

fire hydrants, or according to health and safety requirements as approved by the Architect of the Capitol."

On page 3, line 4, add the following new subsection:

"(c) No construction shall extend into the United States Capitol Grounds except as otherwise provided in section 1."

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, and the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 1608) was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 167), as amended, was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—CONTINUED

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is to recognize the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB.

Mr. GORTON. Is the Interior bill the subject?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Interior bill is the pending business.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, in discussions with the manager of the bill, the majority leader, and the Democratic leader, and understanding that the matter that I was going to raise would require fairly extensive debate and then a vote, thus delaying the departure of Members for the August recess—and remembering how fond Members have been of not bothering Members of this body when they were the last obstacle between leaving on the August recess and making one last vote—I have agreed with the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Washington, not to offer the amendment. He has agreed to recognize me first when the bill is next before the Senate.

With that in mind, and knowing that many of our colleagues are, as I speak, heading for the airports, I will not offer the amendment I had planned to offer this evening. I will offer it when we next take up the Interior appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia.

I had expected that we would have a vote on a point of order with respect to the section of the bill to which he refers tonight. He prefers, as is his right, to introduce a motion to strike this particular provision. That is, of course, a debatable motion and a motion that would be debated with some seriousness.

The majority leader has said the floor is available to debate amend-

ments tonight with the exception of the Senator from Virginia.

I don't see anyone here who I believe really wants to introduce and debate an amendment tonight. We will leave a resolution or any recorded vote until Wednesday, September 8.

One Senator, Mr. SMITH from Oregon, I know, wishes to debate the Senator from Virginia. If we can find him in the next 5 minutes or so, so that there could be a real debate, then I would be delighted to have the Senator from Virginia introduce his amendment. But I think we ought to have someone on both sides here in order to do it.

In the meantime, for a few minutes at least, we are searching around to see if there are any agreed-upon amendments that I can simply introduce and have offered and passed.

I also notice the presence of the Senator from Wyoming who waited patiently this morning with the Senator from Florida for a debate on a particular amendment which might possibly end up being determined by a voice vote.

I ask the Senator from Wyoming whether his partner from Florida is available this evening.

Mr. ENZI. We are checking.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum while we see whether or not in the next few minutes we can gather people together for at least one debate on one amendment before we adjourn for the recess.

With that, for the moment, 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. 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.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support for S. 1292, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for FY 2000.

As a member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee, I appreciate the difficult task before the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Minority to balance the diverse priorities funded in this bill—from our public lands, to major Indian programs and agencies, energy conservation and research, and the Smithsonian and federal arts agencies. They have done a masterful job meeting important program needs within existing spending caps.

The pending bill provides \$14.0 billion in new budget authority and \$9.15 billion in new outlays to fund Department of Interior agencies, including the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Minerals Management Service, and the U.S. Forest Service, the Indian

Health Service, the fossil energy and energy conservation programs of the Department of Energy, the Smithsonian, and federal arts and humanities agencies.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the bill totals \$14.0 billion in budget authority and \$14.3 billion in outlays for FY 2000. The Senate Subcommittee is \$1 million in both budget authority and outlays below its revised 302(b) allocation. The bill is \$35 million in BA above, and \$104 million in outlays below, the bill recently passed by the House. The bill is \$1.1 billion in BA and \$0.7 billion in outlays below the President's budget request in large measure because the President's offsets to increased discretionary spending are not within the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

I commend the Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Member for bringing this important measure to the floor within the 302(b) allocation. I urge the adoption of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 1292, INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 2000 SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL (Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:				
Budget authority	13,922		59	13,981
Outlays	14,250		83	14,333
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	13,923		59	13,982
Outlays	14,251		83	14,334
1999 level:				
Budget authority	13,800		59	13,859
Outlays	13,994		59	14,053
President's request				
Budget authority	15,046		59	15,105
Outlays	14,992		83	15,075
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	13,887		59	13,946
Outlays	14,354		83	14,437
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	(1)			(1)
Outlays	(1)			(1)
1999 level:				
Budget authority	122			122
Outlays	256		24	280
President request				
Budget authority	(1,124)			(1,124)
Outlays	(742)			(742)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	35			35
Outlays	(104)			(104)

Note—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

MATERIALS R&D

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to engage the Chairman in a brief colloquy regarding materials research and development efforts funded through the energy programs in the Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. GORTON. I will be happy to join the Ranking Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee in such a colloquy.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the senior Senator from Washington. Much of the

progress we have made as an industrialized society has been the result of remarkable advances in materials. Improvements in commonplace and necessary items—cars, planes, computers, medical equipment—all are intricately tied to enhancements to the materials from which they are constructed. The same is true of our energy sources and energy production. Our power plants—the turbines, boilers and pollution controls that supply the electricity that powers our economy—are only as effective and reliable as the materials we use to build them.

Mr. Chairman, you and the Committee have done an admirable job in fashioning a budget that points this Nation toward new technologies for generating electricity in the 21st Century. The Committee's proposal supports a new concept for power generation called "Vision 21." This "Vision 21" initiative excites our imagination over the possibility of a pollution-free power plant. But the success of "Vision 21"—or, for that matter, any advances in tomorrow's energy technologies—will depend on the development of stronger, more durable, and more reliable materials.

Your support, Mr. Chairman, has been critical in ensuring that funding for materials research and development is included in this bill. Should the Department of Energy reassess its funding needs and priorities in order to move this research effort forward, would you give consideration to a request from the Department to redirect a portion of its funding to further this effort?

Mr. GORTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his endorsement of this aspect of energy research. As the Senator mentioned, we have included a modest increase in materials research in the fossil energy budget for this bill above the enacted level. I am aware of the excellent research being done in the Senator's home state—at the Federal Energy Technology Center—as well as in other Energy Department laboratories. It is the intent of the Committee to continue to work with the Department of Energy to seek opportunities to enhance and strengthen this important area of research in balance with the other high-priority research. In this regard, the Committee would certainly give careful consideration to such a reprogramming request of the Department of Energy.

GLEN ECHO PARK CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Ms. MIKULSKI. I rise with my colleague from the State of Maryland to engage the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding the funds included in the Senate bill for Glen Echo Park, a unit of the George Washington Parkway in Maryland.

Mr. GORTON. I would be pleased to join with the Senior Senator from West Virginia in a colloquy with the esteemed members of the Senate delega-

tion from Maryland regarding Glen Echo.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Chairman. Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD, is it the intent of the Appropriations Committee that the funds provided in the bill for Glen Echo Park in the construction account of the National Park Service be used for rehabilitation and replacement of facilities at Glen Echo Park?

Mr. GORTON. Yes, it is.

Mr. BYRD. I concur with the Chairman.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member.

Mr. SARBANES. Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD, is it also the intent of the Appropriations Committee that the funds provided for Glen Echo Park in the construction account of the National Park Service represent the first phase of an estimate \$18 million restoration effort, whose total costs will be shared equally by the National Park Service, the State of Maryland and Montgomery County?

Mr. GORTON. Yes it is.

Mr. BYRD. I concur with the Chairman.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member.

OPERATIONAL EXPENSES AT OUR NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a project that the Senate has been working on for over two decades, the Congaree Swamp National Monument. When this National Monument was established in 1976, its purpose was to educate present and future generations. Mr. President, through the leadership of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, we have come a long way. In FY'98, funding was provided to build and pave a new entrance road and with FY'99 funds, the park's first visitor facility, a 10,300 sq. ft. education and administration facility is near completion. The total estimated cost for these two projects was \$5.814 million. Through a partnership with the National Guard, Richland County, and a local non-profit organization these projects will be built for a total cost of \$2.16 million. That is a savings of \$3.65 million to the American tax payer.

Now that a new administration facility is close to being completed, we face the difficult task of providing adequate staffing levels at the Congaree National Monument. Increased staffing levels are needed at this monument to ensure safety and to provide education to the increasing number of park visitors. While I know earmarking operational funds for specific park sites is not the best course of action, I do want to bring to light the problem that this National Monument will be facing in the near future. In 1996, an on-site operations review by seven Atlantic Coast Cluster Superintendents concluded that "the [park's] staffing level is inadequate to provide minimum resource protection and visitor services".

The report continued with the statement that "the park staff, with considerable support from an excellent volunteer cadre, is doing a valiant job of operating the park to the best of their ability, but lack the same breadth of resources and facilities in other National Park Service sites. * * * More than 300-school group program requests were denied last year because of the lack of staff. A large percentage of park visitors leave without learning the significance of the park due to the lack of programs. The shortage of staff will become even more critical with completion of the new infrastructure and increased visitation.

Mr. GORTON. I am well aware of the shortfall when it comes to operation expenses, not only at the Congaree Swamp National Monument, but at many National Park Service sites. When crafting the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill, we took staffing needs and operation expenses into account and provided \$1,355,176,000, which is an increase of \$69,572,000 over the fiscal year 1999 enacted level.

Mr. HOLLINGS. With an additional \$69.5 million, is there any funding provided that would help the Congaree Swamp National Monument in its attempt to address the need for additional staff?

Mr. GORTON. While the distinguished Senator from South Carolina alluded to the problem of earmarking specific operational expenses earlier, I will say that of the total amount provided, \$27,035,000 is for a park operations initiative focused on parks with critical health and safety deficiencies, inadequate resources protection capabilities and shortfalls in visitor services.

Mr. HOLLINGS. If the Congress Swamp National Monument is deemed to have critical health and safety deficiencies, inadequate resources protection capabilities or shortfalls in visitor services, can a portion of this \$27 million be used to hire additional staff?

Mr. GORTON. I understand that the National Park Service has already targeted these funds for specific park sites.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I also understand the frustration that arises when National Park Service sites are understaffed. In fact, a number of National Park Service sites in West Virginia have unmet operational and staffing needs. I can assure the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that if the National Park Service deems the Congress Swamp National Monument to be in need of additional staff to carry out its stated mission the Committee would give careful consideration to providing additional funds in the future to increase staffing levels at this site. It is important that visitors to all our National Park sites come away with the education and appreciation that these sites deserve.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank both the Chairman and Ranking Member for everything they have done in support of

our National Parks. I also want the National Park Service to work with the Congress Swamp National Monument, as well as other park sites, to make sure that they are adequately staffed to carry out their stated missions.

FOREST SERVICE RESEARCH

Mr. BYRD. I rise with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee from Wisconsin and Vermont to engage the Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the Senior Senator from Washington, in a colloquy regarding Forest Service research and the intent of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GORTON. I would be pleased to enter into a colloquy with the Ranking Member of the Interior Subcommittee and with the distinguished Senators from Wisconsin and Vermont who also serve on that Subcommittee to provide further guidance and clarification as to the Committee direction included in the fiscal year 2000 Interior appropriations bill and accompanying report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, S. 1292, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, includes a net reduction of \$10,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 enacted level (from \$197,444,000 to \$187,444,000). Is this the total decrease included in the bill for this program?

Mr. GORTON. While the overall reduction is \$10,000,000, within the total funding level the Committee has provided increases above the fiscal year 1999 level of (1) \$1,130,000 for the harvesting and wood utilization laboratory in Sitka, Alaska, (2) \$2,000,000 for forest inventory and analysis, (3) \$500,000 for hardwood research and development at Purdue University, (4) \$600,000 for the development of the National Center for Landscape Fire Analysis at the University of Montana, and (5) \$700,000 for the CROP program. Therefore, other activities of the Forest Service research are to be reduced by a total of \$14,930,000 below the enacted level.

Mr. BYRD. What guidance has the Committee provided the Forest Service with respect to how the Forest Service should reduce its other research activities by \$14,930,000?

Mr. GORTON. The report accompanying S. 1292, Senate Report 106-99, stresses the concern of the Committee that the research program of the Forest Service has lost its focus on its primary mission—forest health and productivity—and directs the Forest Service to reduce those areas not directly related to enhancing forest and rangeland productivity. There are existing research programs outside the agency that have greater expertise and objectivity than the Forest Service; especially beyond the disciplines of forest health and productivity.

Mr. BYRD. I am concerned that without further elaboration on this matter the Forest Service may misinterpret the Committee's intent and take reduc-

tions that are not in keeping with the expectations of the Committee. It would be useful to expand upon the guidance provided in the report in order to avoid any misunderstandings as to the will of the Senate.

Mr. GORTON. Your point is well taken, and I welcome the opportunity to provide additional information. The expectations of the Committee are that the Forest Service will not provide any increased funding for activities not expressly stated as increases in Senate Report 106-99. In other words, the Committee has not provided any increased funding for the climate change technology initiative or for global climate research. Nor has the Committee provided any increased funding in this account for Forest Service research on invasive species, fire science, watershed science, inventory and monitoring, or recreation, wilderness and social science. The Committee also has denied any increases for fish and wildlife habitat research programs, for the application of mathematical programming and computer simulation tools in national forest planning, and for forest health monitoring research.

Beyond disallowing any of these increases, the Committee expects reductions in research funding to be targeted in those research areas that are not directly related to its core mission of forest health and productivity. In addition to social science and recreation research, which are well outside the expertise and core mission of the Forest Service, research not directly related to forest health and productivity includes, but is not limited to, research on wildlife, fish, water, and air sciences; global climate change and wilderness research. Beyond these research areas, other funding projects that the Committee feels are appropriate for reductions include the administrative costs of the Washington office (funded at \$11.261 million in fiscal year 1999) and support for so-called "national commitments" (funded at \$5.744 million in fiscal year 1999).

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chairman for explaining the expectations of the Committee regarding forest service research. Based on this clarification, is it the Committee's intent that the Forest Service will maintain funding at the fiscal year 1999 level for projects NE-4557 (Disturbance, Ecology and Management of Oak-Dominated Forests), NE-4751 (Forest Engineering Research—Systems Analysis to Evaluate Alternative Harvesting Strategies), NE-4353 (Sustainable Forest Ecosystems in the Central Appalachians), NE-4701 (Efficient Use of the Northern Forest Resources), NE-4803 (Economics of Eastern Forest Use), and NE-4805 (Enhancing the Performance and Competitiveness of the U.S. Hardwood Industry)? All of these projects are in West Virginia and contribute directly to forest health and productivity.

Mr. GORTON. Yes, it is the intent of the Committee that these projects be funded for fiscal year 2000 at their fiscal year 1999 funding levels.

Mr. LEAHY. In that same vein, is it the Committee's intent that the Forest Service will maintain funding at the fiscal year 1999 level for project NE-4103 (The Role of Environmental Stress on Tree Growth and Development)? This project is conducted at Burlington, Vermont, and provides information directly related to forest health and productivity.

Mr. GORTON. Yes, it is the intent of the Committee that this project be funded for fiscal year 2000 at its fiscal year 1999 funding level.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am pleased that the distinguished Senators from Washington and West Virginia have brought up the issue of Forest Service research. As they have noted, there is some significant research being conducted by the Forest Service, vital to forest health management and forest productivity that the Committee supports. Am I correct in my understanding that it was the Committee's intention in its discussion of Forest Service research in the Committee's report to maintain for fiscal year 2000 the forest products utilization research and supporting research activities conducted at the Forest Products Lab in Madison, Wisconsin, at the fiscal year 1999 funding level?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. KOHL. Cutting these research programs would dramatically decrease the Nation's ability to conserve scarce forest resources. It would eliminate work on major research issues in western softwood forests and in eastern hardwoods. Forest products research defrays forest management costs, increases fiber availability to meet the Nation's need for wood and fiber, speeds the acceptance of new and more efficient utilization technologies, and enhances the development of technologies that will restore economic vitality to forest-dependent communities. Curbing forest product research would also eliminate technical expertise on wood use, particularly in the area of housing.

Mr. GORTON. I want to thank Senator KOHL for highlighting the vital work of the Forest Products Lab and reiterate the Committee's support for its research program.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CONCESSION REVIEW

Mr. STEVENS. Will the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yield for a question?

Mr. GORTON. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. STEVENS. As the Senator from Washington is aware, the National Park Service is responsible for the management of much of the land along the Georgetown waterfront in the District of Columbia. As a regular visitor to this area, I have been disappointed with the condition and appearance of much of the land under the management of the National Park Service, particularly the area surrounding Thompson's boathouse, the boathouse itself, and the nearby lands that are

currently used for boat storage. These lands are adjacent to the confluence of Rock Creek and Potomac River, making their care and maintenance critical to the protection of the watershed.

I understand that upkeep and maintenance of the boathouse is the responsibility of the concessioner that manages the boathouse. Does the Chairman of the Subcommittee feel that it would be appropriate for the National Park Service to review the concession contract for the boathouse, and the performance of the concessioner under that contract, to determine whether the concessioner should be compelled to make a greater effort to maintain and rehabilitate the boathouse and appurtenant lands?

Mr. GORTON. I agree that such a review would be appropriate.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Chairman also agree that, to the extent appropriate in meeting its responsibilities and obligations, the National Park Service should review the maintenance and rehabilitation needs for this area and strongly consider allocating additional resources to make any needed improvements?

Mr. GORTON. In the past several years, the Committee has provided the Service with a substantial amount of additional funds of repair and rehabilitation of park facilities and properties. I agree that it would be appropriate for the Service to consider allocating a portion of these resources for the purposes noted by the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee.

MAGGIE WALKER NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I like to take a few moments to express my concern about funding for the Maggie Walker National Historic Site in Richmond. While construction funding was included in the budget submitted by the National Park Service, funding was not included in the Interior appropriations bill before us today. I want to make sure that the managers of this legislation are aware of just how important the Maggie Walker project is to both the Richmond community and to our nation. I would also like to urge them to provide this funding.

Maggie Walker, who lived in Richmond from her birth in 1867 until her death in 1934, epitomized triumph in the face of adversity. In an era that glorified male achievement, and in a part of the nation that did not encourage African American leadership, she stood out as a very successful member of society despite the fact that she was both female and African American.

Ms. Walker both succeeded within the system and pushed for change. She established a newspaper. She organized a student strike to protest unequal graduation ceremonies. She founded a bank and was the first woman in the nation to serve as president of a bank. She was also actively involved in founding the Richmond chapter of the NAACP, and throughout her life,

Maggie Walker championed humanitarian causes.

The Maggie Walker National Historic Site in Richmond is comprised of the Walker home, and several adjacent support buildings. The Walker residence itself was built in 1883 and purchased by the Walker family in 1904. The residence served as Ms. Walker's home until the year of her death. The Walker family sold the home to the National Park Service in 1979. Furnishings throughout the home are original family pieces.

The National Park Service budget request is necessary to literally protect the site from destruction, as well as for safety and historic preservation. Funding will support a fire suppression system for the main Walker home, and will restore the exteriors of the adjacent support buildings. These structures will be used for interpretive and education facilities, and for museum storage.

Mr. WARNER. I join my colleague in this effort. Mr. President, the construction funding request by the National Park Service budget would help protect and expand the facility to provide a better legacy for our children. Educational programs for all children, especially the children of Virginia, will serve as a living reminder of the prejudice that took place in our country at the turn of the century, and Maggie Walker's life will provide a strong role model for present and future generations seeking to overcome adversity.

Maggie Walker urged women to work together to advance their place in society. She said, "If our women want to avoid the traps and snares of life, they must band themselves together, organize, acknowledge leadership, * * * and work * * * for themselves." Maggie Walker also stressed the empowerment of minorities in the business field. She recognized the "need of a savings bank, chartered, officered, and run by the men and women of this [community] * * * Let us have a bank that will take the nickels and turn them into dollars." The Maggie Walker House symbolizes the persistence of an individual in the face of prejudice. For citizens in Richmond, the life of Ms. Walker, and her National Historic Site, are a daily inspiration.

I hope the construction money allotted to the Maggie Walker National Historic Site in the National Park budget and approved by the President will be provided. I thank my colleagues for considering this matter, and I'd appreciate hearing the managers' views on this project.

Mr. GORTON. I agree with the Senators from Virginia that the life of Maggie Walker is indeed an inspiration. While we're facing tough funding constraints and did our best to meet National Park Service needs in the State of Virginia. I will work with the senior senator from West Virginia to see what can be done for the Historic Site.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator from Washington that this project is

important, and I will do what I can to the extent that funds become available.

VIRGINIA BEACH MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER, and I would like to bring to the Managers' attention a serious concern involving the City of Virginia Beach and the Minerals Management Service of the Department of Interior. In my view, the city has been unfairly treated, and I hope we can rectify this matter during conference negotiations on the Interior Appropriations Bill.

Mr. WARNER. I support the view of my colleague. We wish to briefly review the issue for the Managers and explain why we believe that an injustice has been done to the City of Virginia Beach.

For past 25 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in conjunction with the City, has been working to complete the Sandbridge Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project, one of the region's highest priorities. Early in 1998, several Nor'easters struck the east coast and literally demolished Sandbridge Beach, which is a very important barrier island that provides protection for the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Forty homes were lost to the storms, and more than 300,000 cubic yards of protective beach sand were washed away. As a result, there was an immediate, critical need to replenish the beach. Although the Corps has the responsibility of annual renourishment of Sandbridge, as it is a federally-authorized project, the City advanced the money to replenish the beach because it was in a state of emergency.

I wish to emphasize that point. Instead of waiting for the Congress to appropriate the funds to the Corps, the City spent \$8.1 million of its own money for the Sandbridge Beach Renourishment, which is an option Congress allowed the City under the Water Resources Development Act.

The Minerals Management Service (MMS) became involved when the Corps selected a location to mine the sand for Virginia Beach. The location selected, the bottom of the ocean three miles off the coast, is an area legally designated as the "outer continental shelf." Pursuant to the 1994 amendments to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OSC), the MMS negotiates agreements for the right to extract minerals from the outer continental shelf. Under this authority, the MMS made a decision, which we believe to be both unfair and poor policy, to charge the City of Virginia Beach for the sand mined.

The MMS has the authority to change its decision, and I believe this would be the right thing to do. First, with respect to the discretion of the MMS, the MMS's own Proposed Policy and Guidelines state that:

The new law provides that the Secretary may assess a fee. This affords discretion not to assess a fee on a case-specific basis.

Mr. GORTON. So it's clear that the MMS could have opted not to charge the City of Virginia Beach?

Mr. ROBB. That's right. More important, we believe that not charging the city would have been the best policy decision. First, the sand paid for by the city protected federal land. MMS guidelines state that "when OCS sand is used for protection of Federally-owned land (e.g. for military bases, national parks, and refuges), a fee would not be assessed." That is the case in this instance.

Sandbridge beach is crucial to protecting the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge, which is federally owned. The fragile beach acts as a barrier island as the fresh water/brackish environment is three feet lower than the ocean adjacent to Sandbridge. If this beach is not maintained, an inlet could form, changing the ecology to a salt water estuary causing great harm to the Refuge and also disrupting one of the potable water sources for the City of Chesapeake. Additionally, the project is directly adjacent to the Dam Neck Fleet Combat Training Center. The beach at this Center was recently renourished with an 850,000 cubic year nourishment project. Sandbridge acts as a feeder beach for the Dam Neck area and also provides protection to the flank of the training Center. In short, the City of Virginia Beach used its own funds to protect federal property. Compensation is only fair.

I'd like to add that fair compensation is something the City of Virginia Beach had assumed in good faith would be forthcoming. The City acted in an emergency to protect the beach. This beach is a Congressionally-authorized project and is being constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers led the city to believe that it would be compensated. In fact, the Corps has already used approximately 2 million of its federal dollars to design the project, is acting as construction manager, and considered this renourishment to be the first phase of this project authorized by Congress in the 1992 Water Resources Development Act.

In addition, the City of Virginia Beach was assessed a fee by the MMS for mining the sand used to construct the federal project at Sandbridge solely because the City, not the federal government, fronted the cost of the construction.

Mr. GORTON. What is the regulation the MMS used to assess this fee?

Senator WARNER. There is only a guidance document, which was drafted in October 1997 by the MMS under the title "Proposed Policy and Guidelines on Fees for Outer Continental Shelf Resources Used in Shore Protection and Restoration Projects". There have been no further rules promulgated since that time, and the City of Virginia Beach is the first public body and only public body to be assessed this fee subsequent to the issues of the "Proposed Policy".

Mr. GORTON. My understanding is that the purpose for establishing fees

for mineral extraction from the outer continental shelf was to assure that the citizens were compensated for allowing the use of public resources by profit-seeking endeavors.

Mr. ROBB. My colleague is correct. But I wish to stress that this case was not a profit-seeking endeavor, but an emergency situation to replace sand on a federally-authorized beach that was washed away during a severe storm.

Mr. BYRD. Are there any instances of the MMS waiving the fee?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, there are. The MMS waived the fee for two other requests for use of OCS sand for shore protection projects sponsored by the corps. One was in Duval County, FL, and the other in Myrtle Beach, SC. For these two cases, the MMS ruled that project-related activities had progressed to the point that an "assessment of a fee for the OCS sand resources could have delayed or prevented project construction". The MMS therefore determined that waiving the fee would be in the best interest of the public in those two cases. In the case of Sandbridge Beach, we believe that it was in the best interest of the public for the MMS to waive the fee as it not only is a Congressionally authorized project, but it also protects a federally owned wildlife refuge, the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. GORTON. What was the nature of the fee assessed to the City by the MMS?

Mr. ROBB. The City of Virginia Beach was assessed a fee of \$0.18 per cubic yard, and they were forced to enter into a lease agreement with MMS before being allowed to obtain critical sand for the emergency beach erosion project. The money paid in MMS fees, which totaled \$198,000, would have allowed the City to place an additional 40,000 cubic yards of sand on this badly eroded beach.

In conclusion, we hope our colleagues agree that the MMS should have utilized their option to waive the fee for sand replenishment in this emergency situation, and as a result, the City should be reimbursed for protection Sandbridge Beach. Not only did the MMS assess a fee on a federally-authorized project which protects federal land, but they took advantage of the City during an emergency situation. Under the time constraints the City had no other alternative to find sand elsewhere, and was forced to pay the fee. It is for these reasons that my colleague and I believe that the MMS has an obligation to reimburse the City of Virginia Beach for this incorrectly assessed fee.

Mr. GORTON. I am sympathetic to our colleague's request. I am also aware that language authorizing repayment of the fee charged to the City of Virginia Beach is included in this year's Water Resources Development Act. We are facing very tough funding constraints this year, but if the senior Senator from West Virginia agrees, we'll work together to help the city if possible.

Mr. BYRD. I am also sympathetic to the request, and I will support that effort.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from Washington and the Senator from West Virginia. Senator Warner and I want to reemphasize that this is a situation of basic fairness, and action is needed to correct an injustice imposed by the federal government. We ask that if funds become available during the House-Senate Conference, that the Managers provide \$198,000 to reimburse the City of Virginia Beach. We thank our colleagues.

CUMBERLAND ISLAND

Mr. CLELAND. I rise to engage the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding Cumberland Island National Seashore, which is located just off the coast of Georgia. As Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD are aware, the Congress recently provided funding for an important land acquisition for Cumberland Island, which will ensure the protection of lands on Cumberland Island for generations to come. In conjunction with this land acquisition, I worked with the National Park Service, residents of the island, and members of the historic and environmental communities to reach a unanimous agreement on the management of Cumberland Island National Seashore. The agreement provides a framework for the proper management of the cultural and wilderness resources on the island. I strongly supported the development of this agreement and am committed to ensuring that this agreement is followed regarding the management of Cumberland Island National Seashore. Do the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee share my strong support for the implementation of the agreement?

Mr. GORTON. I was pleased that the Georgia delegation, the Administration and a variety of local interests were able to reach agreement with regard to the preservation of lands and historic properties on Cumberland Island, and am pleased that we were able to provide a considerable amount of funds to implement the first phase of the agreement. Your leadership has been instrumental in this matter, and I appreciate your efforts to provide for the lands and management of the Cumberland Island National Seashore. I look forward to working with you to the extent additional funds are necessary to implement the agreement, recognizing the difficult fiscal limitations under which the Committee must operate.

Mr. BYRD. I concur with the Chairman and would support Congressional efforts to provide additional compliance actions regarding the agreement, if necessary. Your involvement in Cumberland Island has been critical in protecting and preserving these precious resources in a manner that balances National and local interests.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the Senators for their support and kind words.

VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION
ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEASE

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank the Subcommittee on Interior, and particularly Chairman GORTON, for his excellent work on the FY 2000 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. I would especially like to thank the Chairman for encouraging the Department of Energy to consider the Vermont Agency of Transportation electric vehicle lease proposal. I would just like to clarify that the committee's recommendation refers to a request for \$400,000 from the Vermont Agency of Transportation to develop an electric vehicle program, including the purchase and demonstration of electric vehicles, the creation of charging stations, reports documenting vehicle use, and the collection of experiential data, for the State of Vermont and its municipalities.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind remarks. Within available funds, the Committee encourages the Department of Energy to provide funding for the Vermont Agency of Transportation Vehicle Lease Program.

PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA USER POPULATION

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I am concerned the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska funding for health services is not adequate to provide these services to tribal members. As the Chairman may know, the Ponca Tribe was terminated in 1962 and restored as a federally recognized Tribe in 1990. At the time of restoration, the Tribe's user population was estimated at 654 and was allocated a \$1.2 million budget.

In January 1998, the Ponca Tribe established the Ponca Health and Wellness Center in Omaha, Nebraska. This clinic provides quality medical, dental, pharmaceutical, and community outreach health services to members of all federally recognized Tribes. As a result of this new clinic, the user population has increased to over 2000 users without a budget increase to address the larger population. Does the distinguished Senator from Washington agree this problem must be addressed?

Mr. GORTON. I understand the concerns of the Senator from Nebraska regarding the need for resources to address the increase in user population for the Ponca Tribe Health and Wellness Center. It is important the Ponca and other Tribes be able to continue providing quality health services for its members. I believe the IHS should examine this issue and identify ways to help the Ponca and other Tribes, which have experienced unusual increases in user populations.

Mr. KERREY. Clearly, the Ponca Tribe needs resources in order to meet the health needs of an increased user population. It is my hope the Indian Health Service (IHS) will address this unusual increase with its resources. I encourage the IHS to provide increased funding to any Tribe that has experienced an increase in the user popu-

lation of 50 percent or more over fiscal years 1996-99 to the extent possible within existing resources.

MARI SANDOZ CULTURAL CENTER \$450,000
FUNDING REQUEST

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished floor manager a question.

Mr. GORTON. Certainly. I am happy to respond to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. I realize that this year, you and Ranking Member BYRD are facing a challenging appropriations season with tight budgetary constraints. I appreciate your hard work and all that you have done. However, I wanted to bring to your attention a very important project for the State of Nebraska, especially the western part of the state, the Mari Sandoz Cultural Center at Chadron State College in Chadron, Nebraska. Mari Sandoz wrote extensively about the Great Plains—about fur traders and homesteaders, about cattlemen and grangers; about the Cheyenne and Oglala Sioux. She captured in her writings a special time and place. Chadron State College and the Mari Sandoz Society are developing a cultural center to preserve, protect and exhibit a collection that is associated with Mari Sandoz's life and work. I had hoped that we would be able to find \$450,000 to assist with this project.

Mr. GORTON. I am aware of the Senator's interest in this project and its importance to Nebraska's history and heritage. We were unable to include funding for one of the accounts where this project might be supported. However, I will work with the Senator to see if we can identify funds for this project in the future.

Mr. KERREY. I thank the Chairman for his assistance. I appreciate the consideration of this important project, and I know the people of Nebraska, especially western Nebraska, will also be more appreciative.

FOREST SERVICE RECONSTRUCTION AND
MAINTENANCE

Mr. KOHL. I rise to engage the Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, Senator GORTON, in a colloquy on an item in the Forest Service budget which needs some clarification. The fiscal year 2000 budget justification submitted by the administration included \$300,000 for planning and design of a new facility at the Forest Products Lab in Madison, WI, to accommodate a move of the Forest Service's regional office from Milwaukee to Madison. However, on April 15, 1999, during a hearing in the Appropriations Committee on the Forest Service budget Mike Dombeck, the Chief of the Forest Service, reiterated what the Forest Service has told me in the past: The Forest Service has withdrawn the proposal to move its Milwaukee office. The idea of moving the regional office from Milwaukee first came up in response to concerns about the rent in Milwaukee. Since then General Serv-

ices Administration (GSA) has indicated that by fiscal year 2000, the rent in Milwaukee will be reduced by 18 percent, eliminating the need for the move.

During the Appropriations Committee's markup, we inadvertently included \$300,000 for the proposed move in the Forest Service's reconstruction and maintenance budget. Since the Forest Service and GSA have confirmed that the move will not and should not go forward, the Committee is directing the Forest Service to use the \$300,000 in this account at the Forest Products Lab to expand the planned heat, ventilation and air conditioning work already scheduled to occur at the lab. The funding should be used to replace air conditioning equipment for buildings 33 and 34. The current equipment is more than 30 years old and is in poor condition, lacking automated controls so overtime staffing is needed to operate the equipment on weekends. Replacement of the air conditioning chillers in these buildings will be more energy efficient and will reduce overtime costs.

Mr. GORTON. I appreciate the Senator from Wisconsin raising this issue. Leaving the regional office in Milwaukee will save the Forest Service \$4.5 million slated for future years spending to build a new facility in Madison. The Committee agrees that using the \$300,000 in the fiscal year 2000 budget to improve the HVAC systems at the Forest Products Lab is a far better use of these funds.

Mr. KOHL. I appreciate the Senator from Washington's courtesy and look forward to working with him in conference to ensure that this money is spent as the Committee intended.

GRAND STAIRCASE-ESCALANTE NATIONAL
MONUMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, there are several provisions in this bill that result directly from the establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. First, we have identified \$300,000 within the amount allocated for the monument planning and decision making process. In FY 1999, \$500,000 was provided to the two counties, and we anticipate that there will be funds available from the fee demonstration program that could return them to the FY 99 level.

Additionally, we provided \$100,000 to implement the "Garfield-Kane County Partnership Action Plan." This action plan is the result of a process that began last year to help the counties and communities that have been most impacted by the monument designation. This is not a welfare program; this is to help them with reorganization leading to economic self-sufficiency. The Department of Interior, to its credit, has supported this effort and provided funds for a conference that was held in Kane County earlier this year. The conference was mediated by the Sonoran Institute. The conference report is the basis for the funding.

The regional entities have formed a planning commission, the Partnership

Task Force, and are talking with the Utah Five County Association of Governments (AOG) to establish a new and independent entity within that organization, which will provide administrative support and organization. Direction will come from a board composed of elected county and city officials from Kane and Garfield Counties and from portions of the Arizona Counties (Coconino and Mohave), which are north and west of the Colorado River. This also includes the Kaibab Paiute Indian Reservation.

It is my understanding that the BLM will fund the Partnership Task Force through the Five County AOG and will cooperate in developing recommendations for the partnership action plan and specific programs. I would ask the Chairman if it is his expectation that the agency will periodically report on the progress being made?

Mr. GORTON. It is, indeed, my expectation that the Department will work with the organization in getting started and will provide a progress report after ninety days, and a full report at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chairman for his support.

EVERGLADES FUNDING ASSURANCES

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM, to address briefly the issue of Everglades restoration and land acquisition funding. We had joined with the President in requesting slightly more than \$100 million for land acquisition in Everglades National Park, state assistance grants, infrastructure investment, and modified water deliveries to the Park and Florida Bay. This funding is critical to keep the restoration effort on budget, on schedule, and consistent with the Congress' commitment in 1997 to fully fund Everglades restoration.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, following on the comments of my colleague from Florida, the Committee did not see fit to appropriate the full amount of these requested funds due to several concerns outlined in the Committee's report. First, the report addressed the \$40 million in unobligated balances at the Department of Interior that have already been appropriated by Congress for the Everglades restoration effort. Further, the Committee echoed concerns raised in a recent GAO report regarding a more expedient dispute resolution mechanism and an integrated strategic plan. I would ask the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee if this—in general—reflects the concerns of the Subcommittee as outlined in the report?

Mr. GORTON. That is correct, I also note that the Subcommittee's 302(b) allocation was more than \$1.1 billion below the Presidents request, which compelled the Subcommittee to provide lower funding levels for land acquisition in order to protect core operating programs.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the reservations of the Subcommittee are

valid ones and my colleague from Florida and I are willing to be helpful however we can in addressing these concerns. I would say to the Chairman that we are making progress on these issues. The Department of the Interior tells me it is working closely with the State of Florida to remove the barriers to allocating the unobligated land acquisition and restoration balances. The Department assures these funds will be obligated by the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I may, let me follow on by saying the Department further assures us they are making good progress on the concerns raised by the GAO report and echoed by the Committee. In fact, on July 1 of this year, the administration released the Everglades Restudy—which is an extremely detailed 20-year plan for restoring the Everglades—to the Congress.

Mr. MACK. I would ask the Chairman of the Subcommittee if he would be willing—given the movement toward resolving his concerns since release of the Committee's report—if he would be willing to work with us in Conference to increase the overall Everglades funding from the levels currently in the bill?

Mr. GORTON. I thank my friends from Florida for their comments. Clearly the Everglades restoration effort is an important national priority. I can anticipate that funding for these accounts will likely be discussed further during the Conference with the House. I can assure my friends that I will take a close look at actions taken by the Department in response to the Committee's concerns and will work to ensure the funding levels are adequate to keep the restoration effort on track for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MACK. I thank my colleague for his response and assurances on this important issue. I would also like to mention briefly the funding level for the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force. It is my understanding the Task Force's funding has been kept steady at \$800,000 since it was statutorily authorized in 1996. I want to bring this matter to the Chairman's attention because of the restraints this low funding ceiling is placing on the Task Force's ability to carry out its mission in South Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would continue by adding that the Task Force is the entity responsible of implementing the recommendations of the Committee with respect to the dispute resolution mechanism and the strategic plan. Further, cost of living adjustments are forcing staff layoffs and seriously eroding the Task Force's ability to do its job. I would ask the Chairman to consider increasing the Task Force's budget to the requested \$1.3 million during the Conference with the House.

Mr. GORTON. I thank my friends from Florida for bringing this matter to my attention. I will take a look at the funding levels for the Task Force as we proceed to Conference.

Mr. MACK. I thank my friend from Washington and yield the floor.

TROUT BROOK VALLEY

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to offer a few remarks on an amendment I have at the desk. The amendment, which I intend to withdraw, would provide a \$2 million increase in funding for the Parks Service Account. This money would be used to help a dedicated coalition of Connecticut citizens, conservation groups, and local and state government acquire 668 acres in the Trout Brook Valley.

The Trout Brook Valley, like much of the remaining open space in Connecticut, is currently under threat of development and the Aspetuck Land Trust is trying to save it. They are not asking the Federal Government to foot the entire bill in the effort to preserve this countryside for the enjoyment of future generations. Far from it, the locally-led effort to save Trout Brook Valley is convinced that they can and will raise \$10.5 million of the \$12.5 million dollars that the property will cost. My amendment would have provided Federal matching funds equal to less than one-sixth of the total cost of acquiring this land for conservation.

I am deeply disappointed that the current Interior Appropriations bill allocates no funding to the stateside portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Trout Brook Valley project represents an excellent example of why we need to appropriate adequate resources for stateside portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which tragically has gone unfunded since 1995. I am encouraged to learn, however, that an agreement to appropriate funds to the stateside LWCF account is currently under discussion. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. GORTON. That is correct. I point out that this project is not authorized as a federal acquisition project. In addition, stateside Land and Water Conservation Fund projects are determined at the State level, so if funds for state grants are included in the bill, it still will not be possible to secure dedicated funding for this project.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I understand that, and respectfully withdraw my amendment.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to engage the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, Senator GORTON, on a matter relating to the Land Acquisition and State Assistance account for the National Park Service.

I was pleased to see that the Committee chose to provide funding for the Ice Age National Scenic Trail in this account. One of eight National Scenic Trails in the United States, the Ice Age Trail meanders through 31 Wisconsin counties, generally following the terminal moraine. As I noted in my request to the Subcommittee, the depth of commitment to the Ice Age Trail in the state of Wisconsin is impressive. Many volunteers, local governments,

and private organizations have contributed to the development of the trail. The state of Wisconsin has also provided essential matching funds to the trail's many partners. One of the most compelling aspects of this request for funding was the commitment from the State of Wisconsin to match the federal funding we are providing for Ice Age Trail land acquisition.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct. The Committee notes the commitment of partners like the state of Wisconsin to provide matching funds for the establishment of our national trails when we make our determinations for funding. The Committee urges partners to honor their commitments as the prospects for future appropriations may be looked upon more favorably.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from Washington for his remarks.

WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BINGAMAN. I rise in the hope that the Chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Alaska, will engage in a colloquy with myself, Senator JEFFORDS and the Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington, on the Weatherization Assistance Program provision in the bill passed by the other body.

Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, the other body passed its version of the FY 2000 Interior appropriations legislation on July 14. That bill included a provision mandating States to provide a 25 percent state cost share, or state match, in order to receive their FY 2000 Weatherization Assistance grants.

Despite the potential ramifications of implementing a State match, no hearings have been held, and no input has been solicited from the States to determine if cost sharing is realistic or necessary for this program.

As many Senators are aware, state legislatures across the country simply cannot meet this deadline with such short notice. In fact, some legislatures are about to adjourn and will not meet again for another year or even two.

Currently, the only data we have regarding the impact of the proposed State match comes from an informal survey undertaken this month by the National Association of State Community Services Programs; it indicates that 25 states definitely cannot provide matching funds in FY 2000; another five large states are uncertain whether they can meet the requirement, and less than ten States currently provide state-appropriated funds to Weatherization and would be able to comply immediately.

It seems to me that consideration of such a fundamental change in the distribution of state Weatherization Assistance grants falls squarely under the jurisdiction of the authorizing committee. Wouldn't the Chairman agree?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That is certainly true. The Committee currently has no analysis of the need for such a cost share nor of the state-by-state or national impact of such a requirement.

Although the State of Alaska has established a state "Trust Fund" to contribute a significant amount to the State's Weatherization efforts, it would be imperative that we ascertain the ability of other States to undertake such commitments before deciding on a change that could bring an end to Weatherization services throughout the nation.

Of course, a federal program that can leverage non-federal funds and attract other partners always has a stronger case for appropriations. Is the Senator from New Mexico informed as to whether any states have many such resources in their Weatherization program?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am told that, nationally, Weatherization leverages about a 50 percent add-on from non-federal sources—but there is no study of this and it probably varies widely among states. In fact, the same informal state survey I just mentioned reported that many of the states have private partnerships between the utilities and the local community action Weatherization programs, brokered in many instances by the Weatherization programs, and that these partnerships are growing as utility restructuring moves forward. Many building owners in low-income communities also chip in for these services.

Further, I am told many states have excellent coordination among the federal low-income energy and the low-income housing and community development programs. However, the fact is that most of the states reviewed the terms of the match in the House bill and said they don't believe these public-private efforts would qualify under that terminology.

I believe we would really have to look into any requirement that didn't encourage private investment in these local programs; I hope the distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee would concur in opposing the inclusion of language authorizing a State match for Weatherization in the Interior appropriations bill or Conference Report.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, the Weatherization Assistance Program is an investment. Its success is unparalleled—as a way to upgrade housing, increase energy efficiency, and assist low-income Americans.

Weatherization enables very low-income people—including families with children, older Americans, and individuals with disabilities—to experience savings of 30 percent on their energy bills. For every federal dollar invested in this program, \$2.40 in energy, health, safety, housing, and other measured benefits are achieved.

The mandate that States provide a 25 percent state cost share contained in the bill passed by the other body may endanger states' use of this program. This provision causes great concern to me and other Senators of the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition, which I co-chair with Senator MOYNIHAN. Such

a fundamental change in the distribution of state Weatherization Assistance grants falls squarely under the jurisdiction of the authorizing committee.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I certainly agree that if we're going to make any major changes to the program, we need to do so in a way that encourages more private investment and that we had better make sure we consult with the Governors and utilities and get it right.

I would certainly oppose making such fundamental changes in the pending bill. I hope the floor managers can give us assurance that the Senate Conferees will convey our concerns to their House counterparts and reject this language in Conference. I would like to ask the Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee if the Senate conferees on this legislation will keep in mind the concerns of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee in mind and move to strike the House language?

Mr. GORTON. As the distinguished Chairman is aware, the bill before us does not include any language requiring a state match. I will certainly keep the objections of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition in mind as we move to conference.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chairman.

MARBLED MURRELETS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last year, we enacted the Intestate 90 Land Exchange Act authorizing a large land exchange in Washington between Plum Creek Timber Company and the Forest Service. The land exchange was scheduled under the Act to be closed on July 19. Just prior to closure, however, Plum Creek discovered Marbled Murrelets on two sections of Forest Service land scheduled under the Act to be transferred to Plum Creek.

The discovery of Marbled Murrelets occurred after the appraisal was completed and signed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Plum Creek and the Forest Service agree the two sections of land containing murrelets should remain in federal ownership. The legislation, however, did not contemplate or provide for the deletion of these lands or for the need to adjust the appraisal after it had been approved by the Secretary. We are working with the Forest Service and Plum Creek on a solution to this problem.

The land exchange is vital because it substantially resolves a decades old conflict created by the checkerboard ownership pattern in central Washington. It places into public ownership thousands of acres of mature timber and essential wildlife habitat, dozens of miles of streams and riparian corridors and some of the most popular recreational lands in Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I join my colleague in his remarks about the Plum Creek exchange. We worked very hard last year to enact this exchange. I also share a concern about the implications of the discovery or marbled

murrelets on the lands scheduled to be exchanged to Plum Creek. I agree these lands should be left in federal ownership. I would like to ask Senator GORTON does one senator understand legislation is needed to allow the Forest Service to keep the two sections in question?

Mr. GORTON. Yes. The Forest Service and Plum Creek have been working on an amendment that would allow these two sections to be dropped from the exchange and for the appraisal to be adjusted accordingly. It is my intention to continue to work with the Forest Service and Plum Creek to draft an amendment to include in the conference report.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator. I look forward to continuing to work with you, the Forest Service, Plum Creek, and other interested parties as the legislation is developed.

THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations for their hard work. As they both know, last year I sponsored the authorizing legislation for the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom. This new law directs the National Park Service to review hundreds of Underground Railroad sites in Ohio and around the country, identify the most notable locations, and produce and disseminate appropriate educational materials. I believe the history of the Underground Railroad is a part of the American story that we should be proud of. Last year, the Chairman and Ranking Member worked with me to fully fund the program in Fiscal Year 1999. I made a similar request this year. I would like to ask for clarification of some language contained in the Committee Report. Specifically, the Committee provided \$1,245,891,000 to the National Park Service for park management. Is it the Chairman's intent that this figure includes \$500,000 for the implementation of the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom?

Mr. GORTON. I thank my colleague from Ohio. The Senator is correct. The funding for National Park Service park management will fully fund the implementation of the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

Mr. DEWINE. I appreciate the clarification from my colleague from Washington and thank him and Senator BYRD for their continued support for this program.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN NATIONAL MEMORIAL DISABLED ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to speak about the need for the federal government to share in the cost of much-needed disabled access improvements at the Benjamin Franklin National Memorial in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. As my colleagues may know, this National Memorial was designated as a National Park Service Affiliated Area by Public law 92-551.

The Benjamin Franklin National Memorial is located in the rotunda of The Franklin Institute Science Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Memorial Hall was opened in 1938 and features a 20-foot high marble statue of Ben Franklin sculpted by James Earle Fraser, as well as many of Franklin's original possessions.

Mr. President, I was very appreciative earlier this year when the distinguished Chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, Senator GORTON, joined me in a visit to The Franklin Institute to see first-hand the need for disabled access improvements in the National Memorial Hall. I believe that he saw for himself that the 1938 design of the facility does not lend itself to easy access for anyone in a wheelchair or with other disabilities. The legacy of Benjamin Franklin is one that should be treasured and understood by all Americans, which is why I salute the Franklin Institute for embarking on a major capital development campaign to pay for, among other things, some of the costs associated with these renovations.

To date, the Institute has spent over \$6 million of its own funds in the ongoing maintenance of the Memorial Hall. Since Congress bestowed national memorial status on this facility, and since it is important to ensure that all Americans, regardless of physical ability, can benefit from learning more about Benjamin Franklin, I want to encourage Chairman GORTON to continue working with me to providing funding for this purpose. I am advised that in Fiscal Year 2000, \$1 million in federal funds would be a significant first step toward meeting the anticipated \$6 million cost of rehabilitating and updating the National Memorial and its exhibits.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for his comments. He has truly shown leadership with respect to the funding needs of the Benjamin Franklin National Memorial, and I was pleased to participate in a tour of this facility when I visited Philadelphia this Spring.

I commend The Franklin Institute for seeking nonfederal sources of funding to defray a substantial portion of the anticipated costs of the improvements. As my colleagues are aware, we face tight budget constraints in this legislation. I will continue working with my colleague from Pennsylvania in the coming weeks, however, in an effort to identify sources of funding that may be available and appropriate for this purpose.

REHABILITATION OF THADDEUS STEVENS HALL

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I have also sought recognition to express my support for a project of historical, academic, and economic importance at Gettysburg College in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. I believe that this project is a perfect candidate for funding under the Save America's Treasures grant program.

Stevens Hall, named for prominent Gettysburg citizen Thaddeus Stevens,

was the fourth major building erected on the campus of Gettysburg College, in 1867. The building currently serves as a dormitory for undergraduate students. Renovation of the structure is necessary to preserve the building's exterior and modernize the electrical and fire prevention systems.

Gettysburg College plans to restore and rehabilitate Thaddeus Stevens Hall and transform the building into a center for the study of history and the Civil War era. Stevens Hall will eventually house the College's Civil War Institute. Located adjacent to Eisenhower House and just blocks from the Gettysburg National Military Park, this project will not only restore a distinguished example of 19th century architecture, but will attract students of the Civil War nationwide. The College has already committed substantial resources to this important project, securing \$2.5 million in private funding for preservation work.

I understand that the committee did not include funding for the Save America's Treasures program; however, federal funding is crucial to the timely completion of restoration work on this historical structure. I urge the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator GORTON, to continue to work with me to identify appropriate federal funding for this important preservation initiative.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his comments, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on this request. I am well aware of the importance he places on this project, and more broadly, on his involvement in Gettysburg. I will work with my friend from Pennsylvania to fund the restoration and rehabilitation of Thaddeus Stevens Hall.

AMENDMENT NO. 1576

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will offer an amendment to H.R. 2466, the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill, to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor all disabled American veterans. This legislation is not controversial, costs nothing, and deserves immediate consideration and passage.

As a Nation, we owe a debt of gratitude to all Americans who have worn their country's uniform in the defense of her core ideals and interests. We honor their service with holidays, like Veterans Day and Memorial Day, and with memorials, including the Vietnam Wall and the Iwo Jima Memorial. But nowhere in Washington can be found a material tribute to those veterans whose physical or psychological well-being was forever lost to a sniper's bullet, a landmine, a mortar round, or the pure terror of modern warfare.

To these individuals, we owe a measure of devotion beyond that accorded those who served honorably but without permanent damage to limb or spirit. For these individuals, a memorial in Washington, D.C. would stand as testament to the sum of their sacrifices, and

as proof that the country they served values their contribution to its cause.

We cannot restore the health of those Americans who incurred a disability as a result of their military service. It is within our power, however, to authorize a memorial that would clearly signal the Nation's gratitude to all whose disabilities serve as a living reminder of the toll war takes on its victims.

Under the terms of this legislation, the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation would be solely responsible for raising the necessary funding. Our amendment explicitly requires that no Federal funds be used to pay any expense for the memorial's establishment.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senators DASCHLE, COVERDELL, CLELAND, and KERREY in support of this legislation. America's disabled veterans, of whom Senator CLELAND himself is one of our most distinguished, deserve a lasting tribute to their sacrifice. They honored us with their service; let us honor them with our support today.

ITM SYNGAS PROGRAM

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington, The Chairman of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, for adding \$1.4 million to the Department of Energy's competitively awarded, cost-shared ITM Syngas program, specifically the "Engineering Development of Ceramic Membrane Reactor Systems for Converting Natural Gas to Hydrogen and Synthesis Gas for Liquid Transportation Fuels" project. This important high-risk, high-impact gas-to-liquids research and development project will convert domestic remote and off-shore natural gas to synthesis gas, resulting in lower cost production and cleaner alternative fuels. This program also promises to create new markets for U.S. domestic resources and extend the useful life of the Alaskan North Slope oil fields and the trans-Alaskan pipeline system.

The ITM Syngas research and development effort is a complex, high risk undertaking by the Department of Energy and its industry, national laboratory and university partners. As with any complex technological undertaking, the Department of Energy and its ITM Syngas team have had to increase the scope of the initial phase of the program and add a university partner to ensure the project's long-term success.

This \$1.4 million is in addition to the budget request for fiscal year 2000 of \$2.5 million that is in the Fossil Energy, Gas, Emerging Processing Technology Applications and the Energy Supply, Hydrogen Research program. The total DOE funding for the ITM Syngas program in fiscal year 2000 is \$3.9 million.

The addition of \$1.4 million in fiscal year 2000 will allow approximately \$600,000 to be allocated to the first phase of this project to fund activities that could not have been anticipated

when the program commenced last year. The remaining \$800,000 will allow the second phase of the ITM Syngas to be accelerated, allowing future costs to be avoided.

This program brings together the Department of Energy, U.S. industry—large and small—our national laboratories and research universities. Again, I want to thank the Senator from Washington for his efforts to ensure that from the earliest phases of this important research and development effort, ITM Syngas is a success.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, there do not seem to be any amendments to the bill that are ripe for debate and for disposition at this point.

Did the Senator from Virginia have any further comments?

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for his offer. Given the absence of other Senators who I know want to debate this particular issue, I look forward to resuming that debate when the Senate returns to session on September 8.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I don't think there is any further business in connection with the interior appropriations bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to speak for just a moment to alert my fellow Senators and others about an important development this evening which I think we categorize as another piece of good news, in addition to the adoption of the conference report on the tax reform just concluded by the Senate.

Even though the conference report is in the process of being signed and has not yet been filed, I think I can advise my colleagues that later on this evening the House and Senate Armed Services Committees will have concluded their conference report, including the important revisions of the Department of Energy which follow generally along the lines of the so-called Rudman report recommendations and the amendment that Senators MURKOWSKI and DOMENICI and I filed earlier in this session to reorganize the Department of Energy.

The House and Senate had both passed versions of that reform of the Department of Energy. The matter was concluded today in the House-Senate conference report of the Armed Services bill, and that is the vehicle by which the reorganization of the Department of Energy will occur.

Just to recapitulate a little bit about how this came about, if you will recall, as a result of the espionage that resulted in the Chinese receiving significant secrets about nuclear weapons of the United States and the possibility that some of that information had come out of our National Laboratories, there was a great deal of study of the security at our National Labs and in the weapons program generally of the Department.

The President's own Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, the so-called PFIAB, headed by former Senator Warren Rudman, issued a report, really a scathing indictment of the Department of Energy, its past security policies or lack of security, and its inability to reorganize itself notwithstanding Secretary Richardson's efforts to begin to reorganize the Department. What it said was the Department of Energy was incapable of reorganizing itself. They reiterated a long list of things which the Department had failed to do, which it had failed to put into place, and described the whole situation at the Department as such that it was impossible to expect them to be able to do this on their own.

Therefore, the Rudman commission recommended strongly the Congress do this reorganization by legislation. That is when Senators DOMENICI, MURKOWSKI and I reoriented our amendment to follow closely the Rudman commission recommendations and introduced that as an amendment before this body.

It was originally introduced to the Armed Services bill. It was later put on the Intelligence bill instead. But the Armed Services Committee took the amendment and has worked it now in the conference committee, as I said. As a result of their agreement tonight, there will be a reorganization of the Department, assuming the President signs the Defense authorization bill, which I am sure he would want to do.

Reorganization was agreed to in principle by Secretary Richardson, although there were many things he wanted to change in the detail of it. But what it will do in a nutshell is to establish within the Department of Energy a semiautonomous agency that will have the accountability and the responsibility for managing our nuclear weapons and complex including the National Laboratories. It will be headed by a specific person, an Under Secretary, who will be responsible to the Secretary directly and to a Deputy Secretary if the Secretary so desires.

While, of course, the Secretary of Energy remains in general control of all of his Department, including the semiautonomous agency, on a day-to-day basis it is anticipated this agency will be operated by the Under Secretary, who is responsible for its functions. It will involve security, intelligence, counterintelligence, all of the different weapons, the Navy nuclear program and the other things at the laboratory that relate to our nuclear weapons. To a large extent it will remove the influences of other parts of the Department