

coming years will bring us more challenges like this, when the environment and the economy must be harmonized. Today is a test of our ability to deal those challenges ahead.

This nation can put a man on the moon. Surely, we can adopt a solution to this problem that protects the environment and protects jobs of the coal fields.

This amendment seeks to go back to the regulations and the agreements that made up the status quo ante before the judge's order—that is all we ask—the status quo ante agreed upon by the administration's EPA, by the administration's Army Corps of Engineers, by the administration's Department of the Interior, the Office of Surface Mining. That is what we ask. And we ask not only for justice, but we ask also for mercy for the coal miners and the other working people of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors and sponsors of this amendment be printed in the RECORD, and they are as follows:

Senators BYRD, MCCONNELL, ROCKEFELLER, BUNNING, REID, CRAIG, BRYAN, HATCH, BENNETT, MURKOWSKI, CRAPO, ENZI, BURNS, and KYL. I have not put forth any big effort to shop this around. I also add Senators BREAUX, SHELBY, GRAMM, and GRAMS, as cosponsors.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business until the hour of 5 p.m. and that the time be divided in the usual form.

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

BYRD-MCCONNELL MINING AMENDMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I first thank my friend from West Virginia for his leadership on this extraordinarily important issue to my State and to his and, for that matter, to all the people of Appalachia where coal is mined.

Thanks to my friend from West Virginia, I had a unique experience last week. As the proud possessor of a zero rating from the AFL-CIO, I had never been invited to a rally by the United Mine Workers of America. Thanks to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who I assume warned the crowd to say nice things or at least to refrain from throwing anything, I joined him on the west front of the Capitol last Tuesday and had an opportunity to watch Senator BYRD in action in a different environment. I have seen him many times on the floor, always persuasive and always effective, but never before a rally largely of his

people and my people who make their livelihood mining coal.

I must say, it was a memorable experience. If I ever do my memoirs, I say to my friend from West Virginia, that experience will be in it. We have joined together today. And there are many others on this side of the aisle, and I hope we will have some on that side of the aisle, who have had enough of this administration declaring war on legal industries engaged in an honest effort to keep the engines of this country moving forward. We have a number of Republican Senators from the West, and they all informed us over the years about the war on the West. Senator DOMENICI and Senator CRAIG have educated some of us southerners about the problems they have had. And I am pleased to say I have supported them over the years, without exception, in their efforts to preserve those jobs in the mining industry out west.

Well, I would say the war on the West is moving east, and we are beginning to feel the sting. Even though this amendment was generated by a very poorly reasoned district court decision in the Federal court in West Virginia, let me say that is just the beginning, as the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out; it is just the beginning.

All the Byrd-McConnell amendment seeks to do—not just for coal mining but for hard rock mining as well—is to restore us to the existing law, at least with regard to coal mining, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has pointed out. The letter from the White House, from Chief of Staff John Podesta to the President, either lies or is woefully ill informed.

It is clear to this Senator that the people downtown don't care what the facts are. They don't care about the 20,000 coal miners in West Virginia and the 15,000 coal miners in Kentucky. They really don't care. I don't think they have bothered to read the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia because, as he pointed out a few moments ago with regard to coal mining, we are seeking to reestablish the status quo, agreed to and entered into by the most radical EPA in the history of the country. There is no question in my mind that whenever any environmental group in America hiccups, it is felt downtown. Anytime they object to anything, the administration falls in line.

It has been fascinating to watch this issue develop because it pits the environmentalists against the unions—truly a Hobson's choice for the administration. When they had to pick a side between the environmentalists and the coal miners in West Virginia and in Kentucky, it is pretty clear whose side they chose. They don't care about these jobs. They are not interested in reading this amendment. They really don't care what is in the amendment. They are willing to sacrifice the 20,000 coal-mining jobs in West Virginia and the 15,000 coal-mining jobs in Kentucky in order to score points with a lot of

environmentalists—who, I assume, enjoy having electricity all the time so they can read their reports—decrying the people who work in the industry so important to our States. Clinton and GORE are determined to put the agenda of the fringe environmental groups and Presidential political concerns ahead of the needs of coal miners in Appalachia.

As I said earlier in a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia, and as he referred to in his speech, the President came to Appalachia last summer. He happened to have picked my State. He came to Hazard, KY. It was a large crowd. They were honored to have him there. The mayor of Hazard is still talking about it. It was one of the high points of his life. The President looked out at the people in Hazard, many of whom make a living in the coal mines, and he said, "I am here to help you."

Well, Mr. President, we need your help. I assume the whole idea behind coming to Kentucky was not to increase unemployment. My recollection of what that visit was about was how the Federal Government could actually produce new jobs for the mountains—something a lot of people have talked about and few have been able to deliver. Well, we would like to have new jobs, Mr. President, but I can tell you this: We would rather not lose any more of the few jobs we have remaining. That is not a step in the right direction.

We don't have as many coal jobs as we used to. The production is about the same. The employment is much smaller. Every time there has been an improvement in the coal-mining industry—whether on top of the mountain or underneath the mountain—safety has gone up, and that is important. But employment has gone down. We are not yet ready to walk away from coal in this country. We have not built a new nuclear plant in 20 years and are not likely to build any more. These people are engaged in an indispensable activity. They would like to have a little support from down on Pennsylvania Avenue. Where is the compassion? Where is the concern about these existing jobs in a critically important industry for our country?

Senator BYRD has really covered the subject, and there is not much I could add, other than just to read once again what this amendment is about. Nothing in our amendment modifies, supersedes, undermines, displaces, or amends any requirement of or regulation issued under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act, or the Surface Mining Act of 1977. So in response to this outrageous and ridiculous court decision, we have not proposed changing the law. The judge, in his decision, has made it clear that he expects us to clear this up. He is inviting us to legislate. That is what we are hoping to do.

The EPA, the Office of Surface Mining, the Corps of Engineers, and other

relevant agencies are in the process of conducting a thorough environmental impact study. At the conclusion of this process, if any of these agencies believe it is necessary, they may create new environmental regulations addressing the practice of mountaintop mining. Some might say that Senator BYRD and I and others are trying to delay the inevitable. I argue just the opposite. I argue that, by maintaining the status quo and allowing the EIS to move forward, you allow coal operators the ability to make the long-term plans essential to the viability of this industry.

So there are only two things you need to remember about our amendment: No. 1, it doesn't alter the Clean Water Act. No. 2, it doesn't alter the Surface Mining Act. It seeks to preserve the status quo.

I say to all of you who you are going to be down here asking us someday to help you save jobs in your State because of some outrageous action on the part of this administration—and some of you have done that already—we need your help. We need your help. This is an extraordinarily important vote to our States. The honest, hard-working people who make their living in the mines are under assault by this administration, and we would like to call a halt to it. We hope we will have your help in doing that.

Let me conclude by thanking again the Senator from West Virginia for his extraordinary leadership on this important issue to his State and to my State and, frankly, we believe, to a whole lot of other States because the principle is very sound. We call on our colleagues from the West—even those of us who have been voting with you over the years weren't quite sure what it was all about, but we have figured it out. This whole thing is moving its way east. We need your help.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my statement, Senator ROCKEFELLER from West Virginia be allowed to speak.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 5:30 p.m.

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

BYRD-McCONNELL MINING AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I forgot to mention the specific names of two Sen-

ators cosponsoring this amendment. The two are Nevada Senators, Mr. REID and Mr. BRYAN. I wanted to mention their names for the RECORD.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from West Virginia has included our two colleagues from the State of Nevada. Today, Nevada is probably the lead mining State in our Nation as it relates to the production of gold.

For the last hour you have heard probably some of the most eloquent statements spoken on this floor on the issue of coal mining. The Byrd amendment does not deal only with coal, although it is extremely important, and the public attention of the last week has been focused on a judge's opinion about coal, coal mining in West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and up and down the Appalachia chain of this country.

But the amendment also has something else in it that my colleague from West Virginia and I agreed to some time ago: When we talk on this floor about mining, when we talk about the economy of mining, the environment of mining, and the jobs of mining, we would stand together; that we would not allow our political differences to divide us. Because if you support the economy of this country, you have to stand together.

I am absolutely amazed that the Speaker of the House or the senior Senator from West Virginia would get a letter from the White House of the kind to which both he and the Senator from Kentucky have referred. Lying? I hope not. Uninformed? I doubt it. Here is the reason I doubt their lack of information.

For the last 7 years, this administration has been intent on changing current mining law. I am referring primarily to the law of 1872. I am referring primarily to hard-rock mining on public lands, because the laws that the Senator from West Virginia referred to that were passed in 1977, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, have become law, and established the principles and the policies under which we would mine the coal of America.

Then, on top of that, came the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act—all of them setting a framework and a standard under which we could mine the minerals and the resources of this country and assure our citizens it would be done in a sound environmental way.

As the laws of West Virginia, which are the laws of America, which are the laws this Senate passed, apply to coal mining, at least in the instances of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, they, too, apply to the mining of the west—to hard-rock mining, to gold mining, to silver mining, to lead and zinc mining, and to open-pit gravel operations of America.

Yet there is an attorney—not a judge, not an elected U.S. Senator, but an attorney—who sits at a desk at the

Department of Interior and upon his own volition 2 years ago decided he would rewrite the mining law of this country—a law that had been in place since 1872, tested in the courts hundreds of times, and that in every instance one principle stood out and was upheld. That was the principle of mill sites and how the operating agency, primarily the BLM, could, upon the request of a mining operation under a mining plan uniform with its processes, ask for additional properties under which to operate its mine. Consistently, for over 100 years, the Federal agencies of this country have granted those additional mill sites.

The attorney I am referring to, prior to his job with the Secretary of Interior, was an environmental activist. In the late 1980s, he wrote a book. His book decried the tremendous environmental degradation that the mining industries of America were putting upon this planet. In that book, he said there is a simple way to bring the mining industry to its knees. "If you can't pass laws to do it, you can do it through rule and regulation." Those are his words. He wrote it in the book, which was well read across America.

When I asked that solicitor to come before the subcommittee I chair, which is the Mining Subcommittee, I quoted back to him his own words and said: If that is not what you said, then what are you doing now? He didn't say yes, but he didn't say no. Here is what he did say. He said: I have reached out to every State director of every BLM operation in this Nation, and I have asked them if the process I have overruled by my decision is a process that has been well used by the agency. He said they responded to him: Not so—very lightly used and only used in recent years.

The tragedy of that statement is that it was a lie because the Freedom of Information Act shows that every State director wrote a letter to the solicitor a year before I asked him the question and every State director of every State office of the Bureau of Land Management said this is a practice in our manuals and has been used consistently since the 1872 law was implemented.

What did solicitor John Leshy do before the Mining Subcommittee of the Senate? He perjured himself. That is what he did. And the Freedom of Information Act shows that.

I would say to the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky, my guess is that the informational mind that wrote the letter that John Podesta sent to you came from an agency that had already perjured itself before the U.S. Senate. I know that as fact. I give that to you on my word and with my honor.

Therefore, in the Byrd-McConnell amendment is a provision that said: Mr. Leshy, you cannot arbitrarily or capriciously overturn over 100 years of mining law. That is not your job. You are a hired attorney. You are not an