

financial waste perpetrated in Washington, they are also generous people. I am pleased to highlight their support for the Kosovar relief effort.

It is a tribute to America's generous spirit and sense of goodness that all of these organizations have mobilized to assist people suffering half a world away. There is no doubt that, despite the overwhelming challenge, these organization will collectively make the difference in the lives of these displaced Kosovar refugees and will provide hope for their future.

THE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. FEINGOLD. Senator KOHL, as Senator COCHRAN read through the amendments included in the Managers package of the FY2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill late last night, I noticed that an amendment I had filed was not included. It had been my understanding that my amendment would be accepted during the wrap-up on the Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Mr. KOHL. I am aware of the Senator's amendment. Will the Senator please describe his amendment?

Mr. FEINGOLD. My amendment was a non-controversial sense-of-the-Senate resolution that the U.S. Customs Service should, to the maximum extent practicable, conduct investigations into, and take such other actions as are necessary to prevent, the importation of ginseng products into the United States from foreign countries, including Canada and Asian countries, unless the importation is reported to the Service, as required under Federal law. It merely asks that current law be complied with.

Mr. KOHL. Your amendment, expressing the sense-of-the-Senate regarding ginseng, was inadvertently left off the list for the Manager's amendment. However, it should be noted, that the amendment was not excluded based on its substance, but only because of a regrettable omission.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator and ask his assistance in including my ginseng amendment in the final conference report on the FY2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Mr. KOHL. I would like to assure Senator FEINGOLD that I will work toward inclusion of this provision in the conference report. The Senator is correct that there was no objection raised to his amendment and I will make that point clear to my fellow conferees.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to engage the Senators from Wisconsin in this colloquy. Yesterday, when the Senate considered the Agriculture Appropriations Bill, I had offered three amendments regarding the Conservation Reserve Program. It is my understanding that at least one of these amendments had been cleared for approval until just prior to final passage of the bill, and that the Ranking Member and Chairman had been giving consideration to the remaining two

amendments. However, the Department of Agriculture had expressed concerns and objections were raised.

Mr. KOHL. That is correct. Will the Senator from Kansas describe his amendments?

Mr. ROBERTS. The first amendment regarding CRP cross compliance is to address a problem we have had in Kansas. In many areas of the state, we have old homesteads that have long been abandoned. As time has passed these old homes have become dilapidated, rundown, and liability risks. Many producers want to remove these old homesteads and incorporate the land into their CRP land, conservation practices, or cropping rotations. But they are unable to do so due to CRP cross compliance rules. Under these rules, producers lose eligibility for CRP payments if they break Highly Erodible land (HEL) into production. Much of the land is considered HEL. Thus most of these homesteads sit on HEL land, and if they are removed, producers have violated the rules and lose payments. This does not seem to make sense and USDA agrees. USDA informed me that they planned to recommend to the Congress the elimination of this program in the next Farm Bill.

The other two amendments involve notices regarding CRP Notices 327 and 338 issued by the Farm Service agency last fall and this spring.

CRP Notice-327 issued by the Farm Service Agency prohibits the use of CRP land for hunting preserves. The notice does not prohibit land owners from leasing hunting rights or charging access fees to hunters. However, it does prohibit hunting preserves. This notice overturns a practice that has been allowed in many areas since the inception of the CRP program. In fact, these hunting preserves operate from the Kansas and Oklahoma areas to the Dakotas. These preserves are strongly regulated in Kansas and they have resulted in an important economic development activity for many rural areas. In Kansas, we have 112 tracts of land designated for use as hunting preserves. 36 of these tracts are in counties designated by USDA as eligible to apply for Round II Rural Empowerment zones under the criteria established by USDA. Basically, to qualify under this criteria, a county must have lost 15 percent or more of its population between 1980 and 1994. These population losses represent a significant erosion of the economic base of these rural areas. Disallowing these hunting preserves would represent a loss of tourism dollars and an economic hit that many of these counties simply cannot afford to take.

CRP Notice 338 prohibits the planting of grass strips on terrace tops for enrollment in the continuous CRP. The notice prohibits the enrollment of grass strips located on the tops of terraces—where erosion is most likely to take place—but allows the enrollment of strips planted between terraces—

where crops can actually be grown. Strips planted on terraces provide important environmental functions by reducing both wind and water erosion. Grass strips help to prevent the breakage of terraces that sometimes occurs during torrential rains and they provide important habitat for wildlife. Fifteen groups in Kansas ranging from the State Secretary of Agriculture to the Kansas Audubon Society have asked Secretary Glickman to reverse this ruling. USDA's actions seem directly aimed at a recent brochure prepared by these 15 Kansas organizations that explains how landowners can use these grass strips to improve environmental and wildlife benefits. This amendment tries to return some aspect of local control to these decisions.

I thank the ranking member for taking another look at these amendments, and I would ask the Ranking Member's assurance that he will work with his Chairman and House counterparts to address my amendments on the Conservation Reserve Program in conference as well.

Mr. KOHL. I would like to assure the Senator from Kansas that I will work with Senator COCHRAN, Chairman of the Subcommittee, to make all members of the conference committee aware of the objectives of these three amendments. The Senator also has my assurance that I hope we can overcome any remaining objections to his amendment relating to CRP cross compliance. Further, I would like the Senator to know that I will continue discussions with all parties regarding his other two amendments to see if it will be possible to give them favorable consideration during conference committee action.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Ranking Member for his assistance and all his work on the bill.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I would like to echo that sentiment and also thank Senator KOHL for his assistance and all his work on this very important bill.

CBO COST ESTIMATE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on August 3, 1999, I filed Report 134 to accompany S. 1330, a bill to give the city of Mesquite, NV, the right to purchase at fair market value certain parcels of public land in the city, that had been ordered favorably reported on July 28, 1999. At the time the report was filed, the estimates by Congressional Budget Office were not available. The estimate is now available and concludes that enactment of S. 1330 "would increase direct spending by about \$500,000 over the 2000-2004 period." I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the CBO estimate be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, August 4, 1999.

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural
Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 1330, a bill to give the city of Mesquite, Nevada, the right to purchase at fair market value certain parcels of public land in the city.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Victoria Heid Hall (for federal costs), who can be reached at 226-2860, and Marjorie Miller (for the state and local impact), who can be reached at 225-3220.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE
S. 1330—*A bill to give the city of Mesquite, Nevada, the right to purchase at fair market value certain parcels of public land in the city*

S. 1330 provides for the conveyance of up to about 8,000 acres of federal land to the city of Mesquite, Nevada. Because S. 1330 would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply to the bill. CBO estimates that enacting this bill would increase direct spending by about \$500,000 over the 2000–2004 period. S. 1330 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). The bill would have no significant impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments, other than the city of Mesquite, Nevada, which would benefit from its enactment.

S. 1330 would give the city of Mesquite, Nevada, the exclusive right to purchase specified parcels of federal land over the next 12 years. According to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the city of Mesquite, these parcels comprise roughly 5,300 acres, depending on the outcome of final surveys. The city would pay fair market value for the acreage. Proceeds from the sale would be deposited in the special account established under the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (SNPLM), out of which the Secretary of the Interior may expend funds for land acquisitions and other projects in the state of Nevada. Under current law, BLM has no plans to sell the property. Based on information from BLM and the city of Mesquite, we estimate that these sales would result in additional federal receipts of roughly \$6 million over the 2000–2004 period and subsequent spending of the same amount. Payments by the city could be in one lump sum or over several years, which could affect the total receipts from the sales. The funds deposited in the SNPLM special account earn interest, which the Secretary can spend. Because a lag between the deposit and spending of sale proceeds is likely, we expect that enacting S. 1330 would result in a net increase in direct spending from the interest. Assuming all the acreage is sold to the city in 2001, we estimate a net increase in direct spending totaling about \$500,000 over the 2000–2004 period. Estimated annual budgetary effects are shown in the following table.

By fiscal years in millions of dollars—						
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING (including offsetting receipts)						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	-4	2	2	1	0
Estimated Outlays	0	-4	2	2	1	0

In addition, S. 1330 provides that within one year of enactment the Secretary of the

Interior shall convey to the city of Mesquite up to 2,560 acres of federal land to be selected by the city from parcels described in the bill. The land would be used to develop a new commercial airport. The bill requires that the conveyance be in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 47125, which permits the Secretary of Transportation to request that a federal agency convey land or airspace to a public agency sponsoring a project such as a new airport. The statute specifies that such conveyances be made only on the condition that the federal government retain a reversionary interest if the land is not used for an airport. Since BLM has no plans to sell the property under current law, conveying the property at no cost to the city would have no net impact on receipts relative to current law.

S. 1330 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA. The city of Mesquite would benefit from enactment of this legislation, which would allow it to obtain needed parcels of land BLM would convey some of this land at no cost. The conveyances would be voluntary on the part of the city, as would any amounts spent by the city to purchase or develop the land. The bill would have no significant impact on the budgets of other local governments, or on state or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contacts are Victoria Heid Hall (for federal costs), who can be reached at 226-2860, and Marjorie Miller (for the state and local impact), who can be reached at 225-3220. This estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION FUNDING

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to highlight an issue of growing concern, namely funding for the U.S. chemical demilitarization program. My concern is that the Congress has been cutting the funding required to eliminate our stockpile of chemical weapons and agents, despite the fact that we have a treaty commitment under the Chemical Weapons Convention to destroy that stockpile by April 24, 2007.

Simply put, if we in Congress do not provide the funds needed to meet that treaty commitment in time, we will be forcing the United States to violate an arms control treaty that we in the Senate approved with our vote of advise and consent to ratification.

Mr. President, this is a trend we should not be continuing. In fact, we should be providing the funds needed to ensure that the United States can and does meet its treaty obligations for all treaties to which we are an adherent, including the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Given the Senate's unique constitutional role in providing advice and consent to the ratification of treaties, I would hope this proposition would be self-evident to all our colleagues. Nonetheless, Mr. President, the Conference Report on the Military Construction Appropriations Bill, H.R. 2465, contains significant reductions from the funding requested for military construction of chemical demilitarization facilities needed to meet our treaty obligations.

The program is cut by \$93 million dollars in fiscal year 2000 funds, includ-

ing a reduction of \$15 million dollars for planning and design work. This appears to be a technical mistake, Mr. President, since the budget request did not contain any funds for planning and design in the military construction projects for chemical demilitarization. This is deeply disappointing since neither appropriations subcommittee had reduced the military construction funding in their respective bills. On the contrary, each subcommittee had provided full funding of the budget request for military construction for the chemical demilitarization program. The conference, however, chose to ignore that and cut funding.

If, as I suspect, those funding reductions would jeopardize our ability to meet our CWC treaty obligations, I hope the Defense Department will take some remedial action, such as a reprogramming or a supplemental request to ensure that the necessary funds are available to do the work needed to ensure that we remain compliant with the treaty. I also hope that the Defense Appropriations Conference will provide the necessary funding for this program since there are reductions made by both House and Senate subcommittees that I believe are not warranted, and are based on incomplete information.

Mr. President, there was a preliminary assessment conducted by the Defense Department's Comptroller office earlier this year that looked at the rate of obligations and disbursements for the chemical demilitarization program. Unfortunately, before that assessment was completed, an internal DoD memorandum was leaked with preliminary and incomplete information. That internal memo was the basis for much concern among various congressional committees. The problem is that some of the Committees acted on the basis of that incomplete information, and it is now clear that the preliminary information was incorrect. Consequently, Congress cut funds for the chemical demilitarization program based on faulty information.

Since that internal memo was leaked, Congress has been looking into the financial management of the chemical demilitarization program, and we have been provided with more complete and accurate information. This information makes it clear that we should not be cutting the program funding based on the earlier information.

The Armed Services Committee, on which I serve as the Ranking Member of the Emerging Threats subcommittee that has responsibility for this program, asked the General Accounting Office to conduct a preliminary review of the financial management of the program. Their conclusion was that the funds requested are all needed and that there are plans for spending them at a reasonable rate. In other words, Mr. President, the worries about slow obligation or expenditure rates are not justified, and there is a good explanation for why the funds are obligated and expended at their current pace. In my