my colleague would give more funding than they asked for by taking it away from the Federal wildlife refuge, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. Craven Crowell, who said, "I want to express my sincere appreciation for your support for TVA's fiscal year 1997 budget. You played a significant role in achieving our goals."

In other words, with regard to LBL, TVA got everything it wanted.

In addition to that, Mr. President, I would like to also have printed in the RECORD a letter I received yesterday from William Kennoy, who is the Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and a Kentuckian, who also confirms that the Land Between the Lakes operated by TVA was given all they asked for in this year's budget.

I ask unanimous consent that it, along with the letters from Mr. Crowell and the Kentucky Farm Bureau, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENTUCKY FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION
Louisville, KY, April 20, 1996.

Mr. DON OVERBY,
*President, Calloway County Farm Bureau,
Almo, KY.*

DEAR DONNIE: This is to acknowledge and thank you and Calloway County for your attendance and participation in the Measure the Candidate training session held April 8.

Also, I wanted to reply to your question on the proposed Clarks River National Wildlife Refuge.

As I had mentioned, Laura Knoth has been working diligently with Senator McConnell's staff to ensure Farm Bureau's policy is contained in the language of the proposed legislation. Specifically, language which protects farmer's property rights. The following provisions, your Farm Bureau policy, have been successfully integrated into S. 1611, "The Kentucky National Wildlife Refuge Authorization Act:"

Section 26 . . . the refuge should not restrict agricultural and silvicultural activities on private lands.

Section 6C(I) no activity carried out in the refuge will result in the obstruction of the flow of water so as to affect any private land adjacent to the refuge; and

(ii) no buffer zone regulating any land use (other than hunting and fishing) is established.

On March 28, the Environment and Public Works Committee passed S. 1611 by unanimous consent. As of this date, it has not been placed on the Senate calendar to receive floor action.

Donnie, I have also enclosed for your review a copy of a letter from Tom Bennett, Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, which outlines significant and unique criteria the Clarks River possesses for the proposed wildlife refuge. I am hopeful that his information is helpful. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact Laura, or myself.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY A. CANSLER,
*Director, National Affairs
and Political Education.*

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, TN, September 13, 1996.

Hon. MITCH McCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to express my sincere appreciation for your support of TVA's fiscal year 1997 budget. You played a significant role in achieving our goals.

We will wisely manage these funds for the benefit of the people of the Tennessee Valley. We hope you will be pleased with the results.

Thank you for being a good friend to TVA.
With warm regards,

Craven Crowell.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, TN, September 18, 1996.

Hon. MITCH McCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR McCONNELL: Yesterday an article appeared in the Paducah Sun referring to a letter I sent Congressman Whitfield on funding for LBL. The letter was inadvertently faxed without my authorization or signature.

The level of funding provided in the Energy and Water Conference report will fully meet TVA and LBL requirements that we have requested of Congress.

I am in the process of preparing an inventory of the needs of LBL's infrastructure for the next few years but this is not yet complete and we have, therefore, made no request to Congress for this future funding.

I understand TVA Chairman Crowell recently wrote you expressing his appreciation for your support for TVA's Budget and noted the "significant role you played in achieving our goals." You have been a strong supporter of TVA and we have no desire to jeopardize that relationship because of inaccurate comments through miscommunications. We appreciate your dedication to LBL over the years.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. KENNOY, P.E.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that it is unusual, to say the least, for two Senators from the same State to differ on projects of this matter. I am sorry that seems to be the case here. But let me say in conclusion and in summary that there are 571 Federal wildlife refuges in the Nation but not one in Kentucky. We are long overdue for our first Federal wildlife refuge. This proposal was developed over a number of years in cooperation with the Kentucky Fish and Wildlife Service, and over 57 sportsmen and conservation groups from across Kentucky feel that this great need should be met.

No land under this proposal will be taken from anyone—only from willing sellers. It is my hope, Mr. President, that this proposal authorizing and appropriating some money to begin Kentucky's first Federal wildlife refuge will be a part of the Interior appropriations bill.

I hope my colleague will not offer an amendment to strip out the money provided—whatever money is ultimately provided—for this first Federal wildlife refuge in order to give it to the Tennessee Valley Authority which says it does not need it.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. I know there are a number of Members who are waiting and wondering what the schedule might be for the remainder of the evening. We are working very aggressively to try to come to a unanimous consent agreement that would allow us to go forward with amendments and debate on those amendments tonight and complete those amendments tonight, if we could get this agreement worked out, with the votes stacked beginning at 10 o'clock on Friday morning.

We are still working with Members on both sides. I think it is, frankly, urgent that we go ahead and get this agreement entered into momentarily. We are very close to that. But as usual, we are trying to check with all the Senators who are interested in the subject matter to see if we can get that worked out.

In the meantime, Mr. President, before I do a statement, let me again observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1174

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of S. 1174, regarding the Lamprey River in New Hampshire, the bill be advanced to third reading and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the leader on our side, I reserve the right to object.

I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would amend his request to include the following: That the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 599, S. 608, that the committee amendments be agreed to, the bill be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not know about the other bill that was attempted to be added to my request for consideration of a bill, but I would just like my colleagues to know that this bill, S. 1174, passed unanimously out of committee with bipartisan support. It was placed on the calendar by the majority leader. It has the unanimous support of everyone on the Republican side. It has the support of my State of New Hampshire. It has the support of the individuals who helped to put this river into the wild and scenic bill. It is 12 miles of a beautiful river that we now preserve under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, if this legislation passes.

I find it outrageous that, for whatever reasons, political or otherwise, a piece of legislation that has that much support would be objected to; tying it, linking it to some other legislation. I think the other legislation can rise or fall on its own merit. This is a good bill.

Mr. President, on August 10, 1995, Senator GREGG and I introduced S. 1174, the Lamprey Wild and Scenic River Act, to designate a segment of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Since introduction, a hearing was held on the legislation in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and soon thereafter, as I

said, the bill was reported unanimously out of the committee.

I introduced this legislation after receiving the vote of support from each of the affected communities along this segment of the River. Ordinarily I do not encourage Federal ownership and control of State or private property, however, this legislation is different.

The process for developing this legislation was different for two reasons. First, the legislation was developed from the bottom up, from environmentally conscious communities and local people. It is not a Washington initiative. Second, the bill is drafted to allow for maximum control at the local level in making land use and conservation decisions.

The history of this legislation goes back almost 5 years when Senator Rudman and I introduced the Lamprey River study bill in February 1991, which was subsequently signed into law by President Bush later that year. Once the National Park Service determined the Lamprey River's eligibility for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, a local advisory committee was formed to work with local communities, landowners, the National Park Service and New Hampshire's environment department in preparing a comprehensive management plan. This management plan was completed in January 1995.

The Lamprey River Management Plan was subsequently endorsed by the advisory committee as well as the local governments affected by this designation. The primary criteria for my sponsorship of this legislation was the support of the local communities. If the affected towns did not vote in favor of designation, I would not be here today seeking support for this legislation.

In fact, the town of Epping had expressed some reservation about designating the segment of the Lamprey which runs through the town and, out of respect for their concerns, the bill excludes that segment of the river. However, that segment was studied and found to be eligible, so we have included a section in our bill that would allow the town of Epping to be involved in the implementation of the management plan and, upon the town's request, be considered for future designation.

The Lamprey River is well deserving of this designation for a number of reasons. Not only is the river listed on the 1982 National Park Service's inventory of outstanding rivers, but it has also been recognized by the State of New Hampshire as the "most important coastal river for anadromous fish in the State." Herring, Shad and Salmon are among the anadromous species found in the river. In fact, New Hampshire fishing maps describe the Lamprey as "a truly exceptional river offering a vast variety of fishing. It contains every type of stream and river fish you could expect to find in New England."

The Lamprey is approximately 60 miles in length and serves as the major