SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, $190,000 of funds granted to the City of Camden, New Jersey, in 1996 as a part of a Federal local law enforcement block grant may be retained by Camden and spent for the purposes permitted by the grant through the end of fiscal year 2000.

AMENDMENT NO. 1334

(Purpose: To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to continue and extend authority for transfers to State and local governments of certain property for law enforcement, public safety, and emergency response purposes)

On page 111, insert between lines 7 and 8 the following:

SEC. 620. Section 203(p)(1)(B) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(p)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking clause (ii);

(2) by inserting ''or public safety'' after ''law enforcement'';

(3) by striking ''(i)'';

(4) by striking ''(I)'' and inserting ''(i)''; and

(5) by striking ''(II)'' and inserting ''(ii)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1335

On page 15, after line 2, insert:

''HIGH INTENSITY INTERSTATE GANG ACTIVITY AREAS PROGRAM

''For expenses necessary to establish and implement the High Intensity Interstate Gang Activity Areas Program (including grants, contracts, cooperative agreements and other assistance) pursuant to Section 205 of S. 254 as passed by the Senate on May 20, 1999, and consistent with the funding proportions established therein, $20,000,000.''

On page 21, line 16, strike ''3,156,895,000'' and insert ''3,136,895,000.''

AMENDMENT NO. 1336

(Purpose: To provide funding to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to upgrade Great Lakes water gauging stations in order to ensure compliance with Year 2000 (Y2K) computer date processing requirements)

On page 57, line 16, strike ''$1,776,728,000'' and insert ''$1,777,118,000''.

On page 57, line 17, before the colon, insert the following: ''; of which $390,000 shall be used by the National Ocean Service to upgrade an additional 13 Great Lakes water gauging stations in order to ensure compliance with Year 2000 (Y2K) computer date processing requirements''.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS and REID for their efforts in helping an amendment be added to the managers' package which Senator DEWINE and I offered relative to Great Lakes stations and measuring stations for water levels. It is an important amendment for the Great Lakes.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter that I and Senator DEWINE wrote to Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS dated June 24 be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, June 24, 1999.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chair, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: We are writing to request that our amendment providing $390,000 for upgrades to 13 Great Lakes gauging stations be included in the managers' amendment to the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill. It has only recently come to our attention that NOAA/NOS was proposing to close rather than upgrade these 13 stations due primarily to budget consideration. Upgrades to the stations supported by the one-time appropriation in amendment will cut the long-term operating expenses for the stations by half or more while ensuring timely transfer of the essential data to the end users in the private sector and other Federal agencies. Because the old technology employed in these stations is not Y2K compliant, it is essential that the upgrades be provided this year.

Many of the 13 stations slated for closure are of particular importance to the monitoring network. Three of the stations have been in operation since the turn of the last century (1899–1901), forming a central part of the long term record for Great Lakes water levels. Their closure represents a grave loss to the continuity of the data. Six of the gauging stations are located in connecting channels, geographic locations for which water levels are nearly impossible to accurately interpolate from other sites and which are essential to determining flow rates between the lakes. Closure of these connecting channel stations will critically injure our ability to determine flow of water, contaminants, and other substances among the Great Lakes.

Furthermore, the proposed reduction in gauging capability comes at a time when such capability is needed most. Great Lakes jurisdictions at the federal, state, provincial and binational levels are confronting a series of complex issues associated with water withdrawal, consumptive use and removal, including export. The Great Lakes system is currently experiencing dramatic declines in water levels compared with just last year, ranging from an 8″ drop in Lake Superior to 30″ in Lake Ontario. Overall, water levels have changed from extreme highs to levels nearly a foot below the long-term averages. This water level reduction has already had profound impacts on commercial navigation and recreational boating. Lake level regulation, dredging needs, and other priorities also are set based on the expectations of water level fluctuations. All of these issues have one thing in common: they are fundamentally dependent upon the accurate and comprehensive data provided by the 49 long-term Great Lakes stations in the National Water Level Observation Network. Federal, state and local decision makers in the Great Lakes region rely upon this network to make informed decisions regarding resource management and policy.

We believe that the funding level requested is both modest and justifiable given the importance of the water level gauging network to the Great Lakes region and the long-term cost savings that will be realized.

Sincerely,

MIKE DEWINE.
CARL LEVIN.

AMENDMENT NO. 1337

On page 34, line 25, after ''title'', insert the following: ''*Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated not to exceed $550,000 shall be available to the Lincoln Action Program's Youth Violence Alternative Project.''

AMENDMENT NO. 1338

On page 26 of S. 1217, line 2 after the word ''Programs'', strike the period and insert the following:

Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available to the TeamMates of Nebraska project.

AMENDMENT NO. 1339

(Purpose: To provide for an analysis by the Securities Exchange Commission of the effects of electronic communications networks and night trading on securities markets)

On page 98, line 16, before the period, insert the following: '': *Provided further,* That the Commission shall conduct a study on the effects of electronic communications networks and extended trading hours on securities markets, including effects on market volatility, market liquidity, and best execution practices''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1340

(Purpose: To provide funding for task forces coordinated by the United States Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Wisconsin and the Western and Northern Districts of New York)

On page 8, line 13, strike ''$25,000,000'' and insert ''$27,000,000''.

On page 8, line 23, insert before the period ''; and of which $1,000,000 shall be for the task force coordinated by the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and $1,000,000 shall be for task forces coordinated by the Office of the United States Attorney for the Western District of New York and task forces coordinated by the Office of the United States Attorney for the Northern District of New York.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1341

(Purpose: To allocate funds for Tibetan Exchange Program)

On page 78, line 8, before the period insert the following: *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated under this heading for the Fulbright program, such sums as may be available may be used for the Tibetan Exchange Program''.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes all action on S. 1217, it not be engrossed and be held at the desk. I further ask that when the House of Representatives companion measure is received in the Senate, the Senate immediately proceed to its consideration; that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken and the text of S. 1217, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the House bill, as amended, be read for a third time and passed; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon passage by the Senate of the House companion measure, as amended, the passage of S. 1217 be vitiated and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this is a wind-up unanimous consent request. I wonder if the distinguished manager would agree that we would

have a voice vote on final passage, which would then cause this Boxer amendment vote to be the last vote tonight.

Mr. GREGG. That is the intention, and we hope that is the desire of the Senate. Therefore, the Boxer amendment will be the last vote tonight.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that there be a voice vote on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will not—do we all agree that when the conference report returns, we will have the vote on that?

Mr. GREGG. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Definitely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the Boxer amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 61, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Ashcroft	Enzi	Lott
Bennett	Gorton	Lugar
Bond	Gramm	McConnell
Breaux	Grams	Murkowski
Brownback	Gregg	Nickles
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Campbell	Hatch	Sessions
Cochran	Helms	Stevens
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Thompson
Craig	Hutchison	Voinovich
Crapo	Kyl	Warner
Domenici	Landrieu	

NAYS—61

Abraham	Feingold	Moynihan
Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Allard	Fitzgerald	Reed
Baucus	Frist	Reid
Bayh	Graham	Robb
Biden	Grassley	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Harkin	Roth
Boxer	Hollings	Santorum
Bryan	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Burns	Inouye	Schumer
Byrd	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kerrey	Snowe
Collins	Kerry	Specter
Conrad	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Levin	Torricelli
Dodd	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden
Durbin	Mack	
Edwards	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—4

Kennedy	McCain
Leahy	Shelby

The motion was rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1306

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1306) was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1271, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent to modify amendment No. 1271, a previously adopted amendment. I send it to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS, proposes an amendment numbered 1271, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 6, line 14, strike ''any other provision of law'' and insert ''31 U.S.C. 3302(b)''.

On page 6, line 18, strike ''(15 U.S.C. 18(a))'' and insert ''(15 U.S.C. 18a)''.

On page 25, line 23, insert after ''(106 Stat. 3524)'', ''of which $5,000,000 shall be available to the National Institute of Justice for a national evaluation of the Byrne program,''.

On page 30, line 17, strike after ''1999'', ''of which $12,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Justice Programs' Global Information Integration Initiative,''.

On page 50, line 6, insert before the period: ''to be made available until expended''.

On page 73, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

''SEC. 306. Section 604(a)(5) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ', and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, pay on behalf of justices and judges of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior, aged 65 or over, any increases in the cost of Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance imposed after April 24, 1999, including any expenses generated by such payments, as authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United States.' ''.

On page 75, line 15, insert the following after ''period''; '', unless the Secretary of State determines that a detail for a period more than a total of 2 years during any 5 year period would further the interests of the Department of State''.

On page 75, line 21, insert the following after ''detail'': '', unless the Secretary of State determines that the extension of the detail would further the interests of the Department of State''.

On page 76, line 11, insert before the period: '': *Provided further*. That of the amount made available under this heading, not less than $11,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Defense Trade Controls''.

On page 110, strike lines 15 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof:

''(ii) Notwithstanding otherwise applicable law, for each license or construction permit issued by the Commission under this subsection for which a debt or other monetary obligation is owed to the Federal Communications Commission or to the United States, the Commission shall be deemed to have a perfected, first priority security interest in such license or permit, and in the proceeds of sale of such license or permit, to the extent of the outstanding balance of such a debt or other obligation.''.

On page 111, insert after the end of Sec. 619:

''Sec. 620. (a) DEFINITIONS—For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''agency'' means the Federal Communications Commission.

(2) the term ''employee'' means an employee (as defined by section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) who is serving under an appointment without time limitation, and has been currently employed by such agency for a continuous period of at least 3 years; but does not include—

(A) a reemployed annuitant under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, or another retirement system for employees of the Government.

(B) an employee having a disability on the basis of which such employee is or would be eligible for disability retirement under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, or another retirement system for employees of the Government.

(C) an employee who has been duly notified that he or she is to be involuntarily separated for misconduct or unacceptable performance;

(D) an employee who has previously received any voluntary separation incentive payment from the Federal Government under this section or any other authority;

(E) an employee covered by statutory reemployment rights who is on transfer to another organization; or

(F) any employee who, during the twenty-four month period preceding the date of separation, has received a recruitment or relocation bonus under section 5753 of title 5, United States Code, or who, within the twelve month period preceding the date of separation, received a retention allowance under section 5754 of that title.

(3) The term ''Chairman'' means the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

(b) AGENCY PLAN—

(1) IN GENERAL—The Chairman, prior to obligating any resources for voluntary separation incentive payments, shall simultaneously submit to the authorizing and appropriating Committees of the House and the Senate and to the Office of Management and Budget a strategic plan outlining the intended use of such incentive payments and a proposed organizational chart for the agency once such incentive payments have been completed.

(2) CONTENTS—The agency's plan shall include—

(A) the positions and functions to be reduced, eliminated, and increased, as appropriate, identified by organizational unit, geographic location, occupational category and grade level;

(B) the time period during which incentives may be paid;

(C) the number and amounts of voluntary separation incentive payments to be offered; and

(D) a description of how the agency will operate without the eliminated positions and functions and with any increased or changed occupational skill mix.

(3) CONSULTATION—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review

the agency's plan and may make appropriate recommendations for the plan with respect to the coverage of incentives as described under paragraph (2)(A), and with respect to the matters described in paragraph (2)(B)-(C). Any such recommendations shall be submitted simultaneously to the authorizing and appropriating committees of the House and the Senate.

(c) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS—The Chairman shall implement the next agency plan without prior written notification to the chairman of each authorizing and appropriating committee of the House and the Senate at least fifteen days in advance of such implementation.

(1) IN GENERAL—A voluntary separation incentive payment under this section may be paid by the Chairman to any employee only to the extent necessary to eliminate the positions and functions identified by the strategic plan.

(2) AMOUNT AND TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS—A voluntary incentive payment

(A) shall be paid in a lump sum, after the employee's separation

(B) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(i) an amount equal to the amount the employee would be entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of title 5, United States Code (without adjustment for any previous payments made) or

(ii) an amount determined by the Chairman not to exceed $25,000.

(C) may not be made except in the case of any qualifying employee who voluntarily separates (whether by retirement or resignation) under the provisions of this section by not later than September 30, 2001;

(D) shall not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation, of any other type of Government benefit; and

(E) shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of any severance pay to which the employee may be entitled under section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, based on any other separation.

(d) ADDITIONAL AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RETIREMENT FUND—

(1) IN GENERAL—In addition to any other payments which it is required to make under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, the agency shall remit to the Office of Personnel Management for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to 15 percent of the final base pay of each employee of the agency who is covered under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States code, to whom a voluntary separation incentive has been paid under this Act.

(2) DEFINITION—For the purpose of paragraph (1), the term ''final basic pay,'' with respect to an employee, means the total amount of basic pay which would be payable for a year of service by such employee, computed using the employee's final rate of basic pay, and, if last serving or other than a full-time basis, with appropriate adjustment therefor.

(e) EFFECT OF SUBSEQUENT EMPLOYMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT—

(1) An individual who has received a voluntary separation incentive payment from the agency under this section and accepts any employment for compensation with the Government of the United States, or who works for any agency of the United States Government through a personal service contract, within 5 years after the date of the separation on which the payment is based shall be required to pay, prior to the individual's first day of employment, the entire amount of the lump sum incentive payment to the agency.

(2) If the employment under paragraph (1) is with an Executive agency (as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code), the United States Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may, at the request of the head of the agency, waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position.

(3) If the employment under paragraph (1) is with an entity in the legislative branch, the head of the entity or the appointing official may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position.

(4) If the employment under paragraph (1) is with the judicial branch, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant for the position.

(f) INTENDED EFFECT ON AGENCY EMPLOYMENT LEVELS—

(1) IN GENERAL—Voluntary separations under this section are not intended necessarily to reduce the total number of full-time equivalent positions in the Federal Communications Commission. The agency may redeploy or use the full-time equivalent positions vacated by voluntary separations under this section to make other positions available to more critical locations or more critical occupations.

(2) ENFORCEMENT—The president, through the office of Management and Budget, shall monitor the agency and take any action necessary to ensure that the requirements of this subsection are met.

(g) REGULATIONS—The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to implement this section.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment. (Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, as included in Public Law 105–277, section 101(b).''

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

''SEC. 621. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter the ''Secretary'') is hereby authorized and directed to create an ''Interagency Task Force on Indian Arts and Crafts Enforcement'' to be composed of representatives of the U.S. Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Treasury, the International Trade Administration, and representatives of other agencies and departments in the discretion of the Secretary to devise and implement a coordinated enforcement response to prevent the sale or distribution of any product or goods sold in or shipped to the United States that is not in compliance with the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1935, as amended.''.

Mr. GREGG. This technical amendment has been cleared on both sides. I ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1271), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1272 WITHDRAWN

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment numbered 1272.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1291

(Purpose: To amend title III of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act and title IV of the Secondary Education Act of 1965 to limit the effects of domestic violence on the lives of children, and for other purposes)

Mr. GREGG. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], for Mr. WELLSTONE and Mrs. MURRAY, proposes an amendment numbered 1291.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent we accept amendment No. 1291.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1291) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1342

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate with respect to hush kits)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send a sense of the Senate to the desk and ask unanimous consent it be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], for Mr. GORTON, for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER, proposes an amendment numbered 1342.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL NOISE RULE AFFECTING HUSHKITTED AND REENGINED AIRCRAFT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) For more than 50 years, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has been the single entity vested with the authority to establish international noise and emissions standard; through OCAOs efforts, aircraft noise has decreased by an average of 40 percent since 1970;

(2) ICAO is currently working on an expedited basis on even more stringent international noise standards, taking into account economic reasonableness, technical feasibility and environmental benefits;

(3) International noise and emissions standards are critical to maintaining U.S. aeronautical industries' economic viability and to obtaining their on going commitment to progressively more stringent noise reduction efforts;

(4) European Council (EO) Regulation No. 925/1999 banning certain aircraft meeting the highest internationally recognized noise standards from flying in Europe, undermines the integrity of the ICAO process and undercuts the likelihood that new Stage 4 standards can be developed;

(5) While no regional standard is acceptable, this regulation is particularly offensive, there is no scientific basis for the regulation and it has been carefully crafted to protect European aviation interests while imposing arbitrary, substantial and unfounded cost burdens on United States' aeronautical industries;

(6) The vast majority of aircraft that will be affected by EC Regulation No. 925/1999 are operated by U.S. flag carriers; and

(7) The implementation of EC Regulation No. 925/1999 will result in a loss of jobs in the United States and may cost the U.S. aviation industry in excess of $2,000,000,000.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) EC Regulation No. 925/1999 should be rescinded by the EC at the earliest possible time;

(2) that if it is not done, the Department of State should file a petition regarding EC on Regulation No. 925/1999 with ICAO pursuant to Article 84 of the Chicago Convention; and

(3) the Departments of Commerce and Transportation and the United States Trade Representative should use all reasonable means available to them to ensure that the goal of having the rule repealed is achieved.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this amendment expresses the Sense of the Senate with respect to the discriminatory European trade practices being perpetrated against certain American products in the guise of promulgating regulations on noise emissions.

Last year the European Union began to restrict the use of so called hushkitted or reengined U.S. aircraft in the European community. These aircraft had been specifically modified to meet U.S. Stage 3 quiet noise standards. Ironically, the United States is several years ahead of Europe in urging U.S. aircraft to be reengined to comply with such standards.

EC Regulation No. 925/1999 has been crafted in such a way as a noise standard to effectively prohibit U.S. aircraft that have been hushkitted from flying in European airspace even though these aircraft are actually quieter than many European aircraft and engines. The standard is written in such a clever way that it touches only U.S. products. That in and of itself should make anyone suspicious as to whether the motive is noise abatement or a clearly disguised technical barrier to trade.

At the moment the EU has delayed implementation of the regulation but it has not been formally rescinded. That means that anyone thinking about buying U.S. aircraft that have been hushkitted, which most older aircraft have been to meet U.S. standards, would have to make some judgement as to whether this regulation is likely to resurface again. If the judgement is yes then a potential buyer would refuse to buy U.S. aircraft if they would be contemplated for use on European routes.

For more than fifty years, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has been the single entity vested with the authority to establish international noise and emission standards, and thanks to its efforts aircraft noise has been decreased by forty percent. Moreover, ICAO is working as we speak to tighten international noise standards even further. For the European Council to arbitrarily seek to preempt the efforts of the ICAO is extremely unhelpful and patently discriminatory against U.S. aircrafts and engines.

The amendment I have offered today calls upon the U.S. Department of State to seek international relief from this discriminatory regulation by petitioning the ICAO under existing relevant international conventions. It also calls upon other relevant U.S. agencies with jurisdiction over trade and transportation matters to work to resolve this matter.

Mr. President, there are clearly binding amendments that could be offered to deal with this problem. I do not support such an effort at this time. This is a matter for the Departments of State and Transportation together with the Office of the United States Trade Representative to work out with their European counterparts. I strongly urge them to do so on an expeditious basis.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a sense of the Senate regarding the European Council noise rule affecting hushkitted and reengined aircraft. Under the guise of an environmental regulation, the European Union is engaged in a blatant effort to lock out the U.S. industry. Once again the EU is dragging its feet rather than finding a balanced resolution to this issue. It is time that we turned up the heat on the EU and roll back this patently protectionist measure.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1342) was agreed to.

FCC FUNDS

Mr. GREGG. I would like to clarify the intent of the Committee regarding the funds appropriated in this bill for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The Committee's intent is that none of the funds provided for the agency in this bill are to be used by the FCC to reimburse the General Services Administration for the cost of the agency's relocation to the Portals site. I would ask the Ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee if that is his understanding as well.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Subcommittee Chairman has accurately stated the intent of the Committee with regard to this issue.

SCHOOL SAFETY INITIATIVE

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary (CJS), about an innovative program recently started by the State of Virginia, which I believe falls within the allowable use of funds within the Safe Schools Initiative, a line item that appears in the FY 2000 CJS Appropriations Bill.

Senator HOLLINGS, it has recently come to my attention that the State of Virginia has begun implementing a new program to reduce crime in its schools called ''4 Safe VA.'' This program is a public/private partnership, which includes online reporting of school crime, a toll-free statewide hotline, and an extensive training program.

Before school begins again in the fall, Virginia will train nearly 3,000 teachers, law enforcement, school resource officers, and other school personnel in school safety procedures. There will be four separate training programs, which are as follows: (1) a training program for school resource officers to prepare them to act as ''first responders'' in crisis situations, such as that which occurred in Littleton, Colorado; (2) a training program for school staff and local law enforcement in communities where there are no school resource officers to prepare them for responding to crisis situations; (3) a training program for 60 Virginia State Troopers to prepare them to support localities should a crisis situation occur; and (4) a training program for custodians, cafeteria workers, and other support staff, who know the students and who are often the ''eyes and ears'' of the school, to prepare them to assist in emergencies.

I have looked at Virginia's program plan and have found it to be innovative and thoughtful. I consider it to be the type of program for which we set aside $38 million for community planning and prevention activities under the Safe Schools Initiative line item. It is my hope that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, which will be administering these grants, will give careful thought to providing the State of Virginia with funds to continue to enhance the 4 Safe VA project.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I agree with you, Senator GREGG, that the 4 Safe VA project is a creative and solid approach to preventing and reacting to possible school crises in the State of Virginia. I agree that this is the type of program that should be funded under the Safe Schools Initiative. I also hope that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention give full consideration to funding this program.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I very much thank the Senator from South Carolina for supporting me and engaging in this colloquy. I look forward to working with him in the future on ensuring that our nation's schools are safe.

CENSUS 2000

Mr. STEVENS. I understand my colleague from New Hampshire, the Manager of this bill, Senator GREGG is interested in making comments on the conduct of the 2000 Census as it regards Alaska Natives.

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I would like to join you in remarking on the 2000 Census and Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I would like to start by referencing a letter received from the Alaska Governor, Tony Knowles, which relates certain Government Accounting Office findings on the 1990 census. Governor Knowles reports that the Alaska Native population was undercounted by 11,000, resulting in an annual loss of federal funding of $162 million over ten years.

Mr. GREGG. It is important to bring this statistic to the Senate's attention

to underscore the significance of reform proposals the Senator from Alaska will raise here today.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I've often noted on this floor that the awesome size of Alaska makes for unique problems in rendering federal services. The 2000 Census count is no exception. The sheer physical separation of neighboring communities makes communication and coordination of planning difficult. The population is dispersed and also remote from the hub cities where resources are often concentrated. Competing forces and policies demand both centralization and decentralization of services.

Mr. GREGG. My staff and myself have traveled to Alaska at your invitation and agree that the distances between communities are a challenge in implementing federal programs and directives.

Mr. STEVENS. The situation is complicated by the diverse ad varied social and political institutions set up in localities and at the regional level. Alaska Natives by traditional or necessity have chosen to organize in various ways to address different circumstances. Often federal agencies chose among these groups and are satisfied that they have covered their bases with Alaska Natives. I urge the Census to take a hard look at the expertise and advice of all Native entities, including Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act corporations which by virtue of their day-to-day business responsibilities and duties to shareholders also have a vigorous pool of human resources to assist in public education and input.

Mr. GREGG. I agree that expediency should not compromise the thorough study and development of local and regional solutions to Census 2000 issues.

Mr. STEVENS. A necessary first step to addressing these issues, is for senior-staff oversight of the Alaska Native Census in Washington, DC. I also urge the staffing and funding of an Alaska office of the Census.

Mr. GREGG. I would support this measure.

Mr. STEVENS. The State of Alaska can do its part. For example, the State could set up an Alaska advisory committee on the Census. This committee could include representatives of rural area, urban areas, Alaska Natives, the military, and municipal and state government.

But I hope Census officials understand that certain agency decisions already being pursued need to be reviewed right now before an advisory committee can be organized. For example, sub-regional hubs like Dillingham are subject only to an update, not a full enumeration under the 2000 Census. Also, reportedly, there are no focus groups for the many and varied Alaska Native voices to be heard; and it is my understanding that groups classified by the federal government as minorities have been provided this opportunity in other states. I urge the Census to develop a public education campaign that will communicate to rural and urban residents the importance of being counted.

Mr. GREGG. I agree these are important issues.

Mr. STEVENS. A specific issue that should be addressed in some manner is the highly mobile urban-rural population of Alaska Natives. We see many families coming to Anchorage on a periodic or seasonal basis, sharing common quarters in the city but considering themselves rural residents. Likewise, commercial fishermen will split the year between two or more residences within the state, and do some subsistence fishing at a traditional fish camp for some part of the year near the village of their birth. The proper enumeration of Alaska Natives would benefit from an effort to reconcile these migration patterns with the fixed residency standards used in a number of federal programs and formulas.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Alaska and will work with him to address his concerns.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my colleague and ask unanimous consent that the letter I referenced earlier be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, AK, April 14, 1999.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I am concerned about an issue critical to our state—the upcoming year 2000 census. When you consider this issue in Congress, I urge you to defend the plan submitted by the experts at the Census Bureau to obtain the fairest and most accurate population counts for use over the next decade.

As you know, any possible undercount of our population means the loss of vital federal funding for Alaska. In a recent U.S. General Accounting Office report, Alaska in 1990 was undercounted by more than 11,000 people with a 10-year fiscal impact of $160 million.

We have common goals of obtaining our state's fair share of federal resources to help fund our investments in Alaska. We should not let partisan differences over census methodology impact the accuracy of census data and its use in revenue sharing and funding formulas.

The 1990 Census was the first to be less accurate than its predecessor. I am hopeful Congress will fund the Bureau of Census at a level appropriate to meet U.S. Supreme Court decisions and other mandates necessary to ensure timely completion of the next census. I urge you to do all possible to ensure Alaska receives its fair share of federal funds and to support the efforts to make the 2000 Census as accurate as possible.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

NATIONAL CORAL REEF INSTITUTE/NOAA NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to engage the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee in a colloquy. First let me begin by thanking my friends for ensuring the committee report included $2 million under the National Ocean Service account to support scientific research and coral reef studies. It is my understanding this money is to be divided equally between the National Coral Reef Institute in Ft. Lauderdale, FL, and the University of Hawaii. This research is critical to our understanding of the factors at work in the degradation of reef ecosystems around the world and I appreciate all my colleagues did in Committee to support this effort.

I say to my colleagues, it is my understanding the Chairman's amendment contains additional funding for this account. Is it correct to say these funds are in addition to the $2 million currently provided by the Committee to the National Coral Reef Institute and the University of Hawaii?

Mr. GREGG. The Senator from Florida is correct. The funds included in the Chairman's amendment are in addition to the $2 million provided to the two institutions you mentioned. Senator HOLLINGS, is this also your understanding?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, the Chairman is correct.

Mr. MACK. I thank my colleagues for this clarification and for their support of coral reef research.

NOAA ACTIVITIES IN FLORIDA

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he would consent to discuss with me for a moment two issues of concern to me with respect to NOAA activities in Florida.

Mr. GREGG. I am pleased to join my colleague from Florida in a colloquy.

Mr. MACK. First, let me say I appreciate my friend from New Hampshire's hard work for the strong support he's given to the State of Florida in the bill before us today. But I would like to bring to the Chairman's attention an initiative undertaken by Florida's top three research universities: the University of Florida, Florida State University and the University of Miami. These three institutions came together to ensure their extensive capabilities in the areas of marine, atmosphere and climate prediction research were focused on the needs of the entire Southeast region. They have especially come together to study the El Nino phenomenon. Their effort has been recognized by NOAA and they have become one of the agency's first regional assessment centers.

My concern, Mr. President, is about the possibility that NOAA may reduce resources available to Florida and this valuable research initiative. Clearly, Florida and the Southeast region are significantly impacted by climatic developments. A strong and continued investment in Florida and the region—along with a balanced investment in the regional assessment centers—is essential. I would ask the support of the Committee to continue the base level funding of this important collaborative

effort. The institutions had been receiving approximately $500,000 per year through the Office of Global Programs, and I would like the Chairman's assurances that this level of funding should and will be continued during the next fiscal year.

Mr. GREGG. I know how important this initiative has been to the Senator from Florida. I can assure the Senator that it is the Committee's intent that the base-level funding you indicated be preserved in the next fiscal year. Did the Senator from Florida have an additional concern?

Mr. MACK. Yes. I know the chairman is aware of the Florida Congressional delegation's strong commitment to the restoration of the Everglades and Florida Bay. I have heard some concern, however, that internal reallocations within NOAA could result in at least a $1 million reduction in South Florida based Florida Bay activities. The administration asked for significant funding of the Everglades-Florida Bay initiative in both FY 99 and FY 2000 through the Coastal Ocean Science Program. But the concern I'm hearing from Florida indicates that NOAA may reallocate funds away from this initiative and toward other programs and purposes. I would like the Chairman to join me in stressing to the agency that funds in this bill currently allocated for critical Florida Bay initiatives not be depleted. I would like the Chairman to join me in working to ensure the NOAA contribution to the interagency program for Florida and adjacent coastal marine waters is continued at the current levels.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the Senator from Florida's comments. The Committee supports and shares your commitment to Everglades and Florida Bay restoration; specifically with respect to the funds allocated to the initiative funded by the Coastal Ocean Science Program.

Mr. MACK. I appreciate my friend's comments with respect to these two issues. I thank him again for his continued support of Florida priorities.

THE LAS VEGAS SPECIAL POLICE ENFORCEMENT AND ERADICATION PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President. I take this opportunity to thank Chairman GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS for their consideration of my request to provide $1 million in funds to the Las Vegas Special Police Enforcement and Eradication Program. Methamphetamine manufacturing, use and trafficking is a serious problem that deserves the highest priority, and I appreciate the leadership of the Chairman and the Ranking Member in this effort.

At this time, I would like to make a technical clarification of my request. I ask the Chairman and the Ranking Member, if, in making this appropriation, it is their understanding that of the $1 million provided, $500,000 is to be directed to the Las Vegas Police Department to be used for their Methamphetamine Eradication Initiative, while $500,000 is to be directed to the North Las Vegas Police Department for their Methamphetamine Eradication Initiative?

Mr. GREGG. The senior Senator from Nevada is correct. Of the $1 million provided, $500,000 is to be directed to the Las Vegas Police Department to be used for their Methamphetamine Eradication Initiative, and $500,000 is to be directed to the North Las Vegas Police Department for their Methamphetamine Eradication Initiative.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I concur with the Chairman.

Mr. REID. I thank the chairman and ranking member.

WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM AT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the Chairman of the Subcommittee, in a colloquy.

I want to begin by commending you, Senator GREGG, and your Ranking Member, Senator HOLLINGS, for the hard work you have done in crafting this Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary appropriations bill. You have done a great job in funding the priorities identified by the Committee in this bill. You have been particularly helpful to me in my efforts to curb the trafficking of Mexican black tar heroin in my home state of New Mexico.

A separate issue of particular importance in my home state is the Women's Business Center program at the Small Business Administration. In this bill, you have funded the Administration's request of $9 million for this program, and I applaud you for meeting the President's request.

Unfortunately, the President's request fails to address an important issue for the future of the Women's Business Center program. Particularly, the President's request does not take into account the need to allow existing WBCs to re-compete for federal funds once their initial five-year funding stream expires. So, many existing centers with outstanding track records of facilitating the growth of women-owned businesses and providing technical assistance to fledgling companies will go unfunded, while the SBA allows new, untested centers to open in other areas. Sacrificing the successful, existing centers to replace them with new, untested ones seems like bad policy. I think we need to open more new Women's Business Centers, but we also need to help the existing ones continue their work.

Senator BOND, the distinguished Chairman of the Small Business Committee, Senator KERRY and I, along with a group of 25 bi-partisan co-sponsors, have introduced S. 791, the Women's Business Center Sustainability Act. This bill would increase the authorization for the Women's Business Center program to $12 million and allow existing centers to re-compete for up to 40 percent of the federal funds available under the program. Is the Chairman of the Subcommittee aware of this bill?

Mr. GREGG. I am aware of this effort and am told that the Small Business Committee will work to report the bill to the full Senate, with the hope that the bill will pass later this year.

Mr. DOMENICI. As the Chairman may know, an additional $2 million in funding this year would be critical to the effort to allow existing centers to re-compete for federal assistance. Without this additional funding, many existing centers will be forced to close their doors. Assuming that S. 791 passes both houses of Congress and is signed by the President later this year, I hope that the Chairman will be willing to find a way to provide this additional $2 million for the program once this bill gets to conference.

Mr. GREGG. I share your concerns about allowing existing Women's Business Centers to re-compete for federal funds. If the Small Business Committee and the Senate approve S. 791 before the conference on this bill, I will make every effort to provide the additional funding you have requested.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the distinguished Chairman, and I yield the floor.

SHORELINE MAPPING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, on shoreline mapping.

Mr. GREGG. I am more than happy to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, the issue, which I wish to discuss, is the mapping of our country's shoreline. As the chairman knows, the National Ocean Service runs a Coastal Mapping Project which is responsible for mapping the nearly 95,000 miles of the US shoreline in an accurate, consistent, tide-coordinated, and up-to-date manner.

I'm concerned that nearly 30 percent of the US shoreline has not been mapped. In addition, one-quarter of what has been mapped as mapped prior to 1970 with severely outdated technology. Since this data is used as the official shoreline on NOAA's nautical charts and is used by the government and the private sectors, it is important to keep up with the changes that result from coastal development and natural processes, which can be drastic.

This year, there was an increase over both FY99 funding levels and the administration's FY00 request within the Committee's recommendation for the ''Mapping and Charting'' account. Would you agree, Mr. Chairman, that it is the recommendation of the Committee that $2 million of those funds can be used for shoreline mapping within the Coastal Mapping Project.

Mr. GREGG. I do agree with my esteemed colleague from Maryland that $2 million of the funds within the ''Mapping and Charting'' account can be used for shoreline mapping.

ANTI-METHAMPHETAMINE FUNDING

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the senior Senator from

Wisconsin, Senator KOHL, regarding the $1 million appropriation for the Western Wisconsin Methamphetamine Law Enforcement Initiative in S. 1217.

As the Senator from Wisconsin knows, the domestic manufacture and importation of Methamphetamine, also know as Meth, has become a continuing public health threat to the United States and most recently to the Midwest. Senate KOHL, what is the extent of the Meth problem within the State of Wisconsin? Also, would you please describe how the proposed $1 million will be used to address the problem?

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his questions, his acknowledgment of the severity of the Meth problem faced by rural communities and cities in the Midwest and throughout our country, and his active support for increased funding to combat Meth. In my own State of Wisconsin, criminal justice officials recognized early on that we had to develop a strategy and consolidate our enforcement and prevention efforts to limit the spread of the Meth epidemic that has been invading our Western Wisconsin borders from Minnesota and Iowa since the mid 1990's. Today, the number of Meth-related incidents is increasing. The Wisconsin State Laboratory reported increases of Meth analysis from 42 examinations in 1996 to 112 examinations in 1998. In 1998 alone, the Wisconsin Department of Narcotics Enforcement opened 90 investigations regarding Meth and prosecuted 40 individuals. In Wisconsin, Meth users generally range from 18 to 25, and recently there was even a disturbing report of Meth trafficking in a rural high school.

With the escalation of Meth trafficking, in February 1997 Wisconsin law enforcement officials organized a coordinated enforcement and prevention initiative among local, state, and federal law enforcement partners to target Meth traffickers. This major effort also addressed the need for training to prevent the potential health threat from toxic and flammable chemicals in clandestine Meth labs. Funding for this continuing intiative has been raised from a variety of sources, including the Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance and the State Attorney General.

Recently, representatives from Wisconsin agricultural associations have reached out to their members and communities to educate the public about the dangers of Anhydrous ammonia, a precursor used in the crude production of Meth. These associations are now working with law enforcement as well.

And this May, the State Attorney General and the U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin sponsored three Meth symposiums to educate and train members of the criminal justice system.

The $1 million appropriated for the Western Wisconsin Methamphetamine Initiative will help build on these efforts and promote more coordination of anti-Meth activities. It will be used jointly by the Office of Attorney General (through the Division of Narcotics Enforcement) and the Office of Justice Assistance (under the direction of the Governor) to support a plan developed in coordination with each other to continue combatting Meth production, distribution and use and for policing initiatives in ''hot spots'' of Meth trafficking activity. Part of this funding will also be used for community and school-based Meth education and prevention awareness programs.

Again, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina—and our Chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG—for their commitment to addressing the Meth problem.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for this fame and effort in this very significant issue.

FUNDING FOR DEA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to enter into a colloquy with Senator GREGG on funding for the Drug Enforcement Agency and on national issues concerning local law enforcement training skills to combat methamphetamine abuse in rural communities, small cities, mid-size communities and on activities to alleviate the growing financial burden resulting from the cleanup of clandestine laboratories and other drug-related hazardous waste.

I say to Senators STEVENS and GREGG that Senators KYLE, DEWINE, KOHL, HAGEL, and I have offered a bill, the Rural Methamphetamine Use Response Act of 1999, that would provide additional funding to combat methamphetamine production and abuse, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREGG. I am aware of the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. As the Senator knows, we have been working on this bill and on others to ensure adequate funding for our nation's counter narcotics efforts. I appreciate the committee's funding efforts to specifically address the national methamphetamine issue and to combat methamphetamine production, distribution, and use. I am also aware that we face tough budget decisions and we need to balance many program needs within a balanced budget.

Mr. GREGG. We have had to make a lot of tough decisions in this bill while trying to ensure that we meet the needs of many critical programs. The subcommittee has worked earnestly to be fair, and we have had to make tough choices.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I appreciate their efforts. I know that the subcommittee has allotted the Drug Enforcement Agency the tools it needs to properly wage the war on illegal drugs. I also know that the subcommittee has added personnel and resources to the western and central regions of the United States to focus primarily on the methamphetamine problems in those geographic regions of the country. However, as you may know, methamphetamine abuse and production across the United States has forced law enforcement agencies to address challenges that exceed the many years of experience of the State and local law enforcement personnel within such agencies. Methamphetamine affects smaller communities and rural areas disproportionately. In many cases, these communities lack the investigative and technical skills, and resources to confront major criminal gangs or the environmental hazards caused by meth product.

Mr. GREGG. I am aware of the training challenges state and local law enforcement personnel have had regarding methamphetamine production and handling of these explosive chemicals involved in the methamphetamine production process and Senator HOLLINGS and I have worked to address those needs.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Since the Senator from New Hampshire is aware of the training challenges of state and local law enforcement agencies, the financial burden of meth cleanup, and the volatile properties of meth, from the funding provided to DEA for methamphetamine initiatives, I hope, where possible, that funding be set aside within the final bill directing DEA to establish a select cadre of Special Agents with Spanish language capabilities to work with local law enforcement agencies across the United States on matters relating to combating methamphetamine-related drug trafficking. I also ask within the funding allotment for methamphetamine training initiatives, funding for DEA staffing at appropriate training facilities for purposes of providing coherent, essential, and sustained clandestine laboratory training to State and local law enforcement personnel, and if possible, funding for DEA to provide these personnel with the skills necessary for clandestine laboratory recertification.

Mr. GREGG. I share in the Senators' concerns for the need for sustained and adequate funding nationally to combat methamphetamine abuse. I will work to ensure, where possible within the funding allotments for methamphetamine initiatives, that the final bill will support the concerns you have raised.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS for their willingness to work with me and my colleagues on funding this needed request.

Mr. BOND. I thank my colleague from New Hampshire for recognizing the needs of Missouri law enforcement in this bill. As he knows well, the State of Missouri is experiencing a law enforcement crisis of epidemic proportions as the methamphetamine trade has exploded in recent years. My colleague, Senator GREGG, as seen to it that the DEA has increased resources to assist state and local law enforcement as they take on these drug dealers.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I too thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his attention to this problem. I would like to

bring a matter to the attention of the Chairman. Under the Violent Crime Control Trust Fund section of this bill, the Chairman has included $6 million for the Midwest Methamphetamine Initiative. The language states that the funding is to be used by the Drug Enforcement Administration to train state and local officers on the proper recognition, collection, removal and destruction of methamphetamine and materials seized in clandestine labs. Is my colleague familiar with the title?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I am.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I have heard repeatedly from local law enforcement officers, as has Senator BOND, that DEA provides excellent training and prepares well officers to raid, bust and clean up these labs. I know that the Chairman is also aware of the funding required for the DEA to assist state and local law enforcement with the clean up of these labs after they have been busted.

Mr. GREGG. I am aware that resources are necessary so that these sites can be cleaned up adequately.

Mr. ASHCROFT. It is my understanding from local law enforcement officers that DEA funds are needed not only in the training of state and local law enforcement officers, but also in the removal and destruction of the materials seized in the labs. Is it the Chairman's understanding that the resources made available to the Midwest Methamphetamine Initiative will also be available for the DEA to assist state and local law enforcement in the clean up methamphetamine labs?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I am aware that the needs to combat the growing meth problem are pressing and that funds made available to the DEA may be used not only to train state and local officers on the proper recognition and collection of meth labs, but also in the removal destruction of the materials seized in the labs.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chairman for his assistance.

Mr. BOND. I too thank the Chairman for his assistance in this matter. DEA's participation in fighting the methampetamine epidemic is essential to state and local law enforcement. As my colleague stated, the DEA provides training for local officers that well prepares them to handle and dispose of the toxic material that they encounter while busting clandestine methamphetamine labs. The DEA also has an important role in the clean up process. There were over 800 clandestine methamphetetamine labs seized in the State of Missouri last year. Most of the labs were busted in rural areas and smaller towns. These towns have police forces and sheriffs offices of a very limited sizes. DEA's presence and help in rural areas is essential to ensure that these communities are not overwhelmed by the drug and the havoc in this wake. If this menace is to be brought under control, local law enforcement must have the assistance of the DEA. The Senator from New Hampshire has been a good friend to Missouri law enforcement as he has worked closely with us in recent years to ensure that the DEA has the resources to focus on this problem and I appreciate him clarifying the use of those designated funds.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, I have spent years addressing the drug problem that confronts our nation. I personally have visited drug source and transit countries throughout the region with the objective of searching for ways to resolve and overcome this escalating problem. As a result of many hearings and meetings on this important matter, last year Senator DEWINE and I introduced the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, a $2.7 billion—3 year authorization for enhanced drug eradication and interdiction efforts. We were successful in getting this legislation passed into law and providing a $800 million down payment for this bill. We must continue to fund this important law.

Recognizing that US government resources are limited, it is important to fund agencies that can get a huge return on a small investment. the Drug Enforcement Administration indeed is an agency that demonstrates this objective on a daily basis. With limited funding, the DEA is a vital source not only for our law enforcement activities, but for other nations as well. Relying primarily on manpower, the DEA has demonstrated how effective an agency with limited funding can produce significant results. Last year, the DEA seized more drugs and arrested more traffickers than ever before. They play an integral part in training foreign law enforcement officials overseas to help them help us keep drugs out of our country. they do a great service to our nation.

This past March, Senators DEWINE and I sent a letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Commerce, State, Justice Subcommittee, calling for building on this year's investment in the DEA and requesting additional funding for 300 new DEA agent, analysts and support personnel, and for other DEA initiatives. This request is consistent with DEA initiatives outlined in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. Specifically, 16 senators—both Republicans and Democrats—co-signed the letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member.

I thank the Subcommittee for addressing our needs in our request. The Subcommittee earmarked $17.5 million for new hires for DEA agents, analysts, and support staff. I recognize this was a difficult task given the tight budget caps confronting this Subcommittee and the other Appropriations subcommittees. While I appreciate the tremendous efforts made by the Subcommittee and their staff to earmark money for new DEA hires within their account, I am concerned that there isn't any additional funding for the DEA. The DEA will have to sacrifice other important and necessary programs for these new hires.

I realize that the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee are trying to complete the bill this evening. I had intended to offer an amendment to request $24 million in additional DEA funding for new agents, analysts and support staff hires. After talking to the Subcommittee leadership, however, I have instead agreed not to offer my amendment and would commit to working with the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee to help find a way to provide additional funding to the DEA during conference of this bill.

Mr. President, I see Senator DEWINE on the floor and understand that he too would like to say a few words on this matter. I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Georgia for yielding the floor. I commend him for all his tireless efforts in finding ways to combat the drug war. Mr. President, I previously gave a floor statement on the importance of the role of the Drug Enforcement Administration in keeping drugs off our streets. I have traveled with the DEA to various countries throughout the hemisphere and have seen them first hand in action. the DEA does a tremendous service to our country both inside and outside our border and should be commended. I agree with Senator COVERDELL on the need for additional funding for the DEA. I too believe that the DEA is underfunded and should receive increased funding, particularly if there are additional resources available at a later date.

Mr. President, I see the Chairman of the Commerce, State, Justice Subcommittee on the floor. I speak for Senator COVERDELL when I say that it is my hope that we can work together with the Subcommittee leadership to help provide additional funding for the DEA during conference, or in the future even that there may be additional available funding.

Mr. GREGG. I thank Senator COVERDELL and Senator DEWINE for their statements. I have listened very carefully to their remarks, and I commend them for his tireless efforts in supporting anti-drug efforts, here in the United States and throughout the world. I would like to assure both Senator COVERDELL and Senator DEWINE that I will give every possible consideration to their request when we go to conference and in the event that additional funding may become available for FY 2000 in the future.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my distinguished friend from New Hampshire and I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. I too thank my distinguished friend from New Hampshire, and I yield the floor.

DEFINITION OF PUBLIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am prepared to offer an amendment with

my distinguished colleague Senator DEWINE to the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill that will help law enforcement officers in their efforts to protect our citizens. We believe that after the Congress passed Public Law 103–411, it had unintended consequences that have imposed unnecessary costs on state and local governments. Under this law, aircraft belonging to law enforcement agencies are considered ''commercial'' if costs incurred from flying missions to support neighboring jurisdictions are reimbursed. Multiple governmental agencies have recognized this problem, with the support of the Federal Aviation Administration, they have jointly drafted corrective language for this problem. Before proceeding, however, I would like to inquire as to the plans for consideration of this issue by the Commerce Committee this year. I wonder if my distinguished colleagues from the state of Arizona and South Carolina—the Chairman and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, which has oversight on these matters—could engage Senator DEWINE and me in a discussion regarding this matter.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would be pleased to engage in a discussion with the distinguished Senators from Florida and Ohio on the substance of this matter.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his time. In the state of Ohio the Bureau of Criminal Justice Services uses aircraft for drug eradication efforts. Under current law Ohio is forced to use private planes for this mission at a considerable cost, rather than their own surplus aircraft. Mr. Chairman is it your assessment that current law defining public aircraft places unnecessary restrictions and costly burdens on law enforcement agencies who operate public aircraft?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would agree that as the current law is written a number of our law enforcement agencies that operate public aircraft are faced with burdens in being reimbursed for the costs associated from flying missions in support of neighboring jurisdictions. The Senate Commerce Committee intends to act to review the matter and work to develop legislation that will help law enforcement.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senators from Arizona and South Carolina agree to review this matter on the FAA reauthorization bill and by the end of year?

Mr. MCCAIN. As I have indicated to my colleague, I will as the Chairman of the Commerce Committee review this matter by the end of the year and work with my colleague from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, in a good faith effort to resolve this issue by the end of the year.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I agree with my distinguished colleague from Arizona and look forward to working with him on this issue this year.

Mr. DEWINE. I want to thank Senators MCCAIN and HOLLINGS for their support on this issue. I look forward to working with them on this issue.

Mr. GRAHAM. I also want to thank Senators MCCAIN and HOLLINGS for their support on this issue. I should also thank the law enforcement organizations that have strongly supported this amendment. Specifically, the National Sheriff's Association, Airborne Law Enforcement Association, International Association of Chiefs Of Police, Florida Sheriff's Association, and the California State Sheriff's Associations. Mr. President, in light of what the distinguished Chairman and ranking member have said, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join my distinguished colleagues, Senators GRAHAM and DEWINE, to support an amendment to the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill that will assist our local law enforcement agencies to respond in a timely fashion to life or death situations.

Sheriffs and police chiefs in my state and around this country have found that their hands are tied when it comes to sharing helicopters or other public aircraft with neighboring jurisdictions. The Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department recently became the first local law enforcement agency in Wisconsin to acquire a helicopter. Neighboring jurisdictions would like to borrow that helicopter and reimburse the Milwaukee County Sheriff for the cost of their use of that helicopter. The Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department is perfectly willing, indeed eager, to share its helicopter but it can't easily do so. Under current law, in order for the assisting agency to receive a cost reimbursement from the neighboring jurisdiction, the neighboring sheriff or police chief must first exhaust the possibility that a private commercial helicopter is available. Even when the neighboring law enforcement agency is faced with a serious imminent threat to life or property, the law requires the neighboring sheriff or police chief to first determine whether a privately operated helicopter is available. Mr. President, this law is absurd and puts everyone's safety at risk.

Law enforcement agencies use helicopters for a variety of reasons—to chase a suspect fleeing the scene of a crime, in search and rescue missions, to observe crowds in public gatherings, to transport prisoners, and to detect marijuana fields. Current law, however, stands in the way of cooperation between agencies to carry out these important law enforcement functions. Cooperation between law enforcement agencies is good. It saves time, money, resources and maybe even lives. We should do all we can to promote law enforcement cooperation.

Saving lives and maintaining law and order is delayed if we require sheriffs and police chiefs to determine first whether they can find a private helicopter. Public safety is also jeopardized because private commercial pilots are likely not trained law enforcement personnel with experience in sensitive and sometimes dangerous situations. In addition, a commercial helicopter is most likely not equipped with the instrumentation and tools needed by law enforcement officers to do their job. But if we allow sheriffs and police chiefs to share their aircraft with neighboring jurisdictions without first exhausting private avenues, law enforcement response is far more likely to be swift and sure.

Current law effectively prevents law enforcement from borrowing a helicopter or other aircraft from a neighboring agency. The law must be changed and this amendment does the job. This amendment modifies the definition of ''public aircraft'' so that law enforcement agencies no longer need to make an attempt to find a private helicopter operator before using a neighboring jurisdiction's helicopter. This amendment is supported by the National Sheriffs' Association, as well as numerous police chiefs and sheriffs across the country.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Senators MCCAIN and HOLLINGS, for working with us on this issue. They raised some concerns, but, as described in the colloquy, they have given us assurances that they will work to resolve the urgent needs of law enforcement either on the Federal Aviation Administration appropriations bill or by the end of the year. I welcome their recognition of the magnitude of this problem to law enforcement and their willingness to work with us on this issue.

Mr. President, we demand that law enforcement act quickly and professionally to life or death situations, but we're not always giving them the tools they need to do their job. We must do our part. I urge my colleagues to join in this bipartisan effort to change the law and give the sheriffs and police chiefs in Wisconsin and across this country the tools they need to keep our communities safe and secure.

I yield the floor.

BARRY UNIVERSITY INTERCULTURAL CENTER

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to engage the Chairman of the subcommittee in a brief colloquy regarding Barry University in Miami Shores, Florida. Barry University has a strong history of addressing important Miami community issues like urbanization, ethnic diversity, community development and cultural understanding. Recently the University announced the planning of an Intercultural Community Center which is designed to promote necessary neighborhood and small business revitalization. The facility will provide conference space, meeting rooms, executive seminars and continuing education courses related to international business and commerce.

It is my understanding Barry University will be requesting an Economic Development Administration grant for this project from the Department of Commerce during the next fiscal year. I would appreciate the Chairman's support in recommending the Department of Commerce give strong consideration

to the merits of University's grant application.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Florida for bringing this issue to my attention. The Committee is aware of Barry University's efforts and I would strongly urge the Economic Development Administration to consider its application within applicable procedures and guidelines and provide a grant if warranted.

Mr. MACK. I appreciate my friend from New Hampshire's comments on this important initiative and for all he and the Senator from South Carolina have done in this bill for the citizens of Florida.

EPSCOT PROGRAM

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished Subcommittee Chairman, Senator GREGG, to engage in a colloquy on a matter of extreme importance to my State and a number of others, and that is the need for more funding for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Technology, a program of the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana and engage in a colloquy.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, as you know, technology is fueling the tremendous economic growth the nation is currently experiencing. However, as is frequently the case, rural states are struggling to participate in this new economy. The EPSCoT program is a competitive matching grants program that reaches beyond the traditional recipients of federal research and development funding. This pioneering initiative brings together the interest of economic development, science and technology, university research, and private business. Although the program is only a couple of years old, it has met with very high enthusiasm in areas such as Louisiana and New Hampshire.

Mr. President, there is important work being done through the EPSCoT program. This is a flexible program designed to assist states. Applications may be submitted by state, local, or Indian tribal governments, community colleges, universities, non-profit organizations, private organizations, technology business centers, industry councils or any combination of these entities from the eligible states. The eligible states are those that have received less in federal research and development funding than the majority of the states. Therefore, the program is carefully designed to benefit those states that need more assistance in developing a high-tech economy.

Mr. President, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, also a part of the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration, runs the Advanced Technology Program. The ATP provides matching funds for high-risk research with broad economic benefits. As a part of the program, grants occasionally are reclaimed by the ATP due to business failures and other such circumstances. These reclaimed monies are used by the ATP to fund new awards. The Committee has provided in the bill that the ATP may use these ''carry over'' funds for new awards in Fiscal Year 2000.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire concur that it is the intent of the committee to direct $2.0 million in funds provided to NIST for new ATP awards under the provisions dealing with the use of carry-over funds be used for new grants under the Technology Administration's EPSCoT program?

Mr. GREGG. It is the intent of the Committee to direct $2.0 million in carry-over funds for the ATP be used for new grants under the Technology Administration's EPSCoT program. I look forward to working with the Senator from Louisiana to ensure that the $2.0 million in ATP carry-over funds are provided to the EPSCoT program for new grants in Fiscal Year 2000.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, does the Senator from South Carolina concur?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, it is the Committee's intent that $2.0 million in ATP carry-over funds be provided to the EPSCoT program for FY 2000 grants.

DISTRIBUTION OF TECHNOLOGY FUNDS TO BURLINGTON, RUTLAND, AND SAINT JOHNSBURY

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would first like to thank Senator GREGG for all his work on crafting the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Fiscal Year 2000 appropriations bill. In this time of tight budgetary caps, and with the many requests by members, Senator GREGG has worked hard to get the bill through the Appropriations Committee and to the floor of the Senate.

I would especially like to thank Senator GREGG for recognizing the need of three Vermont towns to upgrade, modernize and acquire technology for their police departments. Allowing these police departments to improve their technology will permit them to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the services they provide. Reflecting the needs of the police departments, the $1.5 million should be divided on the following basis: one-half ($750,000) to the Burlington Police Department, one-third ($500,000) to the Rutland Police Department, and one-sixth ($250,000) to the St. Johnsbury Police Department. Again, I appreciate Senator GREGG's help to address the technology problems these town's police departments are facing, and I look forward to working with him to get this important appropriations bill signed into law.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator JEFFORDS bringing the needs of these three police departments to my attention, and will work with him to ensure that the money for technology grants to these three Vermont towns are distributed in the way he has described.

INTERNATIONAL WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I would like to engage the Chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee in a colloquy.

I am deeply concerned that the Subcommittee bill does not include the full Administration request for funding of the International War Crimes Tribunals.

We are all horrified by the crimes against humanity that occurred in Kosovo. Recent reports state that as many as 10,000 people were murdered. An untold number of women were raped. Hundreds of thousands of people were driven from their homes. The War Crimes Tribunal needs adequate funding to gather evidence, to pursue and to try those who are responsible for these crimes against humanity.

Congress provided additional funding for the War Crimes Tribunals in the Supplemental Appropriations bill. These funds were necessary to provide emergency assistance to the War Crimes Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. Before we provided this funding, Chief Justice Louise Arbour said that she had only seven investigators available for Kosovo. However, full funding for the War Crimes Tribunal is necessary for fiscal year 2000, if we are to continue ongoing investigations in Bosnia or Rwanda.

The Chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Committee is a strong supporter of law enforcement—both in the United States and abroad. I ask him to join me in supporting the full request for funding of the International War Crimes Tribunals during the Conference on the Commerce, Justice and State Department Appropriations bill.

Mr. GREGG. I share the Senator's strong support for the work of the International War Crimes Tribunals. The Subcommittee, with the Senators help, provided more than $40 million for the War Crimes Tribunals in the fiscal year 1999 bill. The full committee, again with the Senator's assistance, made an additional $28 million available to the tribunals as part of the fiscal year 1999 emergency supplemental that passed in May. Just two weeks ago, the Subcommittee approved yet another $2 million for FBI forensic teams investigating massacre sites in Kosovo under the tribunal's direction. I look forward to working with the Senator during the Conference on this bill to ensure that full funding is provided.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I again thank Senator GREGG and his staff for working with me to provide funding for two important initiatives in my home State of Vermont. It is my understanding that within funds provided to Department of Justice of Juvenile Justice Programs, the FY 2000 Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill provides $100,000 for the establishment of a teen center in Colchester, Vermont and $100,000 to Prevent Child Abuse-VT to evaluate the SAFE–T program, a comprehensive child abuse prevention program for middle school communities.

There is a great need for a community center with a focus on youth in the Town of Colchester. Currently after school gathering places for Colchester youth are limited to local restaurants and supermarkets. This project has strong local support. Last October, a group of local citizens formed a non-profit organization called the ''Colchester Community Youth Project'' and purchased an available property in the town for use as a teen center. The Town of Colchester hopes to buy the building from the non-profit, and then plans to renovate the 4,500 square foot main building to house a youth center/multi use space, offices, and a branch of the local public library.

For over four years, Prevent Child Abuse-VT has funded, developed and piloted SAFE–T, a comprehensive health education and abuse prevention program for middle school communities. Students learn victim an victimizer prevention, build healthy relationship skills and experience personal and social change. Parents, guardians, school staff and service providers participate in training, dialog assignments, classroom presentations and school community change projects. SAFE–T research-based and classroom tested with over 500 students.

More work, however, needs to be done to evaluate the success of the SAFE–T program. Dr. David Finkelhor, Co-Director of the Family Violence Research Laboratory at the University of New Hampshire, plans to embark shortly on a three-year scientific evaluation of the SAFE–T program. I am very pleased that this appropriation will enable this evaluation to move forward.

The sexual abuse of and by children is now at epidemic proportions in America. The SAFE–T Program is an excellent resource in helping early adolescents develop the skills they need to grow safe, free of abuse. This program offers great promise as a national model for comprehensive abuse prevention programs. A thorough scientific evaluation will ensure that this research-based initiative can be proven effective and disseminated properly.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I applaud Senator JEFFORDS' work on these important issues. He is correct that the FY 2000 Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill provides $100,000 for the establishment of a teen center in Colchester, Vermont and $100,000 to Prevent Child Abuse-VT to evaluate the SAFE–T program, a comprehensive child abuse prevention program for middle school communities.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FUNDING

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to address a question to the Chairman of the Subcommittee, the Senator from New Hampshire, regarding funding for the Civil Division of the Justice Department.

In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton announced that the Federal Government intended to sue the Nation's tobacco companies to recover billions of dollars in smoking-related health care costs reimbursed by federal heatlh care programs. The Administration's FY 2000 budget requested $15 million in new resources for the Civil Division of the Justice Department and $5 million for the Fees and Expenses of Witnesses account to support this litigation effort.

Unfortunately, we were unable to provide the additional resources requested by the Administration for the Civil Division to carry out this task. While I regret that the Committee was unable to provide the new funds, it is my understanding that if the Justice Department deems this activity to be a high priority, base funding, including funds from the Fees and Expenses of Witnesses account, can be used for this purpose.

I ask the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee if my understanding of the bill and the report language is correct?

Mr. GREGG. I agree with the Senator from Iowa. While the Committee was unable to provide new funding as the Administration requested, nothing in the bill or the report language prohibits the Department from using generally appropriated funds, including funds from the Fees and Expenses of Witnesses Account, to pursue this litigation if the Department concludes such litigation has merit under existing law.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I also agree with Senator HARKIN.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to address the Chairman of the Subcommittee. Does the Chairman also agree to strike the language on page 15 and on page 25 of Senate Report 106–76 relating to funding for tobacco litigation?

Mr. GREGG. That is correct.

COMMUNITY-BASED HABITAT RESTORATION PROGRAM

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, with the indulgence of my distinguished colleagues from New Hampshire and South Carolina, I would like to bring to their attention one of the Federal government's most successful restoration programs for marine and estuarine habitats—the Community-Based Habitat Restoration Program started by the National Marine Fisheries Service in 1995. This program promotes restoration of fisheries habitats around the country through voluntary partnerships among state and local governments, the conservation community, industry and businesses, and the academic community. Since its inception, more than 60 projects have been funded. There is a minimum one-to-one match required, but non-Federal parties typically contribute three dollars, and often as much as ten dollars, for every one spent by NMFS. Indeed, over the life of the program, Federal funding totaled $1.2 million, with $6.1 million raised in non-Federal funds.

Mr. GREGG. I am aware of the program and agree with the Senator from Rhode Island. It is an excellent program that supports worthwhile projects with limited funding. Last year, $450,000 was appropriated for the program.

Mr. CHAFEE. Unfortunately, S. 1217, as approved by the Committee, did not provide any funding for the program for FY 2000.

Mr. GREGG. That is correct. The Administration's budget proposal included the program as part of a larger and new initiative that did not receive any funds.

Mr. CHAFEE. I would like to request that the distinguished manager of the bill provide some funding for the program for FY 2000, so that it can continue to build on its past success. Numerous groups, in particular the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the FishAmerica Foundation, rely on grants from the program for their restoration efforts, and they would be hardpressed to continue these efforts if the program were not funded. As it is, about 145 projects in 1999 alone are going unfunded due to lack of funds, of which seven are in my own state of Rhode Island.

Mr. GREGG. I am pleased to consider the request of the Senator for Rhode Island. I have discussed this with my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, and we have agreed to a provision in the manager's amendment that directs NMFS to take $1 million from available funds within its budget and apply it to the Community-Based Habitat Restoration Program.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I agree with my distinguished colleagues from Rhode Island and New Hampshire, and am pleased to support the program. The manager's amendment ensures that the program will not only be continued, but will receive some additional funding.

Mr. CHAFEE. I wholeheartedly thank my colleagues from New Hampshire and South Carolina. It is always a pleasure working with them, especially on a worthwhile endeavor such as this.

ARMS CONTROL TREATY VERIFICATION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my colleague, the Subcommittee Chairman, regarding a specific funding provision in this bill within arms control treaty verification. I have been concerned for some time that our arms control efforts have been focused on treaty negotiation at the expense of treaty verification. The Committee report expressed the same concern. As a result, technological advances in arms control verification made at the national laboratories are not being fully applied or exploited. Accordingly, this bill provides $10,000,000 for this purpose. I want to be absolutely precise about what the Committee has directed in this area so I will quote from the Committee's report accompanying this bill. The report states the following: ''the Committee recommendation provides a $10,000,000 increase over fiscal year 1999 for verification technology.''

Mr. President, I think the plain meaning of this language could not be any clearer and I think my colleague the Subcommittee Chairman would agree with me. That is why I was puzzled to hear from my staff that, in informal conversations, State Department personnel have expressed confusion over how to interpret this language. If my understanding is correct, some in the State Department have expressed their belief that the $10,000,000 increase is intended to be applied first to the President's priorities for increased funding—costing approximately $8,000,000—and that only the remaining $2,000,000, left over after the President's priorities are funded, would be applied to the treaty verification work.

Mr. President, I certainly hope that the information I have about the interpretation of agency officials is incorrect. I certainly hope that the State Department would not disregard the abundantly clear direction provided by the Committee. I ask my colleague if my interpretation of the Committee's direction comports with his own, as Chairman of the Subcommittee.

Mr. GREGG. My colleague from Idaho is correct. In setting the funding priorities for the Bureau of Arms Control, within the State Department, the Committee has clearly directed that the $10,000,000 provided be used for the purpose of verification technology. The Committee further specifies that verification technology will include systemization of promising non-intrusive nuclear topographic techniques including the Fission Assay tomography System and the Gamma Neutron Assay Technique, which together will provide the ability to detect and characterize special nuclear materials while at the same time ensuring that design information is not revealed. The President's budget request is just that—a request for the Committee's consideration—but Congress, within its prerogatives, sets agency funding levels, and sets priorities within those levels.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the distinguished Subcommittee Chairman. I am assured that his understanding of the Committee's intent for these funds is the same as mine.

FUNDING FOR THE SBA OFFICE OF ADVOCACY

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I commend my colleagues, Senator GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS, for their initiative to allocate $2.5 million in the Fiscal Year 2000 Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill to fund the research function of the Office of Advocacy at the Small Business Administration. This is an increase of $1.1 million over the amount in the President's FY 2000 budget request for SBA.

The Office of Advocacy, which is headed by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy, performs an essential role acting as the eyes, ears, and voice from within the Federal bureaucracy on behalf of the small business community. One key responsibility carried out by the Office of Advocacy is the research it conducts on issues critical to small businesses. It is our understanding that $500,000 of the additional funds for the Advocacy research function are targeted toward the review of interpretative regulations issued by the Internal Revenue Service of the Department of the Treasury and rules issued by the Mine Safety and Health Administration of the Department of Labor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I join my colleague and friend from Missouri, Senator BOND, in supporting the additional funding for the Office of Advocacy. This is a substantial increase over FY 1999 funding, which I believe is important for the ability of the Office of Advocacy to carry out its important mission on behalf of small business. Among others, those responsibilities include conducting research on a number of issues that are critical to small minority-owned and women-owned firms, and the cost of Federal regulations. I commend my colleagues, Senator GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS, for their initiative in providing this increase.

We are also very concerned about the current staffing needs of the Office of Advocacy, which has declined significantly in recent years. In FY 1990, there were 70 full-time employees assigned to the Office of Advocacy. During the current fiscal year, it is my understanding the SBA Administrator has allocated 49 full-time staff for the Office of Advocacy.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator KERRY about the failure of SBA to allocate adequate staff to the Office of Advocacy. This shortfall has placed an enormous burden on the ability of the Office to fulfill its mission. While I would encourage the SBA Administrator to allocate staff for the Office of Advocacy at the 1990 level, I realize they may not be able to make such an large increase in one year. Therefore, I would like my colleagues on the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS, to clarify their intent for the increase in the FY 2000 budget for the Office of Advocacy.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the time and effort spent by Senator BOND and Senator KERRY working with the Subcommittee in developing the FY 2000 budget for SBA. The Subcommittee approved the increase in the budget for the Office of Advocacy to enable it to assess the economic contributions made by small businesses, to determine the impact of federal regulations and tax policies on small businesses, to dedicate sufficient resources to help carry out its responsibilities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and to undertake reviews of interpretative regulations issued by the Internal Revenue Service of the Department of the Treasury and rules issued by the Mine Safety and Health Administration of the Department of Labor.

It was further our intention to direct SBA to add 5 full-time equivalent employees to the Office of Advocacy for a total of 54 full-time employees for FY 2000. It is our belief this number of full-time staff is reasonable to address the burgeoning responsibilities of this important office.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I concur with my good friend and colleague from the New Hampshire on the use of the increased funds for the Office of Advocacy. In addition, it was our intent to add 5 full-time equivalent employees in the Office of Advocacy bringing the total for FY 2000 to 54 full-time employees.

Mr. GREGG. I want to make one further clarification regarding the $2.5 million earmarked for research by the Office of Advocacy. It was our intention that this amount be spent on research contracts and other initiatives by the Office of Advocacy. The Subcommittee did not intend that any of these funds would be transferred to the general operating account for the Agency nor would any of these funds be used to pay the costs of maintaining the full-tme staff of the Office of Advocacy.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I concur with the statement by Senator GREGG.

THE BUNKER HILL SITE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a discussion with the Senator from New Hampshire, the distinguished Chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee concerning a situation that exists in my home state of Idaho.

Mr. GREGG. I would be pleased to engage in such a discussion with my friend the senior Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. this past weekend Senator CRAPO, Congresswoman CHENOWETH and I conducted a public meeting in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho where federal, state, local, tribal officials and citizens give statements and responded to questions concerning the federal, tribal and state governments' involvement in a Superfund site in North Idaho known as the Bunker Hill site.

To date there has been approximately $200 million spent on cleanup. Significant progress has been made, but there is a great deal of debate going on between the parties concerning what other areas in the Basin need to be included in the cleanup. I believe the State of Idaho, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe and the federal agencies can work out these questions and resolve the conflicts that have gone on over this issue in the Coeur d'Alene Basin for over a decade.

I feel the Department of Justice, Idaho and the Nation as a whole would be well served if the DOJ and the other parties involved in litigation were to work among themselves parties to resolve the issues rather than to continue to litigate.

Mr. GREGG. The Senator raises excellent points. The resources of the National are better served in working to resolve these types of problems rather than to continue in a litigation strategy for years and years. All parties should work to resolve the problems in

the Coeur d'Alene Basin and the Committee will work with the Senator from Idaho to see if further direction is appropriate in the Conference Report.

DEVELOPMENT OF A HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN

Mr. BURNS. The Senate is accepting my amendment to allocate $250,000 for the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan as part of the Idaho and Montana Coldwater Fishery Enhancement Program. This funding is imperative in the preparation of a voluntary Habitat Conservation Plan aimed at saving our native fish populations in the two states. As you know, we are at the upper end of the Columbia River drainage and the impacts seen on salmon in that drainage are interrelated to our native trout as well.

As the debate raged on about what exactly was impacting the native fish populations in the lower Columbia system, those of us in the upper reaches of the system were doing our best to ensure that enough water was sent downstream at the appropriate time to help the native fish as much as possible. What we have learned from this practice is that the health of our bull trout population is linked to that of the salmon. Fewer salmon returning from the ocean to spawn placed concern on the health of the entire river system, and the traditional actions taken to help one species sometimes had negative impacts on others. As is commonly the case with these types of issues, we didn't always realize the interrelation until some negative impacts had already taken place.

Making these funds available for the Idaho and Montana Coldwater Fishery Enhancement Program will help us address more of the survival needs of native fish species in the Columbia Basin. Stabilizing the bull trout population and developing this plan will allow us more flexibility in helping the salmon populations recover as well. Senator, I hope you will join me in clarifying where this money is to be directed and to reaffirm the value of developing a state-led voluntary Habitat Conservation Plan for bull trout in Idaho and Montana.

Mr. GREGG. The Idaho and Montana Coldwater Fishery Enhancement Program is an important element in the concerted effort to help native fish throughout the Pacific Northwest. This year's appropriations bills place a priority on stabilizing the native fish populations throughout the region, and this program fills a niche previously left unmet by other recovery efforts.

SCAAP FUNDING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, about funding in this measure for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, popularly known as the SCAAP.

As the Senator knows, states and localities, especially those such as California with high immigrant populations, face extraordinary costs in incarcerating illegal aliens who have committed serious crimes in the United States and sentenced for their felony offenses.

The burden on states and localities which incarcerate criminal aliens continues to grow. In California, for example, during February 1997, there were 17,904 criminal alien inmates with INS holds on them. This rose to 19,355 in 1998. At the end of February, 1999, there were 21,792 alien inmates in the California state correctional system who have INS holds.

Congress appropriated $585 million for SCAAP in fiscal year 1999 to help reimburse state and local governments for the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens.

Given the increasing numbers of illegal aliens that California and other states must incarcerate, one would reasonably expect that funding for this important program would be increased in fiscal year 2000.

But it is my understanding, Mr. President, that the bill reported by the committee actually makes dramatic cuts in federal funding for SCAAP, reducing the level of funding by more than 80 percent to only $100 million.

Given the urgency of the need and the fact that all 50 states, the District of Columbia, two territories and 244 localities received SCAAP funding in the most recent reimbursement period, I would like to inquire of my friend from New Hampshire if there is something that can be done to increase funding in this bill for SCAAP to a more appropriate level.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the excellent comments of my good friend, the Senator from California, and also look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee to resolve the funding disparity in the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP).

Before I begin my comments about this important program and the level of funding in the Senate Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill, I want to state my full support for what I have been told will be a $585 million funding level for SCAAP in the House FY 2000 bill. I would also like to insert for the record a copy of a letter from the U.S./Mexico Border Counties Coalition (which consists of 18 county governments located on the Southwestern border) that describes why an adequate funding level for SCAAP is so important to these border ares, many of which are facing very difficult fiscal situations.

Through the Crime Control Act of 1994, the Congress created SCAAP to reimburse states and localities for the costs they incur incarcerating criminal illegal aliens. Such costs, it has been made clear, are the responsibility of the federal government. SCAAP is authorized at $650 million, although total expenditures of the states exceed $2 billion per year. Though the financial burden of criminal illegal aliens overwhelms the criminal justice budget of many states and localities, SCAAP has never even been allocated its full authorization. In 1996 and 1997, SCAAP was allocated $500 million and last year, states and localities received a total of $585 million.

Frankly, the Congress would be fully justified in increasing the authorization level to $2 billion annually. In 1998, the taxpayers of Arizona spent $38 million incarcerating criminal illegal aliens, including $26.8 million in state facilities, $406,000 in Cochise County, $9 million in Maricopa County, $136,000 in Mohave County, $534,000 in Pinal County, $450,000 in Santa Cruz County, and $401,000 in Yuma County. In turn, the state received a reimbursement of $15.1 million in SCAAP funds—less than half of what Arizona should have gotten, and that was when SCAAP was funded at $585 million overall.

To reduce the total 1999 SCAAP fund by more than 80 percent for fiscal year 2000, to $100 million, is absolutely unacceptable. Should funding be reduced to $100 million, all 50 states, D.C., and the 244 local jurisdictions, which currently receive 39 cents on the dollar, would be reimbursed a mere seven cents on the dollar, even though such costs are a clear federal responsibility. This situation is especially disturbing, considering incarceration is only one component of the overwhelming cost incurred by states and localities when processing criminal illegal aliens—and one for which the federal government promised to provide reimbursement in the Crime Control Act of 1994.

In Santa Cruz County, Arizona, the overall costs of both processing and incarcerating illegal criminal aliens takes up 39 percent of the county's criminal justice budget. And that is just one county in my state. The combined costs to jurisdictions all over the country are staggering, and the SCAAP program only reimburses states for the incarceration portion of these onerous costs. Unless Congress appropriates sufficient funds for SCAAP, at the very least, Arizona and other state and local governments will continue to shoulder billions of dollars of the expense of incarcerating and processing criminal illegal aliens.

Mr. President, I very much hope that Senators GREGG, HOLLINGS, FEINSTEIN and I can work to resolve these issues before this bill is signed into law.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the comments expressed by my friends, the Senator from California and the Senator from Arizona, and commend them for their efforts on the extremely important issue.

The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program provides much needed financial assistance to New York State and many of our great state's cities and counties, as they try to grapple with the significant costs of incarcerating criminal aliens. In fiscal year 1998, New York and its localities received a total of $96.4 million in SCAAP funding—

with New York City securing the largest single grant for a locality in the nation.

I am very disappointed and disturbed that the bill reported by the committee would reduce SCAAP funding to $100 million for fiscal year 2000, This could translate to a $80 million cut in assistance for New York: a $46 million cut for the state itself, $27.7 million for New York City, 4 million for Nassau County, $1 million for Suffolk County, $800,000 for Westchester County, $32,000 for Montgomery County, $25,500 for Albany County, $19,500 for Putnam County, and smaller amounts for Cortland County.

Cuts of this magnitude would leave New York to assume a difficult and heavy burden for what is very much a federal responsibility. I join my friends from California and Arizona in asking our friend from New Hampshire whether something could be done to restore SCAAP funding to a more acceptable level.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I thank my friends from California, Arizona, and New York for their excellent observations. I know that they have been tireless in their efforts to secure both an end to illegal immigration and to ensure that the federal government assume a share of the financial responsibility for its inability to control illegal immigration.

I know, as well, that the senator from California and the senator from Arizona were two of the principal authors of the SCAAP program when it was created by the 1994 Crime bill, and that they both worked very hard to help secure the $585 million which was appropriated last year and in fiscal year 1998 for this important program.

Knowing of the great need for adequate funding for SCAAP, it pains me that the Committee was unable to fund it at the level it deserves. I assure the senators that I will make it a high priority during the conference between the House and Senate to secure adequate funding for this program, that does so much for all of our states that are burdened by the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I concur with my colleague from New Hampshire. I understand the importance of this funding for states impacted by high rates of criminal alien incarceration and I am hopeful we can provide an adequate funding level for SCAAP during conference.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their encouraging words. As I am sure they know, the SCAAP reimbursements provided in prior years did not nearly cover the costs states and localities incurred to incarcerate illegal aliens in their jurisdictions.

In fiscal year 1998, the last year for which such cost figures are available, the cost for states and localities amounted to $1.7 billion. Thus, last year's funding level covered only 30 percent of actual costs.

A cut along the magnitude of that which is included in the Committee bill would be absolutely devastating. I understand the House CJS Subcommittee is recommending an FY00 SCAAP funding level of $585 million. I will work closely with the Chairman and Ranking Member and others in both bodies during the weeks to come to assure that the conference on this bill adequately funds this program.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues with regard to the issue of funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP). SCAAP is a vital reimbursement program for states like mine that assists in the significant cost of incarcerating criminal aliens.

Although securing the border is the responsibility of the federal government, states and localities have had to bear the costs associated with incarcerating aliens should they enter the criminal justice system. In previous years, Congress has recognized their burden and worked to secure as much as $585 million for this critical program. Even at that level, less than 40% of Texas' costs of criminal alien incarceration have been reimbursed. Cutting SCAAP by over 80% as proposed in this measure would result in a reimbursement of only about 7% of the total cost to the State of Texas. It is estimated that the State of Texas would receive less than $7 million, and Texas counties would share in less than $3 million. Dallas County would receive less than $200,000 despite enduring costs of over $2.5 million; the County of El Paso, with costs exceeding $2.6 million, would be reimbursed only about $200,000; and Harris County, with costs nearing $14 million, would receive less than $1 million. Mr. President, this is the same Harris County that last week took custody in its county jail of the accused railway murderer, Angel Maturino-Resendez. In this case, Harris County is forced to assume the costs of detaining Maturino-Resendez, who is alleged to have repeatedly entered this country illegally and further alleged to have committed a string of stunningly violent murders across the United States. There could not be a more graphic illustration of why we need to support the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, so that our cities, counties and States are not left alone to pay the costs of the Federal government's failure to protect the border.

I pledge to work with the chairman to see that adequate funding can be restored to this vital program and appreciate the Senator from California bringing this important matter to the floor.

THE HARBOR GARDENS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to express my support for the Harbor Gardens economic development project. I have requested funding in the Economic Development Administration (EDA) account for this worthwhile initiative in the Manchester neighborhood of Pittsburgh.

The mission of Harbor Gardens is to continue to help in rebuilding the economic, physical, social, human, and cultural infrastructure of one of Pittsburgh's most distressed communities. The project consists of a state-of-the-art urban greenhouse for the benefit of students and city residents. Horticulture is the fastest growing segment of agri-business, and therefore, the skills which program participants gain can translate into well-paying jobs. The project will ensure the education of its graduates in the horticultural industry, including advance greenhouse production technology and landscaping techniques. The Business and Industrial Development Corporation is partnering with the Pennsylvania State University, the School District of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Civic Garden Center, Phipps Conservatory and Botanical Center, Zuma Canyon Orchids, and Pittsburgh Cut Flowers. Rare plants will be grown to be purchased for resale, and tours, seminars, plant auctions, and festivals will all contribute to maximizing revenues.

Federal funding crucial to the completion of this innovative approach to economic development, and an EDA grant will play an important role in meeting that federal commitment.

I look forward to working with the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator GREGG, to ensure that this project receives funding.

Mr. GREGG. I welcome the comments by the Senator from Pennsylvania and look forward to continuing to work with him on this request. I am well aware of the importance he places on the Harbor Gardens project. I would strongly urge the EDA to consider a proposal by the Business and Industrial Development Corporation within applicable procedures and guidelines and provide a grant if warranted.

THE BYRNE GRANT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee, Senator GREGG, regarding the importance of the Byrne Grant.

Mr. GREGG. I understand the Senator's interest in this area.

Mr. KYL. I thank Senator GREGG for entering this colloquy with me about a program which is particularly vital to the law enforcement personnel in my own state of Arizona. As you know, the Byrne Grant is a key source of federal financial assistance for state and local drug law enforcement efforts. It funds a wide variety of activities ranging from task forces and drug education to apprehension and prosecution. In Arizona, numerous counties and agencies rely on Byrne Grant funds to pay the salaries of nearly 300 law enforcement and prosecution personnel; rural counties especially benefit from Bryne Grant funds for their law enforcement activities.

Mr. GREGG. I am aware of the Byrne grant program and its importance, as

well as the fact that the Administration's budget cut Byrne by over $90 million, not to mention the Administration's ''zero-funding'' of the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant—which this Subcommittee funded at $400 million. As Chairman of the subcommittee that provides funds for law enforcement, I am intimately familiar with the need to fund effective and successful law enforcement programs. I join with the Senator from Arizona in recognizing the importance of the Byrne Grant. As this bill moves to conference, I look forward to working with you to address your concerns.

Mr. KYL. Once again, I thank the distinguished Chairman.

WARDEN OFFENDER NOMITORING SYSTEM

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator GREGG and his staff for their tireless efforts on this legislation. I believe this legislation contains some important steps in a number of areas, including law enforcement. At this time, I would like to engage the Chairman in a discussion with regard to a new technology developed by Capstone Technologies, a company located in my state of Alabama. I think it is essential that we explore new areas of technology that can increase the effectiveness of law enforcement.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his interest in this legislation and in improving our law enforcement efforts. I agree that we should explore new techniques that can improve the capabilities of the law enforcement community.

Mr. SESSIONS. Capstone Technologies developed the Warden Offender Monitoring System to aid in monitoring offenders that have been put under residential detention. The Warden is a biometric, three dimensional monitoring system using voice verification, personal history inquiry and voice recording. The Warden uses computer voice verification to identify offenders placed on residential detention. The Warden monitors the offender using a touch-tone phone, with no new equipment to install or maintain. Random calls are made by the computer to the home of the offender during the hours sanctioned by the court. The system uses the ''voiceprint'', which is recorded initially, to identify the offender on the phone. All calls are monitored and all violations identified by the computer are followed by a personal call from the staff to ensure that there are no false violations recorded. The Warden can also detect when an offender is under the influence of alcohol or other drugs. If the computer detects certain characteristics of intoxication it will report a violation immediately to the supervisor with a recommendation to conduct a sobriety test. I believe this technology could be an extremely useful tool for law enforcement. One specific area in which the Warden system might be very helpful would be in monitoring juveniles. By implementing a versatile residential detention system, we can avoid having to place our youth in jail, and possibly help parents and the individual gain control of his life before it's too late.

Mr. GREGG. I agree that this technology could have useful applications to our law enforcement system. I look forward to working with the Senator from Alabama in the future as we explore technological developments and other useful tools that can aid our law enforcement community.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chairman again for his leadership and for his interest in this important issue. I look forward to working with him on this new technology in the months to come.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee, for joining me to discuss the urgent need to provide funding for defense conversion in the greater St. Louis area. Over 7,000 Missourians are in danger of losing their jobs if the F–15 production line shuts down at the Boeing plant in St. Louis. These are high-paying, high-skilled jobs, and I am committed to doing everything I can to help these hard-working Missourians find other sources of employment in the greater St. Louis area.

These workers have helped keep America strong through their work on the F–15 and other military systems that are so integral to our national security. Their skill and knowledge are a national asset—a national asset which I think should be preserved through keeping the F–15 line open. I have worked toward that end, and Senator BOND and I successfully secured funding for additional F–15 purchases in the Defense Appropriations bill last month. But hundreds of F–15 workers will lose their jobs even with additional purchases of the plane, and those workers should be assisted in the transition process.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is well aware of the Economic Development Administration (EDA) and the good work EDA does to facilitate economic adjustment in so many parts of the country.

Mr. GREGG. I am well aware of the EDA and the economic adjustment programs it funds, including substantial work in areas of the country impacted by defense downsizing.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I appreciate the Senator's reference to the defense conversion work performed by the EDA. In fact, EDA has assisted St. Louis before, as the regional economy has adjusted from defense layoffs over the past decade. St. Louis has one of the most effective and highly respected economic adjustment offices in the country, as the Defense and Commerce Departments would attest. The city has a demonstrated track record of using federal dollars effectively and is well-prepared to use EDA funding to meet the current, pressing needs of these F–15 workers. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire if he will work with me in the coming months to address the defense conversion needs in the St. Louis area.

Mr. GREGG. I am aware of the good work St. Louis has done in the past when defense downsizing has affected the city's economy. As Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee overseeing funding for the Commerce Department and the EDA, I will work with the distinguished Senator from Missouri to assist the city.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks and his willingness to work with me to address this important matter in Missouri.

RAPID RESPONSE SYSTEM FOR YOUNG CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate Maine's Community Alliance to End Violence Against Children. The Alliance, which includes the Maine State Police, Catholic Charities Maine, and the Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point, will improve and expand the coordination of services for preventing and reducing the negative impact that exposure to violence has on young children. As my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire is aware, rural regions have unique problems coordinating and delivering services to children exposed to violence.

Mr. GREGG. I am pleased the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary directed the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to examine the proposal for a Rapid Response Program for children living in Hancock and Washington Counties and to provide a grant for the program if warranted.

Ms. COLLINS. Downeast Maine is particularly in need of help. Washington County, for example, is a large rural area in which chronic poverty, unemployment, substance abuse and domestic violence result in far too many children being exposed to violence. Currently there is no program in these counties that offers adequate intervention and treatment to address the harmful aftereffects of exposure to violence. The Alliance will develop a system through which existing resources can be coordinated to provide appropriate and timely responses to the emotionally and physically damaging situations children often face. There is strong evidence that a rapid response team, intervening on behalf of children in crisis situations, can mitigate the long term consequences of trauma.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Maine for her efforts to address this problem. Data from urban areas have shown that a rapid response to trauma in children does reduce the development of anti-social behavior in the long term. However, there are no data from rural communities. The demonstration project that the Alliance proposes can be a model for service delivery in other rural areas and

appears to be an excellent candidate for Department of Justice funds.

Ms. COLLINS. I am sure that many rural communities will benefit from the work of the Maine Alliance. Its plan has been inspired by the work of Dr. Carl Bell, President of the Community Mental Health Council in Chicago, Illinois. Dr. Bell's analysis of the effects of trauma and the needs of African-American youth in Chicago can be applied to the predominantly white and Native-American youth in eastern, rural Maine and ultimately youth in any rural area.

Mr. GREGG. I want to assure the Senator from Maine that I understand the importance of the work of the Maine Community Alliance to End Violence Against Children and its potential significance as a model for rural areas across the nation.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chairman and the Subcommittee for their support and look forward to working with you to implement this project.

CONSOLIDATION OF ALL FIRST RESPONDER TRAINING AT THE CDP

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in a brief colloquy to discuss the merits of consolidating training for our Nation's First Responders.

Would the Senator agree consolidation of all Department of Justice first responder training under the Center for domestic Preparedness at Fort McClellan, Alabama would significantly improve the quality and level of first responder domestic preparedness training?

Mr. GREGG. Is Consolidation of training in one organization really necessary?

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes. Stakeholders have repeatedly stated the need for a single authoritarian point of contact for training information. Also the June 2, 1999 Report to Congress specifically recognized the requirement: ''A centrally coordinated and standardized national training program is needed to ensure an effective, integrated response and to minimize redundancy in training programs.''

Mr. GREGG. What would be the advantage of this consolidation?

Mr. SESSIONS. OSLDPS approach to responder training is somewhat fragmented. The CDP currently oversees most DoJ training. However, in October, 2000, DoD will transfer responsibility for its Nunn-Lugar City Training program to DoJ. Current plans are to manage this new program out of OSLDPS in Washington, DC office. Consolidation of all DoJ training at the CDP would centralize all training in one organization providing a more effective, efficient use of resources.

Mr. GREGG. How much City Training will remain once the programs transfers to DoJ?

Mr. SESSIONS. Of the original 120 cities scheduled to receive training, only 25 will be completely finished by October 2000. Approximately 65 cities will be in some phase of training. This is a very large and complex training program requiring extensive coordination and attention to detail.

Mr. GREGG. Does the CDP have the expertise to execute such a large training program?

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes. The CDP Director and his key staff have extensive experience in planning, coordinating and executing large training programs with DoJ, DoD and other agencies. The staff also has expertise in the first responder disciplines, such as fire, law enforcement and emergency medical. The CDP is also closer and perhaps, more attuned to first responder issues.

Mr. GREGG. What is the relative experience of the OSLDPS key staff?

Mr. SESSIONS. While they have some experience in coordinating programs within the interagency arena, their primary experience has been in the area of grant formulation and execution. no one on the OSLDPS staff currently has any experience in executing a training program this large.

Mr. GREGG. Are there other advantages to consolidating DoJ first responder training at CDP?

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes. Placing one organization in charge of all DoJ training has several advantages:

It centralizes all training and course development, curriculum standardization, assessment and instructor certification in one organization;

It provides more effective oversight of training and related programs;

Eliminates course overlap and course redundancy;

It facilitates coordination of training issues in the interagency community; and

It provides a single point of contact ''one stop shopping'' for state and local responders for all training issues.

Mr. GREGG. Will this consolidation save money and manpower?

Mr. SESSIONS. Dual-hatting the Director of the CDP as the OSLDPS Director of Training will eliminate the need for a large training coordination and oversight function/staff in Washington, DC.

Mr. GREGG. Why is this so important?

Mr. SESSIONS. Consolidation of all training at the CDP is important because it will provide a single authoritative source for training and related technical assistance and information. To this end, I am convinced that the National Guard should establish its central distance learning facility at Fort McClellan to leverage these training requirements for the 11 million First Responders in America.

Mr. GREGG. I would like to say to my good friend from Alabama that I agree with his views on training consolidation at the Center for Domestic Preparedness, and I appreciate his time and attention to this important issue. I look forward to working with him to fully explore this issue with Justice Department officials in the coming months. I would hope they will move aggressively to implement a National Training Strategy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for participating in this colloquy and for his support on this issue. I, too, look forward to working with my friend from New Hampshire and other colleagues on this important issue.

THE REPEAL OF SECTION 110 OF THE 1996 IMMIGRATION LAW

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the important issue of a visa entry-exit control system with the Senator from Michigan, Mr. ABRAHAM, the Chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, and Senator GREGG, the Chairman of the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Subcommittee.

Senator ABRAHAM, you and I and other Members who represent the Northern regions of our country have been working for over 3 years now to repeal Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–208). Section 110 of this 1996 Immigration law would require a recording and identification system to be implemented to document the arrival and departure of all non-U.S. citizens at all ports of entry in the U.S., including those entry points along the U.S. border with Canada.

Mr. ABRAHAM. The Senator is correct. Those of us who represent states bordering Canada know well the immense volume of tourism and trade that passes through our states from our neighbor to the North. The implementation of Section 110 would cause gross delays to all those crossing the Northern border from Canada, and ultimately have a disastrous impact on the Northern economy as critical trade and travel routes are slowed. It would also harm states along the Southern border as well.

Ms. COLLINS. In my State of Maine, this new border policy would have the most immediate impact on border communities such as Calais, Houlton, Madawaska, and Jackman. Businesses in these communities rely on Canadian consumers to stay in business. Moreover, the impact on trade, including lumber and tourism, would extend beyond these communities and reverberate across Maine and through the Northern economy as a whole.

Those of us who represent states along the Canadian border know intimately how deep the shared ties between the U.S. and Canada truly are. Our relationship has included disagreements over the years, but our Canadian neighbors are part of our family—a fact that is literally and figuratively true for many Mainers whose extended families live across the border in Canada.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Our border policy with Canada has served us well, and is a symbol of the close relationship between our two countries. The border with Canada is the longest continuous open border in the world, and our close friendship should not be clouded by a needless bureaucratic exercise. Moreover, numerous jobs, jobs held by

Americans in Michigan and elsewhere, would be lost if Section 110 is implemented. The effect on tourism and on just-in-time deliveries would inhibit the flow of goods and people in a way that would hurt the economics of many states.

Ms. COLLINS. Largely because of your efforts, Senator ABRAHAM, Section 110 has yet to be substantively implemented at land borders and sea ports of entry. Last year, the FY99 Omnibus Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (105–277) delayed the implementation of Section 110 on land and sea ports of entry until March 31, 2001, and included language stating that the entry/exit control system must ''not significantly disrupt trade, tourism, or other legitimate cross-border traffic at land border points of entry''. And in today's Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill, Section 110 is repealed outright. I salute your efforts on behalf of this very important measure which will benefit both of our states and the northern economy as a whole.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank the Senator from Maine for her remarks, and for the important work she has done to repeal this measure. As the overwhelming vote nearly one year ago illustrates, there is near unanimity in the Senate on this issue, and I salute the Senator from New Hampshire for his outstanding ongoing support, and his willingness to insert provisions addressing this problem into the underlying Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Bill.

Mr. GREGG. I am pleased to support the measure to repeal Section 110 of the 1996 Immigration bill. I too believe strongly that the border policy we currently enjoy with the country of Canada should not be disturbed. I will continue to work in Conference to see that this matter is finally put to rest.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Senator GREGG, your efforts are deeply appreciated by the American people.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you to both Senators for their leadership on this issue, and for joining me in this colloquy.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, as the Senate reaches the conclusion of the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill, I would like to speak a moment about an important US law enforcement agency funded in this bill—an agency dedicated to keeping drugs off our streets. I am specifically talking about the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Mr. President, in 1998, the DEA seized more drugs and arrested more traffickers than ever before. With limited funding, and unlimited hard work and dedication, DEA human resources are a vital source not just for our law enforcement activities, but for other nations as well. The DEA does its job without a heavy reliance on big ticket items like ships and aircraft. On the contrary, this agency relies primarily on manpower. Their manpower and skill are what makes them such an effective organization both inside and outside our borders.

Fortunately after 2 years of almost stagnant funding levels, the Republican Congress has been working to increase its investment in the DEA. Last year Congress provided the DEA with $1.4 billion in Fiscal Year 1999, an increase of roughly $60 million. This increase was possible largely through legislation Senator COVERDELL and I introduced and Congress passed last year—the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. However, we need to do more.

Congress should continue its support of the DEA. Increasing our investment in DEA, which will in turn increase the strength and ability of our counter-narcotics strategy, is the only way to continue to increase the numbers of drug arrests and seizures.

Let me give you some examples of where more DEA resources have and can continue to make a difference. Mr. President, I have visited Haiti numerous times and have visited the Dominican Republic as well. It is truly unfortunate that roughly twenty per cent of the drugs entering the United States travel through these two countries. The Haiti-Dominican Republic transit route has become increasingly popular for drug traffickers because both governments do not present a real threat to drug traffickers. What makes matters worse is that our resources devoted to preventing drugs from reaching this island have been minimal at best.

When I visited Haiti back in March 1998, I was astonished to find out that there was only one DEA agent stationed in Haiti. When I visited the Dominican Republic on the same trip, I was disappointed to find out there were only two DEA agents stationed there. How can our government keep drugs from entering our country if we do not make a commitment to seize drugs along a major international route on the drug trafficking highway? When I returned from that trip, I worked with the DEA and the Attorney General to get additional agents assigned to both countries. I received a commitment to station seven DEA agents in Haiti and six agents in the Dominican Republic. The process has been slow in getting the agents to Haiti—because of language training in particular—but the increase in agents has already made a tremendous difference.

Since that trip back in March 1998, I have returned to Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and visited with the DEA agents stationed there. As a result of our increased DEA presence on the island, the DEA, in conjunction with the US Customs and with the Haiti and Dominican governments, has pursued several counter-drug operations. Their presence also has helped increase cooperation between the two nations.

I had the opportunity to visit the Haitian-Dominican border last November to observe a DEA-Customs counter-drug initiative called Operation Genesis. Until that time, there was virtually no cooperation between the two nations at the border. This lack of cooperation is a major reason why the island became a popular drug trafficking route. The objective of Operation Genesis was to help both countries better coordinate and cooperate with each other to prevent drugs from transiting the border.

The enhanced Haitian-Dominican cooperation through overall DEA efforts has proven successful. For example, last February, the Haitian National Police in coordination with the DEA, arrested relatives of the Coneo family—a well known Colombian drug trafficking family with connections in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Heriberto Coneo's wife, son and his brother-in-law were arrested in Haiti for carrying false Dominican passports. Haiti later expelled them to the Dominican Republic, where they were arrested and placed in prison. This was a major victory.

Another example of this enhanced cooperation was the recent arrest of a Haitian National Police Division Chief who had fled to the Dominican Republic after his involvement in the deaths of more than 11 Haitians. The coordinated efforts by the DEA with these two countries resulted in the Dominicans arresting the police official and expelling him to Haiti.

The DEA also has helped train the Haitian National Police counter-drug unit. With DEA assistance, our Embassy in Port-au-Prince reports that the Haitian police has seized more than $1 million in money being smuggled out of the country in large sums.

I also have seen the DEA in action in South America, specifically in Peru and in Colombia. I walked through poppy fields in Neiva, Colombia where I saw first hand the source of the serious heroin problem plaguing our country today. We were in a region only 20 miles from the Colombian demilitarized zone. The DEA has been instrumental in working and training the Colombian National Police to seize drugs and arrest drug lords.

While, I have described a few success stories, I need to remind my colleagues that the DEA is producing incredible returns on a very small investment.

Imagine what more the DEA could do if they had more personnel. The fact is the DEA simply does not have the resources to meet their demanding and necessary tasks. With more resources, border initiatives like the one in Haiti and the Dominican Republic could be expanded, allowing for a greater reduction in the heavy trafficking that occurs between the two countries. With more resources, additional DEA agents can be sent overseas to assist law enforcement officials in learning ways to stop drug trafficking. That kind of investment—to build anti-drug operations in other countries—will build even more barriers to drugs outside our borders.

Mr. President, last March, Senator COVERDELL and I, along with a number of our colleagues—Republican and Democrat—sent a letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS, calling for building on this year's investment in the DEA and requesting additional funding for 300 additional DEA agents, analysts and support personnel, and for other DEA initiatives. This request would enable the DEA to carry out specific initiatives outlined in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, a three year initiative for enhanced international drug eradication and interdiction efforts.

I recognize the serious budget challenges facing this Subcommittee and other Appropriations subcommittees as well. Chairman GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS were extremely gracious in accommodating our request. Specifically, the Subcommittee earmarked $17.5 million for new DEA agents, analysts, and support staff for both international and domestic posts.

Mr. President, this is an important first step. It is my hope that as this bill moves to a conference with the House, the conferees will work to increase our overall investment in the DEA, so that specific priority requirements are not funded at the expense of other important DEA programs.

Again, Mr. President, since 1995 Congress has made great progress last year to increase our investment to revive our international counter narcotics strategy. Last year's passage of the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act was the latest example of this progress. Not only did Congress pass legislation, but we also provided an $800 million down payment for the bill.

Unfortunately, the Clinton Administration is not showing a similar commitment. The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2000 provided zero funding for provisions outlined in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. In fact, it calls for more than $100 million less than our total anti-drug funding for 1999. The Coast Guard received zero funding for the acquisition of air/maritime assets; the Drug Enforcement Agency received zero funding for new agents; our Customs Service received zero funding for procurement of maritime/air assets and zero increases for U.S. Customs inspectors. This Administration has not demonstrated a commitment to fund a real, coherent international counter-drug strategy. What good is it to have tough drug laws here at home and a tough international counter narcotics policy at and beyond the border if you do not have the resources to enforce them?

Mr. President, I have repeatedly expressed my concerns that the Administration has not been doing enough in the fight against drugs. When the Clinton Administration took over, the DEA workforce dropped from 7,277 in 1992 to 7,066 in 1994. However, since the Republican takeover of Congress in 1994, we have fought to boost the workforce from 7,066 to more than 9,000. The Administration's latest action, or lack of action, only reinforces my belief that more can be done. There has been an increasing number of reports of outrageous amounts of drugs being distributed throughout our country that originates internationally and domestically. Why is that? Only the federal government can devote the resources to seize drugs outside our country. It is unfortunate that the Clinton Administration continues to fail to fully support this exclusive federal responsibility.

With increased DEA funding, we have the opportunity to eliminate one of the most glaring omissions in the President's budget. It is my hope that we will continue to search for additional funding to the DEA so that they can hire these new agents, analysts, and support personnel without having to sacrifice other important programs. These agents would work hand-in-hand with international law enforcement authorities to provide the intelligence, expertise, and even the manpower required to arrest the drug traffickers.

Mr. President, I have seen the DEA at work throughout the region. The agency is a group of hard-working dedicated individuals who risk their lives to create a healthy environment for democracies to flourish, while at the same time get the drugs off the streets of America. They do so much good with the limited resources they have. It is now time for us to pass this amendment, give the DEA additional resources and once again watch the number of arrests and seizures increase causing the flow of narcotics into our country to sharply decrease.

Mr. President, it is time to renew drug interdiction efforts; time to provide the necessary personnel and equipment to our drug-enforcement agencies, and time to make the issue a national priority once again.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the managers of this bill for their hard work in putting forth annual legislation which provides federal funding for numerous vital programs. The Senate will soon vote to adopt the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Bill for the Fiscal Year 2000. I intend to support this measure because it provides funding for fighting crime, enhancing drug enforcement, and responding to threats of terrorism. This further addresses the shortcomings of the immigration process, funds the operation of the judicial system, facilitates commerce throughout the United States, and fulfills the needs of the State Department and various other agencies.

For many years, I have tried to cut wasteful and unnecessary spending from the annual appropriations bills—with only limited success, I must admit. Nonetheless, I will continue my fight to curb wasteful pork-barrel spending, and I regret that I must again come forward this year to object to the millions of unrequested, low-priority, wasteful spending in this bill and its accompanying report. This year's bill has over $1 billion in pork-barrel spending. This is a disgracefully huge increase over last year's FY 99 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Bill, which contained $361 million in pork-barrel spending. $1.2 billion is an unacceptable amount of money to spend on low-priority, unrequested, wasteful projects. In short, Congress must curb its appetite for such unbridled spending.

CBO projects that we will have close to a trillion dollar budget surplus over the next 10 years. However, if we continue with our current levels of wasteful spending, these budget surpluses may not occur. Pork-barrel spending today not only robs well-deserving programs of much needed funds, it also jeopardizes social security reform, potential tax cuts, and our fiscal well-being into the next century.

The multitude of unrequested earmarks buried in this proposal will undoubtedly further burden the American taxpayers. While the amounts associated with each individual earmark may not seem extravagant, taken together, they represent a serious diversion of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to low priority programs at the expense of numerous programs that have undergone the appropriate merit-based selection process. Congress and the American public must be made aware of the magnitude of wasteful spending endorsed by this body.

I have compiled a lengthy list of the numerous add-ons, earmarks, and special exemptions provided to individual projects in this bill. It would take a substantial amount of time to recite this list to you. Instead, I will ask unanimous consent to include this list in the RECORD.

Mr. President, because of our nation's robust economy, we now have a balanced budget. But we cannot continue to bear the financial burden of servicing a $5.6 trillion national debt. We need to continue to work to cut unnecessary and wasteful spending so we can begin to pay down our debt and save billions in interest payments.

As I mentioned earlier, CBO recently projected that we will have close to a trillion dollar budget surplus over the next 10 years. These are projections and not real dollars until they materialize. Further, these surplus projections are all contingent on Congress maintaining the spending caps. Unfortunately, I already hear the grumbling to break these caps even as we have only deliberated on a small number of appropriations bills.

Simply because we can fund programs of questionable merit within the spending caps does not mean that we should. There is no room for pork-barreling when we are so close to breaking the caps. Last year alone, I uncovered

over $14 billion of wasteful spending in the appropriations bills. $14 billion funds a lot of worthy programs.

As a matter of simple fairness, we have an obligation to ensure that Congress spends taxpayers' hard-earned dollars prudently to protect our balanced budget and to protect the projected budget surpluses. The American public cannot understand why we continue to earmark these huge amounts of money to locality specific special interests at a time when we are trying to cut the cost of government and return more dollars to the people. Pork barrel spending cannot be justified in an environment where our highest fiscal priorities should be to save Social Security, and provide much needed tax relief such as: increasing the number of tax payers in the 15% tax bracket, elimination of the marriage penalty; reduced taxation of savings and investment income; repeal of the estate and gift tax; repeal of the Social Security Earnings Test; increasing the contribution level for 410(k), and 457 retirement plans; and increasing the contribution level for the traditional IRA to $5,000.

Let me say very frankly that I do not generally like the idea of griping year after year regarding Congress' appetite for wasteful pork-barrel spending. But it is a sad commentary on the state of politics today that the Congress cannot curb its appetite to earmark funds for programs that are obviously wasteful, unnecessary, or unfair. Unfortunately, however, Members of Congress have demonstrated time and again their willingness to fund programs that serve their narrowly tailored interest at the expense of the national interest.

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

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

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN S. 1217 THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Bill Language

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

$2,500,000 for the operation of the National Advocacy Center at the University of south Carolina

$5,000,000 for a task force in each of the paired locations of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Camden, New Jersey; Las Cruces, New Mexico, and Albuquerque, New Mexico; Savannah, Georgia, and Charleston, South Carolina; Baltimore, Maryland, and Prince Georges County, Maryland; and Denver, Colorado, and Salt Lake City, Utah

An earmark for funding for the care and housing of Federal detainees held in the joint Immigration and Naturalization Service and United States Marshals Service's Buffalo Detention Facility

Funding for planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; and for leasing the Oklahoma City Airport Trust Facility

$50,000,000 for the Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing facilities and other areas in cooperation with State and local law enforcement

$3,000,000 for the National Institute of Justice to develop school safety technologies

$5,200,000 to the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation of violence against women

JUDICIARY

$2,700,000 to the ''Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services'' for the Institute at Saint Anselm College and the New Hampshire State Library

A $500,000 earmark for the National Law Center for Inter-American Free Trade in Tucson, Arizona

$13,500,000 for the East-West Center in Hawaii

$125,000 for the Maui Pacific Center in Hawaii

$12,500,000 earmarked for the Center of Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in the State of Hawaii

Language providing that all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made

Report Language

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A $30,000,000 earmark for the creation of two counterterrorism laboratories at the site of the Oklahoma City bombing and at Dartmouth College, for research of new technologies and threat reduction for chemical and biological weapons as well as cyber-warfare.

$2,300,000 to expand the multi-agency task forces in Richmond and Boston, which are designed to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals by enforcing Federal gun laws, by implementing these programs in Philadelphia and Camden.

$25,000,000 is earmarked for expansion of the existing ''Exile program'' in Philadelphia, PA and Camden, NJ and to create new task forces in the following four crime corridors: Las Cruces—Albuquerque, NM; Savannah, GA—Charleston, SC; Denver, CO—Salt Lake City, UT; and Baltimore—Prince George's County, MD.

$2,612,000 for a courtroom technology pilot program involving 10 districts, including Colorado, the northern district of Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Vermont.

$500,000 to establish a Bankruptcy Training Center at the National Advocacy Center at the University of South Carolina

A $13,750,000 earmark for courthouse security equipment to outfit newly opening courthouses in the following locations: Omaha, NE; Hammond, IN; Covington, KY; Charleston, WV; Montgomery, AL; Tucson, AZ; Phoenix, AZ; Charleston, SC; Albany, NY; Los Angeles, CA; Sioux City, IA; Pocatello, ID; Agana, Guam; Islip, NY; St. Louis, MO; Kansas City, MO; Las Vegas, NV; Albuquerque, NM; Riverside, CA; Corpus Christi, TX.

$500,000 for the acquisition and installation of videoconferencing equipment in the following locations: Leavenworth, KS; Dawson County, NE; Las Vegas, NV; Charlotte, NC; and high-volume jail locations to be determined in New Mexico and elsewhere.

Earmarks for courtoom construction at the following locations: Fairbanks, AK; Prescott, AZ; Atlanta, GA; Moscow, ID; Chicago, IL; Rockford, IL; Louisville, KY; Detroit, MI; Las Cruces, NM; Greensboro, NC; Muskogee, OK; Pittsburgh, PA; Florence, SC; Spartanburg, SC; Columbia, TN; Beaumont, TX; Sherman, TX; Cheyenne, WY. Not only are these amounts earmarked for particular locations, but the total earmark is $800 above low tax budget requests.

$25,392,000 for the National Infrastructure Protection Center, of which $1,250,000 is for a national program for infrastructure assurance developed in cooperation with the Thayer School of Engineering.

Language addressing the need for a focused response to illegal drug trafficking in northern New Mexico and an expectation that the FBI will devote sufficient resources to this problem in cooperation with other federal law enforcement agencies.

Language addressing the need for a focused response to illegal drug trafficking in northern New Mexico and an expectation that the DEA will devote sufficient resources to this problem in cooperation with other Federal law enforcement agencies.

A $222,000 earmark for the Iowa Division of Narcotics Enforcement to support the overtime, travel, and related expenses of 11 additional narcotics enforcement personnel.

$178,000 for an Iowa methamphetamine education mobile learning center.

Funding provided, within the amount made available for legal proceedings, to increase by not less than two the number of attorneys assigned to the district office in Alaska.

$250,000 for office space for the special agent on Kodiak Island.

$3,000,000 for the Law Enforcement Support Center. Report language assumes Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina will be added to the system.

$1,500,000 for equipment, modifications, and manning for a Secure Electronic Network for Traveler's Rapid Inspection lane at San Luis, AZ, port of entry.

Report language directing the Immigration and Naturalization Service to give full consideration to the Etowah County Detention Center in Alabama should it seek to expand available bed space in the region, as long as the county facility remains cost competitive.

An earmark of $49,968,000 for new Border Patrol construction as follows: $1,000,000 in Alcan, AK for POE Housing; $1,000,000 in Skagway, AK for POE Housing; $6,500,000 in Chula Vista, CA for a Border Patrol Station; $5,000,000 in El Centro, CA for Sector HQ; $7,850,000 in Santa Teresa, NM for a Border Patrol Station; $4,000,000 in Alpine, TX for a Border Patrol Station; $1,200,000 in Brownsville, TX for a Border Patrol Station; $4,300,000 in Del Rio, TX for Border Patrol Sector HQ; $5,118,000 in Presidio, TX for Border Patrol Housing; and $14,000,000 in Charleston, SC for a Border Patrol Academy.

$8,148,000 for Border Patrol planning, site acquisition, and design as follows: $600,000 in Campo, CA for a Border Patrol Station; $307,000 in El Cajon, CA for a Border Patrol Station; $447,000 in Temecula, CA for a Border Patrol Station; $300,000 in Douglas, AZ for a Border Patrol Station; $1,330,000 in Tucson, AZ for a Border Patrol Station; $687,000 in Yuma, AZ for a Border Patrol Station; $173,000 in Del Rio, TX for Checkpoints; $934,000 in Eagle Pass, TX for a Border Patrol Station; $865,000 in El Paso, TX for a Border Patrol Station; $128,000 in Laredo, TX for Checkpoints; $954,000 in McAllen, TX for Sector HQ; $685,000 in McAllen, TX for a Border Patrol Station; $500,000 in Port Isabel, TX for a Border Patrol Station; and $238,000 in Sanderson, TX for a Border Patrol Station.

$11,000,000 is earmarked for new construction of a Border Patrol Service Processing Center in Port Isabel, TX.

$9,500,000 for new construction of a Border Patrol Service Processing Center in Krome, FL.

$2,000,000 for Border Patrol planning, site acquisition, and design of Service Processing Centers in the following locations: $1,000,000 in El Centro, CA; $800,000 in Florence, AZ; and $200,000 in El Paso, TX.

$2,000,000 for housing at the remote Alcan and Skagway ports of entry in Alaska.

$367,000 for a fence in Santa Teresa, NM.

Funding for five new prisons: one minimum security facility in Forrest City, AR; a medium and minimum security facility in Victorville, CA; and detention centers in Houston, TX, Brooklyn, NY, and Philadelphia, PA.

An earmark of $101,633,000 to begin or complete activation of the following facilities: $7,500,000 in Butner, NC; $5,422,000 in Fort Devens, MA; $1,902,000 in Loretto, PA; $4,585,000 in Forrest City, AR; $25,230,000 in Victorville, CA; $19,384,000 in Houston, TX; $22,258,000 in Brooklyn, NY; $15,352,000 in Philadelphia, PA.

$221,000,000 to complete construction of the Northern Mid-Atlantic penitentiary and the South Carolina facility.

$94,000,000 earmarked for construction of a Federal Correctional Institution at Yazoo City, Mississippi.

Recommended bill language which allows for leasing a facility in Oklahoma City, OK.

$50,948,000 for the National Institute of Justice for fiscal year 2000 to expand the Adam Program.

The National Institute of Justice is directed to provide $2,100,000 to the School Crime Prevention and Security Technology Center.

The National Institute of Justice is further directed to provide $1,025,000 to the Criminal Imaging Response Center, at the Institute of Forensic Imaging, Indianapolis, Indiana, to conduct research; $300,000 to the United States Mexico Coalition to determine costs to border counties to process criminal illegal immigrants; $1,500,000 to the University of Connecticut Health Center to establish a prison health research center; and $2,500,000 for the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement in Arkansas to establish a school violence research center.

Funding for the Office of Justice Programs to expand training activities at the Fort McClellan Center for Domestic Preparedness and to enter into training agreements with the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Louisiana State University, Texas A&M University, and the Nevada Test site to develop and implement first responder preparedness training curricula.

$30,000,000 for the creation of two counterterrorism laboratories for research on chemical and biological weapons as well as cyberwarfare, to be located at the site of the Oklahoma City bombing and at Dartmouth College.

$3,500,000 for a Consolidated Advanced Technologies for the Law Enforcement Program at the University of New Hampshire and the New Hampshire Department of Safety.

$2,000,000 for continued support for the expansion of Search Group, Inc. and the National Technical Assistance and Training Program to assist States, such as West Virginia, to accelerate the automation of fingerprint identification processes.

$1,500,000 for project Return in New Orleans, LA.

$1,500,000 to the New Hampshire Department of Safety to support Operation Streetsweeper.

A $973,900 earmark to allow the Utah State Olympic Public Safety Command to continue to develop and support a public safety master plan for the 2002 Winter Olympics.

$400,000 is earmarked for the Western Missouri Public Safety Training Institute for classroom and training equipment to facilitate the training of public safety officers.

$1,000,000 for the Nevada National Judicial College.

$2,000,000 for the Alaska Native Justice Center.

$800,000 is earmarked for the San Bernardino, CA, Night Light Program to provide five probation officers and five police officers 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

$250,000 to Gallantin County, Montana, for the planning and needs assessment for a new detention facility;

$3,000,000 for the National Center for Innovation at the University of Mississippi School of Law to sponsor research and produce judicial education seminars and training.

An earmark of $1,200,000 to the Haymarket Center's Alternatives to Incarceration Program, Chicago, Illinois.

$330,000 to the city of Oakland, California, for Project Exile.

$50,000,000 for the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, to include a pilot program for Internet education directed toward the states of Alaska, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and Arizona.

Report language indicating that the Office of Justice Programs should consider the needs of the Wapka Sica Historical Society of South Dakota and award a grant, if warranted.

$350,000 to establish the Sarpy County Drug Treatment Court in Nebraska.

$500,000 to the Family Protection Unit in Oceanside, California.

$290,000 to the Alaska Family Violence Project.

$1,750,000 is earmarked for the Las Vegas victims of domestic violence program.

$250,000 for the Legal Aid Society of Hawaii Navigator Project.

An earmark of $7,500,000 to the Utah Communications Agency Network for enhancements and upgrades of security and communications infrastructure to assist with the law enforcement needs arising from the 2002 Winter Olympics;

$7,500,000 to the Utah Communications Agency Network (UCAN) for enhancements and upgrades of security and communications infrastructure to assist with the law enforcement needs arising from the 2002 Winter Olympics.

$2,500,000 to the Missouri State Court Administrator for the Juvenile Justice Information System to enhance communication and collaboration between juvenile courts, law enforcement, schools, and other agencies.

$550,000 to the City of Santa Monica's automated Mobile Field Reporting System to place new computers in patrol cars.

$1,200,000 to Yellowstone County, Montana, to place Mobile Data Systems in patrol cars.

$650,000 to Yellowstone County, Montana, for a driving simulator to assist them with law enforcement driver training needs.

$1,333,200 to the city of Jackson, Mississippi, for public safety and automated systems.

$60,000 for Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi, for public safety and automated system technologies to improve campus law enforcement security.

$10,000,000 for the South Dakota Bureau of Information and Telecommunications to enhance their emergency communication system.

$2,000,000 to the Alameda County, California, Sheriff's Department for a regionwide voice communications system.

$2,500,000 for the North Carolina Criminal Justice Information Network to implement J-Net.

$390,112 to Racine County, Wisconsin, for a countywide integrated Computer Aided Dispatch management system and mobile data computer system.

$200,000 to the Vermont Department of Public Safety for a mobile command center.

$350,000 to the Birmingham, Alabama, Police Department for a mobile emergency command unit.

$1,000,000 to Fairbanks, Alaska, for police radios and telecommunications equipment.

$90,000 to Fairbanks, Alaska, for thermal imaging helmet mounted rescue goggles.

$200,000 for Mobile Data Computer System in Logan, Utah.

$106,980 for public safety and automated system technologies, Ocean Springs, Mississippi.

$3,000,000 to the Low Country Tri-County Police initiative.

$350,000 to the Union County, SC, Sheriff's Office for technology upgrades.

$430,000 to the Greenwood County, SC, Sheriff's Office for technology upgrades.

$1,500,000 to the St. Johnsbury, Rutland, and Burlington, VT, technology programs.

$6,000,000 to the Vermont Public Safety Communications Program.

$400,000 to the Kauai County Police Department in Hawaii, to enhance their emergency communications systems.

$400,000 to the Maui County Police Department in Hawaii, to enhance their emergency communications systems.

$110,000 for the Scotts Bluff Emergency Response System.

$2,000,000 for the Rock County Law Enforcement Consortium.

$100,000 for Mineral County, Nevada, technology program.

$28,000 for Nenana, Alaska's, mobile video and communications equipment.

$500,000 to the New Jersey State police for new firearms.

$2,000,000 to the Seattle Police Technology Program.

$2,000,000 to the South Dakota Training Center [LET] for technology upgrades.

$9,000,000 to the Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information Systems [SWBSADIS] for technology upgrades.

$3,000,000 to the New Hampshire State Police VHF trunked digital radio system; and

An earmark of $1,700,000 for the Circle of Nations, North Dakota, Juvenile Detention Center to serve high risk American Indian youth.

Report language recommending that the Office of Justice Programs provide a $2,000,000 grant to Marshall University Forensic Science Program; $5,000,000 to the West Virginia University Forensic Identification Program; $500,000 for the Southeast Missouri Crime Laboratory; $660,760 to the Wisconsin Laboratory to upgrade DNA technology and training; $1,250,000 for Alaska's crime identification program; $1,200,000 to the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division to update their forensic laboratory.

$6,000,000 is earmarked for the Midwest (Missouri) Methamphetamine Initiative to train local and state law enforcement officers on the proper recognition, collection, removal, and destruction of methamphetamine.

$1,200,000 for the Iowa methamphetamine law enforcement initiative.

$1,000,000 for the Rocky Mountain, Colorado, Methamphetamine Initiative.

$1,000,000 for the Illinois State Police to combat methamphetamine and to train officers in those types of investigations.

$1,000,000 for the Western Wisconsin Methamphetamine Law Enforcement Initiative.

$1,000,000 for the Northern Utah Methamphetamine Initiative.

$525,000 is earmarked for the Nebraska Clandestine Laboratory Team.

$1,000,000 to the Las Vegas Special Police Enforcement and Eradication Program to be equally divided between the Las Vegas Police Department and the North Las Vegas Police Department.

$50,000 for the Grass Valley Methamphetamine Initiative.

A $1,000,000 earmark for the Arizona methamphetamine initiative.

Report language directing the Office of Justice Programs to review requests from Washington State and award grants if warranted.

Report language directing the Weed and Seed Office to provide $600,000 to the Kids With a Promise Program, Bushkill, PA and $300,000 to the Gospel Rescue Ministries.

A $3,500,000 earmark for the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence.

$2,000,000 to expand the Milwaukee Safe and Sound Program to other Wisconsin cities such as Green Bay and Eu Claire.

$1,000,000 through the University of Montana to create a juvenile after-school program based on the study of Northwest Native Americans in relation to the Lewis and Clark expedition.

$750,000 is earmarked for the Rio Arriba County, New Mexico, After School Program.

$200,000 for an evaluation of the Vermont SAFE–T and Colchester Community Youth Project.

$200,000 for the Vermont Association of Court Diversion Programs to help prevent and treat teen alcohol abuse.

Report language directing the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to provide $1,000,000 to Utah State University for a pilot mentoring program that focuses on the entire family and $1,000,000 to the Tom Osborne Mentoring Program.

$1,000,000 to the Sam Houston State University and Mothers Against Drunk Driving to establish a National Institute for Victims Studies.

$165,000 to the Inglewood California, Graffiti Removal Project to combat and clean up graffiti in the Inglewood schools.

$500,000 to the San Bernardino County, California, Home Run Program for five probation officers to be placed in schools.

$540,767 to the Milwaukee Public Schools Summer Stars Program.

$425,000 is earmarked for the Montana Juvenile Justice System Teleconferencing Equipment.

$500,000 for the University of Louisville School Safety Project.

$250,000 for the Alaska Community in School Program.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES

$117,500,000 is earmarked for the National Technical Information Service's ''Construction of research facilities'' account, which includes $10,000,000 for a cooperative agreement with the Medical University of South Carolina and $10,000,000 for a cooperative agreement with Dartmouth College.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

National Ocean Service

Report earmarks the following projects:

$500,000 to continue the South Carolina geodetic survey.

$3,000,000 for the joint hydrographic center for the evaluation of innovative equipment and techniques for the acquisition of survey data at the University of New Hampshire.

$1,566,000 for a data survey of Naragansett Bay, RI to be conducted in conjunction with the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council.

$1,000,000 for the South Carolina Task Group on Toxic Algae for research and response activities.

$1,400,000 for the South Florida Ecosystem.

$100,000 above the request level for the Coastal Vulnerability Reduction Program for the Community Sustainability Center, in Charleston, SC.

$5,800,000 for the cooperative Institute for Coastal and Estuarine Environmental Technology (located at the Univ. Of New Hampshire—UNH not specified in report). p. 89.

$1,250,000 for a Pacific Coastal Services Center in Hawaii.

$2,000,000 for the Joint Institute for Coastal Habitat at Louisiana State University.

$2,000,000 for the National Coral Reef Institute and to continue Hawaiian coral reef monitoring and assessment by the University of Hawaii.

$6,825,000 for the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory (FY 99 appropriated level).

Report directs the Coastal Ocean Program (a NOAA office) to work with and continue its current levels of support for the Baruch Institute's (SC) research and monitoring of small, high-salinity estuaries.

National Marine Fisheries Service

The bill report earmarks the following projects:

$500,000 for the Hawaiian Community Development Program and fishery demonstration projects for native fisheries development.

$3,000,000 for PACFIN, the Pacific fishery information network, and directs that Hawaii receive an appropriate share of PACFIN resources. (same level as FY 99)

$3,000,000 for AKFIN, the new Alaskan fishery information network. (A new line item)

$3,900,000 for RecFIN, the recreational fishery information network program. Report further directs that the Pacific, Atlantic, and Gulf States each receive one-third of these funds with funding for inshore recreational species assessment and tagging efforts in South Carolina.

$2,400,000 for continued operations of the NOAA vessel the Gordon Gunter, homeported in Mississippi.

$250,000 for the harvest technology unit of the National Warmwater Aquaculture Research Center at Stoneville.

For information collection and analyses resource information programs:

$3,500,000 for implementation of the Magnuson-Stevens Act off the coast of Alaska;

$2,500,000 for the Gulf of Mexico Stock enhancement consortium;

$500,000 for the Hawaii stock enhancement plan;

$300,000 for Hawaiian sea turtles;

$200,000 to conduct sampling of lobster population in State waters in New England;

$400,000 to continue research on shrimp pathogens in the southeastern U.S.;

$300,000 to continue a study of the status and trends of southeastern sea turtles;

$300,000 for research on the Charleston bump, an offshore bottom feature which attracts large numbers of fish;

$1,500,000 for the Chesapeake Bay multispecies management strategy;

$1,050,000 for Hawaiian monk seals.

$1,000,000 for the Xiphophorus Genetic Stock Center at Southwest Texas State University for fish genetics and evolution;

$1,500,000 for Chesapeake oyster research.

$6,325,000 for Alaska groundfish monitoring, including $300,000 for the Berin Sea Fisherman's Association, $225,000 for the Gulf of Alaska Coastal Communities Coalition.

$1,250,000 for the State of Alaska to develop commercial fisheries near shore, including dive fisheries fur urchins, and groundfish fisheries for cod, rockfish, skates, and dogfish.

$4,000,000 for Stellar sea lion recovery off of Alaska, including $1,100,000, for the State of Alaska, $1,000,000 for the Alaska SeaLife Center, and $800,000 for the North Pacific Marine Mammal Consortium.

an $800,000 increase over the FY 99 appropriated level of $700,000 for the Yukon River Drainage Fisheries Association for habitat restoration and monitoring projects.

$200,000 for the Northeast Fisheries Science Center for the Virginia Institute for Marine Science to begin participation in the Cooperative Marine Education and Research Program.

$850,000 to continue the Marine Resources Monitoring Assessment and Prediction Program carried out by the South Carolina Division of Marine Resources.

$2,000,000 for maintenance of the Sandy Hook, NJ NMFS facility lease.

$300,000 for maintenance of the Santa Cruz Lab.

$1,500,000 for maintenance of the Kodiak facility.

Report earmarks funding for the following commissions in Alaska:

$400,000 for the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission

$250,000 for the Beluga Whale Committee

$100,000 for Bristol Bay Native Association

$200,000 for Aleut Marine Mammal Commission

Report earmarks the following:

$500,000 for swordfish research at the NMFS Honolulu laboratory.

$6,000,000 for the implementation of the American Fisheries Act, including $750,000 for the State of Alaska (a $20 million taxpayer funded fishing industry buy-out attached to the Omnibus bill last year)

$8,000,000 for NMFS to spend on the Gulf of Maine groundfish fishery (includes MA–NH–ME), including $2,820,000 for the Northeast Consortium to conduct cooperative research and development.

$800,000 to the State of Alaska to conduct harbor seal research.

$6,200,000 for California sea lions.

$250,000 for the State of Alaska for technical support of proposed salmon recovery plans.

$425,000 for the North Pacific Fishery Observer Training Center.

$750,000 for the Hawaiian Fisheries Development Program.

$300,000 for a New England Safe Seafood Program.

$300,000 for the Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation.

Oceanic and Atmospheric Research

Report earmarks the following projects:

$1,000,000 for Southeast Atlantic marine monitoring and prediction at the University of North Carolina;

$1,500,000 for a tsunami warning and environmental observatory at Shumigan Islands;

$1,200,000 for ballast water research and small boat portage zebra mussel dispersion problems in the Chesapeake Bay and Great Lakes, including Lake Champlain;

$250,000 for South Carolina Division of Marine Resources Research on Coastal Urbanization Impacts;

$240,000 for the Muskegon (MI) Lake Center;

$200,000 for the New England airshed pollution study;

$500,000 for the Gulf Coast Study on severe weather impacts;

$300,000 for the Lake Champlain study; and

$1,000,000 for the Gulf of Mexico oyster initiative.

NOAA Facilities

Report earmarks $10,000,000 for conversion of two surplus Navy Yard Torpedo Test vessels. One to be a replacement in Charleston, SC for the research vessel Farrel, and one to be located with and used by CICEET and the Joint Hydrography Center at the Univ. Of New Hampshire.

Procurement, Acquisition, and Construction

Report earmarks $14,500,000 for Alaska facilities (of which $1 million is for Juneau, $5 million is for Ship Creek, and $8.5 million is for SeaLife Center.)

THE JUDICIARY

An earmark of $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Consular Affairs Visa Office for planning, developing, and implementing and information technology solution, the Olympic Visa Issuance Database.

$100,000 for the Montana Tech. Foreign Exchange Program.

$1,000,000 for planning activities for the Paralympics and Winter OIympic Games to be held in 2002.

A $5,000,000 earmark for costs associated with hosting the World Trade Organization conference in Seattle, WA.

$9,353,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, which includes $8,724,000 for the sea lamprey operations and research program, of which not less than $200,000 shall be used to treat Lake Champlain.

$921,000 to replace an aerostat at Cudjoe Key, Florida that was decommissioned in June, 1998.

$10,000,000 for two rotatable transmitting antennas at the IBB transmitting site in Greenville, NC.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to address the funding for the Judicial Branch for fiscal year 2000. The Appropriations Committee that worked on this budget has done an outstanding job with limited resources and very demanding budget requests. Senators STEVENS, GREGG, BYRD, and HOLLINGS, and their staffs, are to be commended for doing a very difficult job in a professional manner that does credit to the Senate.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I have a special interest in this budget. And I agree with most of the Senate bill. The Senate bill fully funds compensation for judges. This is required by the Constitution.

The Senate bill fully funds judges' staffs. This is appropriate because judges cannot operate without their law clerks and secretaries.

The Senate bill fully funds the rental costs of court facilities leased from the General Services Administration. This is appropriate because we must have courtrooms for judges and their staffs to work in.

Further, the Senate bill appropriately reduces funding for certain expenditure requests that were not critically needed.

However, the Senate bill underfunds court support staff and operating expenses for the circuit and district courts by a net 257 million dollars.

The Judiciary's budget request was for maintaining the current level of services by support staff. The support staff is needed to handle high levels of criminal cases, bankruptcy cases, pretrial services, and supervised release services. These duties are not going away. The Judiciary is required by law to continue to address each of these areas. Moreover, I note that the Judiciary's budget request does not even take into account the increased workload that new legislation, like the Juvenile Crime Bill, will place on the federal courts.

The Judiciary cannot maintain the current level of services in the Courts of Appeal and District Courts without some portion of the 257 million dollar shortfall being replaced.

I request that over the next few months we work together to provide the Judiciary with additional funding for support staff on the Courts of Appeal and the District Courts.

I am also concerned about a deeper problem that exists with the budget process for the Judiciary.

Current law requires the Executive Branch to submit the Judiciary's annual budget request to Congress ''without change.'' Nonetheless, the Administration's Office of Management and Budget indirectly decreases the Judiciary's budget request through the use of negative allowances.

The Judicial Branch should be required to be responsible in its budget requests, and I believe they are. But, the Judicial Branch's budget should not be subject to reductions by the Executive Branch to fund the political priorities of the President. Current law prohibits such reductions, but the Administration does not follow this law. This is a systemic problem that I hope we can address in the future along with the Judiciary's current-year budget needs.

As legislators, it is our duty under Article I of the Constitution to provide sufficient funds so that the federal courts established under Article III of the Constitution are effective and federal law is upheld. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address these issues in the next few months.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to thank Senator GREGG, the Chairman of the Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations Committee, as well as Senator HOLLINGS, for their full support of the Crime Identification Technology Act in this appropriations bill. Their support represents a strong commitment to anti-crime measures that really work to reduce crime.

This Act is a bipartisan law that Congress passed unanimously last year. The Crime Identification Technology Act is based on the recognition that technology is the key to the future of police work. We can no longer continue to ask law enforcement to fight increasingly mobile and sophisticated criminals with outmoded twentieth-century Technology.

The Crime Identification Technology Act will help state and local justice systems update and integrate their anti-crime technology systems and support their overburdened forensic crime laboratories. CITA authorizes $250 million to states and local governments each year, for five years, for crime technology. This effort is fully funded in this appropriation bill.

State and local governments are at a crucial juncture in the development and integration of their criminal justice technology. This bill provides for system integration, permitting all components of the criminal justice system to share information and communicate more effectively, on a real-time basis.

This is one of the wisest investments we could possibly make. I would like to emphasize three reasons for this. First, crime technology, in itself, is crucial to making significant reductions in the crime rates in our communities. Second, we can use this opportunity to leverage the Federal Government's investments in national anti-crime systems that require state participation, such as the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System, the National Criminal Information Center 2000, and the National Integrated Ballistics Information Network. We have literally invested billions of dollars in national systems. That is a key reason why so many organizations have applauded the appropriators' support of anti-crime technology, including the International Association of Police Chiefs, National Governor's Association, National League of Cities, American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, and our states' information repository directors in the National Consortium of Justice & Information Statistics.

Third, but certainly not last, there is a tremendous need to consolidate the patchwork of Federal programs, which have funded specific areas of anti-crime technology to the exclusion of others. A recent GAO report identified more than $1.2 billion in direct and indirect support to state and local governments; however, the absence of coordination and integration of both systems and funding means that if we continue the current system of disparate funding streams, there will never be enough money or integration. Too many existing Federal programs mandate specific technology spending, instead of allowing states the flexibility to meet their respective anti-crime technology needs within the type of broad framework which the Crime Identification Technology Act. CITA offers a dedicated, coordinated stream of funding to help states develop and upgrade their anti-crime technology from the patchwork of existing programs, and utilize the technical assistance of agencies who have developed technological expertise. I believe that this will greatly increase accountability and efficiency.

The bottom line for me, based on my more than 25 years in law enforcement, is that fully employing our anti-crime technology today will help law enforcement solve more crime, more rapidly, and pursue increasingly sophisticated, mobile criminals.

Again, I want to thank Chairman GREGG, and Senator LEAHY and Senator HATCH for their strong support of the Crime Identification Technology Act and its appropriation. I would also like to extend my personal thanks to Senator GREGG's staff, particularly Jim Morhard and Eric Harnschteger for making the best of a very difficult funding situation.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today along with Senator SNOWE to voice my deep concerns regarding the substantial cut to the economic Development Administration's Fiscal Year 2000 budget. The FY 2000 Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill being considered by the Senate cuts EDA's budget by $164.1 million—from $392.4 million in FY 1999 to $228.3 million for FY 2000. This represents a

42 percent cut. Clearly, this reduction will have a dramatic affect on the EDA's ability to serve distressed rural and urban communities in states like Arkansas, New Hampshire, Maine, Alaska, New Mexico, Kentucky, and Colorado.

My colleagues will remember that last November we passed the Economic Development Administration Reform Act of 1998. In response, the EDA has become a more efficient and effective agency by reducing regulations by 60 percent; they have trimmed the period of processing applications to 60 days; and they are now requiring applicants to demonstrate both eligibility and need at the time of application. I firmly believe that these achievements will only strengthen the EDA's history of providing critical assistance to distressed areas.

In its 34 years of service to Americans, the EDA has created 2.9 million private sector jobs; investing $16.8 billion in distressed communities. Currently, every $1 invested by the EDA generates $3 in outside investment. With an administrative overhead of less than 8%, more Americans in economically distressed areas benefit from their tax dollars.

This is good news for my home state. As a rural state with many economically distressed communities, Arkansas relies heavily on the EDA and their invaluable services. Sam Spearman, who heads EDA in Arkansas, is a true servant and a great asset to my constituents. From the tornadoes that tore through northeast and central Arkansas this January, to the Levi-Strauss and Arrow Automotive closing in Morrilton, Arkansas, the EDA is helping communities stay alive. To help grow the economies in some depressed areas, the EDA has been assisting in planning and developing intermodal facilities in Marion and West Memphis.

My state was not immune to BRAC in the early 1990s. A Strategic Air Command bomber base in Blytheville and an Army training facility in Fort Smith were closed. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am happy to report to my colleagues that both communities are slowly recovering, but not without ongoing assistance from EDA.

Again, last November we passed legislation to restructure and reform the EDA. I believe that they have responded well to Congressional direction, however, reducing their funding by 42% greatly limits their ability to implement the changes we thought were necessary. I thank my colleagues and hope that they will support increasing funding to EDA in FY 2000.

CALLING OF THE BANKROLL

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I promised that from time to time when I participate in debates on legislation I would point out the role of special interest money in our legislative process, an effort I have entitled the Calling of the Bankroll. When I Call the Bankroll I will describe how much money the various interests lobbying on a particular bill have spent on campaign contributions to influence our decisions here in this chamber.

Of course I embarked on this effort with the hope of exposing the corruption of our current campaign finance system, and in particular how wealthy donors exploit the soft money loophole.

When I began this effort, I never worried that I would lack for opportunities to Call the Bankroll, and as I've demonstrated over the past few months, there are countless opportunities to Call the Bankroll about efforts to influence legislation before this body.

For example, so far I have talked about the contributions of special interests working to influence the debate over the Patients' Bill of Rights, I have discussed the contributions of the high tech industry and trial lawyers lobby during debate on the Y2K legislation, and I have pointed out the contributions of gun makers and gun control advocates during the juvenile justice debate, just to name a few.

And now we have before this body the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill.

During his state of the union address last January, the President called for the Justice Department to prepare a ''litigation plan'' against the tobacco companies to reclaim hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars spent through federal health-care programs such as Medicare to treat smoking-related illnesses.

But this bill does something quite different. The language in the committee report on the Commerce, State, Justice Bill attempts to grant immunity to the tobacco industry from any federal litigation. Instead of a litigation plan, this bill would create a protection plan for the tobacco companies.

I hope my colleagues in this body would agree that the Justice Department must be able to pursue litigation based on the law, and that we should do everything in our power to enable the department to enforce the law.

But the language currently in the committee report prevents the Justice Department from enforcing the law. So instead of a huge federal lawsuit, the tobacco industry will have immunity from federal litigation. It looks like the tobacco companies have really gotten what they wanted in this bill, Mr. President.

It's a fortunate turn of events for the tobacco companies, but based on the tobacco industry's track record of political donations and political clout, I can't say that it's surprising.

The nation's tobacco companies are some of the most generous political donors around today, Mr. President, including Philip Morris, which reigns as the largest single soft money donor of all time. During the 1997–1998 election cycle the tobacco companies, including Philip Morris, RJR Nabisco, Brown and Williamson, US Tobacco and the industry's lobbying arm, the Tobacco Institute, gave a combined $5.5 million dollars in soft money to the parties, and another $2.3 million in PAC money contributions to candidates.

I offer this information to my colleagues and to the public to paint a clearer picture of who is trying to influence the bill before us, and how they are using the campaign finance system—very successfully, I might add—to get what they want from this bill and this Congress.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1217, the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations Bill for 2000.

This bill provides new budget authority of $34 billion and new outlays of $23.1 billion to finance the programs of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and the federal judiciary.

I congratulate the Chairman and Ranking Member for producing a bill that complies with the Subcommittee's 302(b) allocation. This is one of the most difficult bills to manage with its varied programs and challenging allocation, but I think the bill meets most of the demands made of it while not exceeding its budget. So I commend my friend, the chairman, for his efforts and leadership.

When outlays from prior-year BA and other adjustments are taken into account, the bill totals $34.1 billion in BA and $34 billion in outlays. For general purpose activities as well as crime funding, the bill is at the Senate subcommittee's 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

I ask members of the Senate to refrain from offering amendments which would cause the subcommittee to exceed its budget allocation and urge the speedy adoption of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1217, COMMERCE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000—SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars]

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-Reported Bill:				
Budget authority	29,460	4,150	523	34,133
Outlays	28,214	5,271	529	34,014
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	29,460	4,150	523	34,133
Outlays	28,214	5,271	529	34,014
1999 level:				
Budget authority	27,165	5,509	523	33,197
Outlays	26,364	4,369	529	31,262
President's request:				
Budget authority	32,347	4,216	523	37,086
Outlays	31,327	4,538	529	36,394
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
1999 level:				
Budget authority	2,295	(1,359)	.....	936
Outlays	1,850	902	.....	2,752
President's request:				
Budget authority	(2,887)	(66)	.....	(2,953)
Outlays	(3,113)	733	.....	(2,380)