

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California is recognized.

THE CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so grateful to the majority leader. This morning there was, I thought, a very good presentation by several colleagues concerning S. 25, the Murkowski-Landrieu bill. This legislation, which is supported by a number of my colleagues, is called the Conservation and Reinvestment Act.

I want to say that is a wonderful title because it implies that we are going to conserve something and that we are going to reinvest money to make our environment better.

It is very tempting when you first look at the bill to say this is an excellent bill. But as you get into the bill, and as you listen to the remarks of my colleagues who are for it, you basically realize that it does basically one thing and one thing only; that is, it encourages more offshore oil drilling on Federal lands because it makes the revenues States receive dependent upon how much offshore oil drilling they engage in off their coast.

What it means for States such as California that protect its coastline by restricting offshore oil drilling, is that there will be less funding for conservation, and States that encourage offshore oil drilling, which I believe despoils the environment, will be rewarded by far more funds. States that have absolutely no offshore drilling and those that are landlocked also do not benefit from this bill.

While purporting to simply provide guaranteed funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, S. 25 distorts the fundamental principle behind the establishment of the Act.

The original idea behind it is to purchase beautiful lands for future generations.

When I ask colleagues if, in fact, S. 25 encourages offshore oil drilling—they say, no; we don't. But yet if you listened to Senator MURKOWSKI's comments on the floor today, you will hear something different. This is what he said about the bill, S. 25:

In order to have a successful Conservation and Reinvestment act, we've got to have a continuation of OCS revenues occurring off the shores of some of our States."

He went on to say:

Support for this legislation is related, to some extent, by those States that see an opportunity to generate a source of revenue.

And continued to say:

In order for it to be successful, we have to have and encourage offshore revenue sharing.

Clearly, what Senator MURKOWSKI is saying about S. 25 is the truth. That is, if a State wants to receive more funds, they should allow and promote more offshore oil drilling off their coasts.

I come from a State that treasures its coastline and knows that the impact of offshore oil drilling is devastating. I don't think we should be punished because we stand strong in our State in a very bipartisan way, to say we don't want this impact.

I don't believe S. 25 is a conservation bill. I believe the principal goal is to encourage more offshore oil drilling, and thereby bring about more destruction to the environment—not less destruction.

States that have active drilling programs will be the primary benefactors. There is no question about it. Alaska, Texas, and Louisiana get 50 percent of the money while the entire Nation will lose as we deplete a beautiful federal publicly-owned natural resource; namely, our ocean.

This doesn't seem fair. This is a national resource owned by the American people. As such revenue from this resource must be shared throughout our nation.

States that are protecting their resource and don't have offshore oil drilling, as well as States that are landlocked, will lose under S. 25.

I introduced a bill that really does fulfill our commitment to the preservation of our natural resources. Congressman George Miller introduced the companion bill in the House. The bill we introduced, the Resources 2000 Act, has a number of fine cosponsors. In fact, 37 states would benefit more from the funding distribution under Resources 2000 than in S. 25.

I hope colleagues will look at the Resources 2000 bill, which has the support of over 200 environmental organizations.

Those on my bill include Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN, PAUL SARBANES, CHUCK SCHUMER, FRANK LAUTENBERG, PAUL WELLSTONE, TED KENNEDY, JOE BIDEN, BARBARA MIKULSKI, BOB TORRICELLI, and JOHN KERRY. We have more coming.

We have a national resource—our oceans. We destroy that resource when we drill for oil.

Frankly, the amount of oil that is there isn't worth all the destruction that follows. However, if a State wants to do this, that is their option.

But I don't think they should get rewarded more because they do not mind destroying their coast. States that care about their coast and protect and defend it with laws and coastal zone management plans are penalized under S. 25.

In 1965, Congress established the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Congress decided that as we deplete one of our nation's natural non-resources, we should invest that money into protecting and preserving our nation's renewable resources. The Act required that we take the revenue from offshore oil drilling and put that money into purchasing critical lands.

They take the money and they repair. They repair, and they buy beautiful tracts of land to save it in per-

petuity. Part of that money is supposed to be for historic preservation, which we haven't fully funded either.

S. 25 flies in the face of the principal purpose of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Money distributed through S. 25 does not have to go for environmental purposes. S. 25 says to the States: You don't have to use the funds you are getting for the environment. In fact, money could be used to fund environmentally destructive activities, such as road building.

Many of my colleagues have stated that revenue generated from the Outer Continental Shelf should be treated similar to revenue from on-shore drilling. Lets be clear: the OCS land is unique. It is federal land, and federal land only. It is not within the boundaries of any state, unlike on-shore areas.

I think any expansion of the uses of OCS revenue should stick to the framework of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act that Congress in its wisdom passed in 1964. And we must uphold that original commitment by fully funding the trust fund. That is what we ought to do—fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund, on the State side as well as the Federal side, and fully fund the historic preservation fund.

Many of us in our beautiful States, whether it is Mississippi, California, or anywhere in this country, have beautiful old buildings that are falling apart, and we don't have the funds to preserve them.

We should fully fund protection of our marine resources. In our bill, we provide \$350 million for States to conserve and protect the marine environment.

We protect ranchland, farmland, and forestland through purchasing conservation easements.

I think it is a very exciting alternative to S. 25. It is, in fact, endorsed by over 200 conservation organizations. It is also the only legislation that provides funding to restore degraded Federal lands and tribal lands.

The majority leader made some good remarks this morning. He said we must maintain the lands we currently own. I agree with that. That is why Resources 2000 takes care of that by providing \$250 million for the maintenance of our degraded federal and tribal lands.

I would like to inform you at this time of some of the organizations that support Resources 2000: Sierra Club; National Audubon Society; Environmental Defense Fund; The Wilderness Society; the California Police Activities League; Defenders of Wildlife; and Earth Island Institute.

I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

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

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING RESOURCES 2000
American Oceans Campaign.
Bay Area Open Space Council.
Bay Area Trail Council.

Bay Institute.
 California Police Activities League.
 Carquinez Strait Preservation Trust.
 Defenders of Wildlife.
 Earth Island Institute.
 East Bay Regional Park District.
 Environmental Defense Fund.
 Friends of the Earth.
 Friends of the River.
 Golden Gate Audubon Society.
 Greater Vallejo Recreation District.
 Izaak Walton League.
 Land Trust Alliance.
 Marin Conservation League.
 Martinez Regional Land Trust.
 National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.
 National Audubon Society.
 National Environmental Trust.
 National Parks and Conservation Association.
 National Association of Police Athletic Leagues.
 National Wildlife Federation.
 Natural Resources Defense Council.
 Physicians for Social Responsibility.
 Preservation Action.
 Save San Francisco Bay Association.
 Save the Redwoods.
 Scenic America.
 Sierra Club.
 Society for American Archaeology.
 Trust for Public Land.
 U.S. Public Interest Research Group.
 Wilderness Society.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to support the true conservation bill: the Resources 2000 Act. Again I thank the majority leader for his graciousness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we cleared the campaign finance consent on both sides of the aisle. As far as I know, 99 Senators are prepared to agree with that. One Senator, the Senator from Michigan, came in at the last minute and objected.

I will make the commitment that I will live up to this unanimous consent agreement we have entered into to call it up on no later than Tuesday, October 12, 1999. I hope we will get the entire agreement worked out. But in the meantime, we plan on going forward October 12, either way.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to H.R. 1555.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the offering of the amendment by Senator KYL as provided for in the consent agreement of May 27, there be up to nine relevant second-degree amendments in order for each leader or their designees, and an additional amendment to be offered by the managers to include agreed-upon amendments.

I further ask unanimous consent that the listed first-degree amendments noted below also be relevant and subject to relevant second-degree amendments: Senator TORRICELLI, funding disclosure; Senator MOYNIHAN, declassification; Senator GRAHAM, relevant;

Senator FEINSTEIN, drug czar; Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, intelligence listing; Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, intelligence declassification; and Senator COVERDELL, drug kingpins.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the amendments, the bill be advanced to third reading and passage occur, all without any intervening action or debate, and no motions to commit or recommit be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I want to make it clear to the majority leader, in anticipation or not anticipation of the Senator from Michigan agreeing to the unanimous consent request, that it is the majority leader's intention to follow through with the unanimous consent request as is now presently in the Record no later than October 12 to move forward with the amending process as agreed to by the Senator from Kentucky and all of us until the Senator from Michigan objected; is that correct, I ask my friend from Mississippi?

Mr. LOTT. I apologize.

Mr. MCCAIN. Again, I want to reaffirm that it is the intention of the majority leader to comply with the unanimous consent request which was agreed to on both sides, with the exception of the Senator from Michigan, that no later than October 12, we will move forward with the legislation as articulated in the unanimous consent request.

Mr. LOTT. I say that is my intent. Of course, I would like to get the same commitment from the Senator from Arizona that it is his intent to live with this agreement also.

Mr. MCCAIN. Absolutely.

Mr. LOTT. That is my intent. I modify my UC request to delete the amendments by Senators TORRICELLI and GRAHAM and add one by Senator BRYAN regarding DOE labs.

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

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1555) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the junior Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, is to be recognized to offer an amendment after the general statements.

Mr. SHELBY. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized to make an opening statement on the bill.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, on May 5 of this year the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence unanimously reported out of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. It subsequently referred to the Committee on Armed Services, where it was reported out on June 8.

Senator KERREY and I have once again worked very closely together to address our critical need for high-quality intelligence by allocating resources in a manner designed to ensure that this need is met.

In preparing this legislation, the committee conducted a detailed review of the administration's three major intelligence budget requests for fiscal year 2000. They are the National Foreign Intelligence Program, the Joint Military Intelligence Program, and the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities of the Military Services.

The committee held briefings and hearings with senior intelligence officials, reviewed budget justification materials, and considered responses to specific questions posed by the committee.

As in the past, the committee also impaneled a group of outside experts composed of distinguished scientists, industry leaders, and retired general and flag officers to review specific technical issues within the intelligence community.

The panel is known as the Technical Advisory Group and is similar to the Defense Department's Defense Science Board in some ways.

This group brings an invaluable level of expertise to the committee's work, and we owe them a debt of gratitude for their service.

Many of their recommendations have been incorporated into this bill before the Senate this evening.

Once again the committee has focused on what we refer to as the "five C's". They are: counterproliferation, counterterrorism, counternarcotics, covert action, and counterintelligence.

The last of the five, counterintelligence, has received a great deal of congressional and media attention in recent months in light of revelations of espionage activities by the People's Republic of China.

I am proud to say that the Intelligence Committee has been attempting to address the shortcomings of the Department of Energy's counterintelligence program for nearly 10 years, often to no avail.

In fact, it was the Intelligence Committee that directed the study that finally led to the drafting and signing of Presidential Decision Directive 61.

Before I turn to the legislative provisions in this bill, I feel compelled to share with our colleagues some comments about the current state of our defense and intelligence preparedness.

In the immediate aftermath of the cold war, optimistic appraisals of our