

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 esti-  
mate, 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, Ne-  
vada, 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 af-  
fect direct spending, pay-as-you-go proce-  
dures 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 intergovern-  
mental 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 trib-  
al governments, other than the city of Mes-  
quite, Nevada, which would benefit from its  
enactment.

S. 1330 would give the city of Mesquite, Ne-  
vada, the exclusive right to purchase speci-  
fied parcels of federal land over the next 12  
years. According to the Bureau of Land Man-  
agement (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 de-  
posited 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 ex-  
pend funds for land acquisitions and other  
projects in the state of Nevada. Under cur-  
rent law, BLM has no plans to sell the prop-  
erty. Based on information from BLM and  
the city of Mesquite, we estimate that these  
sales would result in additional federal re-  
ceipts 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. 1350 would result in  
a net increase in direct spending from the in-  
terest. 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 con-  
veyances 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 ob-  
tain needed parcels of land BLM would con-  
vey some of this land at no cost. The conve-  
yances 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 con-  
cern, namely funding for the U.S.  
chemical demilitarization program. My  
concern is that the Congress has been  
cutting the funding required to elimi-  
nate our stockpile of chemical weapons  
and agents, despite the fact that we  
have a treaty commitment under the  
Chemical Weapons Convention to de-  
stroy 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 Sen-  
ate 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 Con-  
vention.

Given the Senate's unique constitu-  
tional role in providing advice and con-  
sent to the ratification of treaties, I  
would hope this proposition would be  
self-evident to all our colleagues.  
Nonetheless, Mr. President, the Con-  
ference Report on the Military Con-  
struction Appropriations Bill, H.R.  
2465, contains significant reductions  
from the funding requested for military  
construction of chemical demilitariza-  
tion 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 ap-  
pears 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 nei-  
ther appropriations subcommittee had  
reduced the military construction  
funding in their respective bills. On the  
contrary, each subcommittee had pro-  
vided full funding of the budget request  
for military construction for the chem-  
ical demilitarization program. The  
conference, however, chose to ignore  
that and cut funding.

If, as I suspect, those funding reduc-  
tions would jeopardize our ability to  
meet our CWC treaty obligations, I  
hope the Defense Department will take  
some remedial action, such as a re-  
programming or a supplemental re-  
quest to ensure that the necessary  
funds are available to do the work  
needed to ensure that we remain com-  
pliant 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 sub-  
committees that I believe are not war-  
ranted, and are based on incomplete in-  
formation.

Mr. President, there was a prelimi-  
nary assessment conducted by the De-  
fense Department's Comptroller office  
earlier this year that looked at the  
rate of obligations and disbursements  
for the chemical demilitarization pro-  
gram. Unfortunately, before that as-  
sessment was completed, an internal  
DoD memorandum was leaked with  
preliminary and incomplete informa-  
tion. That internal memo was the basis  
for much concern among various con-  
gressional committees. The problem is  
that some of the Committees acted on  
the basis of that incomplete informa-  
tion, and it is now clear that the pre-  
liminary 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 chem-  
ical demilitarization program, and we  
have been provided with more complete  
and accurate information. This infor-  
mation 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 pro-  
gram, 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 obli-  
gation or expenditure rates are not jus-  
tified, and there is a good explanation  
for why the funds are obligated and ex-  
pended at their current pace. In my