

something to be proud of and could play a positive role in facilitating positive change in Yugoslavia. That S.720 has remained stuck in the House is unfortunate, but the message that it sent merely by its introduction was powerful. We cannot selectively stand for freedom and should not be ashamed that it provides the moral foundation of our foreign policy. Ongoing events in Serbia illustrate vividly the intense desire for democracy in Serbia and the United States should not hesitate to state its strong support for the election of Vojislav Kostunica and for the forces of change in Yugoslavia.

The Balkan powderkeg is facing its most promising period of change since the end of the Cold War. We should not be idle witnesses to that change. I urge the House to speak forcefully on this issue by passing the Serbia Democratization Act at once. The symbolism of U.S. support for democratic change will not play into the hands of a discredited regime in its death throes. On the contrary, it will tell the people of Yugoslavia that we stand with them on the verge of a new era.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4578, the Department of the Interior appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4578, the Interior appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 265 Leg.]

Abraham	Baucus	Bingaman
Akaka	Bayh	Bond
Allard	Bennett	Boxer
Ashcroft	Biden	Brownback

Bryan	Hagel	Murray
Bunning	Harkin	Nickles
Burns	Hatch	Reed
Byrd	Helms	Reid
Campbell	Hollings	Robb
Chafee, L.	Hutchinson	Roberts
Cleland	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Cochran	Inouye	Roth
Collins	Johnson	Santorum
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Craig	Kerrey	Schumer
Crapo	Kerry	Sessions
Daschle	Kohl	Shelby
DeWine	Kyl	Smith (OR)
Dodd	Lautenberg	Snowe
Domenici	Leahy	Specter
Dorgan	Levin	Stevens
Durbin	Lincoln	Thomas
Edwards	Lott	Thompson
Enzi	Lugar	Thurmond
Frist	Mack	Torricelli
Gorton	McConnell	Voinovich
Gramm	Mikulski	Warner
Grams	Miller	Wellstone
Grassley	Moynihan	Wyden
Gregg	Murkowski	

#### NAYS—8

Breaux	Graham	McCain
Feingold	Inhofe	Smith
Fitzgerald	Landrieu	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Jeffords	Lieberman
-----------	----------	-----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 89, the nays are 8. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Presiding Officer state what the order of business is now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a time limit on the conference report, 10 minutes equally divided between the two managers, 10 minutes equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, 30 minutes under the control of Senator LANDRIEU, and 15 minutes under the control of Senator MCCAIN.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the unauthorized and unrequested earmarks, earmarks added in conference, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS IN H.R. 4578, CONFERENCE REPORT FOR FY 2001, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

##### Bill Language

Additional \$1,762,000 for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96-487.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 provided to local governments in southern California for planning associated with the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program.

Earmark of \$1,607,000 for security enhancements in Washington, D.C.

Earmark of \$1,595,000 for the acquisition of interests in Ferry Farm, George Washington's Boyhood Home and for management of the home.

An additional \$5,000,000 for Save America's Treasures for various locale-specific projects.

Earmark of \$650,000 for Lake Champlain National Historic Landmarks.

Earmark of \$300,000 for the Kendall County Courthouse.

Earmark of \$365,000 for the U.S. Grant Boyhood Home National Historic Landmark which should be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 of the total of the grants made available to the State of Maryland under Title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 if the amount is set aside in an acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund established under a State law.

Earmark of \$300,000 shall be for a grant to Alaska Pacific University for the development of an ANILCA training curriculum.

Provision stating that none of the funds in this Act may be used to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in the Kankakee River basin that is inconsistent with the United States Army Corps of Engineers' efforts to control flooding and siltation in that area.

Provision stating that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall designate Anchorage, Alaska, as a port of entry for the purpose of section 9(f)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Provision stating that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to Harvey R. Redmond of Girdwood, Alaska, at no cost, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to United States Survey No. 12192, Alaska, consisting of 49.96 acres located in the vicinity of T. 9N., R., 3E., Seward Meridian, Alaska.

Provision which requires a land exchange regarding the Mississippi River Wildlife and Fish refuge.

Provision which authorizes a land exchange in Washington between the Fish and Wildlife Service and Othello Housing Authority.

Provision which authorizes the establishment of the First Ladies National Historic Site in Canton, Ohio.

Provision which authorizes the Palace of Governors in New Mexico.

Provision which authorizes the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission.

Provision which redesignates the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area as a National Park.

Provision which authorizes the Wheeling National Heritage Area in West Virginia.

Earmark of \$500,000 to be available for law enforcement purposes on the Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests.

Earmark of \$990,000 for the purpose of implementing the Valles Caldera Preservation Act, which shall be available to the Secretary for the management of the Valles Caldera National Preserve, New Mexico.

Earmark of \$5,000,000 to be allocated to the Alaska Region, in addition to its normal allocation for the purposes of preparing additional timber for sale, to establish a 3-year timber supply and such funds may be transferred to other appropriations accounts as necessary to maximize accomplishment.

Earmark of \$700,000 shall be provided to the State of Alaska for monitoring activities at Forest Service log transfer facilities, in the form of an advance, direct lump sum payment.

Earmark of \$5,000,000 is appropriated and shall be deposited into the Southeast Alaska Economic Disaster Fund without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation. The Secretary of Agriculture shall distribute these funds to the City of Craig in fiscal year 2001.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 80 percent of the funds appropriated to

the Forest Service in the National Forest System' and 'Capital Improvement and Maintenance' accounts and planned to be allocated to activities under the 'Jobs in the Woods' program for projects on National Forest land in the State of Washington may be granted directly to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife for accomplishment of planned projects.

Language stating that funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.

Language stating that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as appropriate with the Pinchot Institute for Conservation, as well as with public and other private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals, to provide for the development, administration, maintenance, or restoration of land, facilities, or Forest Service programs, at the Grey Towers National Historic Landmark.

Language stating that funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available, as determined by the Secretary, for payments to Del Norte County, California.

Earmark of \$5,000,000 to be designated by the Indian Health Service as a contribution to the Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation (YKHC) to start a priority project for the acquisition of land, planning, design and construction of 79 staff quarters at Bethel, Alaska, subject to a negotiated project agreement between the YKHC and the Indian Health Service.

Provision stating that notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2001 the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior are authorized to limit competition for watershed restoration project contracts as part of the 'Jobs in the Woods' component of the President's Forest Plan for the Pacific Northwest or the Jobs in the Woods Program established in Region 10 of the Forest Service to individuals and entities in historically timber-dependent areas in the States of Washington, Oregon, northern California and Alaska that have been affected by reduced timber harvesting on Federal lands.

Provision which continues a provision regulating the export of Western Red Cedar from National Forest System Lands in Alaska.

Provision which continues to limit mining and prospecting on the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri.

Provision limiting competition for fire and fuel treatment and watershed restoration contracts in California.

Provision that amends the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act to expedite the acquisition of critical lands within the NSA dealing with land appraisal assumptions utilized by the Forest Service to acquire land within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.

Provision that adds the "Boise Laboratory Replacement Act of 2000" that permits the sale of the Forest Service Boise, ID, laboratory site, occupied by the Rocky Mountain Research Station, and the use of the proceeds to purchase interests in a multi-agency facility at the University of Idaho.

#### *Conference Report Language*

##### *Bureau of Land Management*

Earmark of \$500,000 for Montana State University weed program.

Earmark of \$750,000 for Idaho weed control.  
Earmark of \$900,000 for Yukon River salmon.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for Missouri River activities associated with the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial celebration.

Earmark of \$500,000 for the Missouri River undaunted stewardship program.

Earmark of \$700,000 for the development of a mining claim information system in Alaska.

Earmark of \$500,000 for a coalbed methane EIS in Montana.

Earmark of \$650,000 for the Montana cadastral project.

Earmark of \$300,000 for the Utah geographic reference project.

Earmark of \$2,400,000 for Alaska conveyance.

Earmark of \$500,000 to prepare an EIS for future coal bed methane and conventional oil and gas development in the Montana portion of the Power River Basin.

Earmark of \$500,000 for the Undaunted Stewardship program, which will allow for local input and participation in grants to protect historic sites along the Lewis and Clark Trail. This program is to be cooperatively administered by the Bureau and Montana State University.

Language which encourages the Bureau to work with the Waste Management Education and Research Consortium (WERC) at New Mexico State University in addressing the problem of abandoned mine sites in the western United States.

Earmark of \$482,000 for an Alaska rural fire suppression program (Wildland fire management).

Earmark of \$482,000 for a rural Alaska fire suppression program. (Wildland fire suppression).

Earmark of \$8,800,000 is to be made available to the Ecological Restoration Institute (ERI) of Northern Arizona University, through a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Land Management, to support new and existing ecologically-based forest restoration activities in ponderosa pine forests.

Earmark of \$3,760,000 for construction at the Coldfoot Visitor Center.

Earmark of \$400,000 for construction at the Fort Benton Visitor Center.

Earmark of \$200,000 for construction at the California Train Interpretive Center.

Earmark of \$500,000 for construction at the Blackwell Island Facility.

Language which encourages the Bureau to work with the town of Escalante and Garfield County, UT to ensure that the construction of the science center is consistent with the Escalante Center master plan.

Earmark of \$5,000,000 for land acquisition in El Dorado County, CA.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for land acquisition at Organ Mountains, New Mexico.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for land acquisition for Upper Crab Creek, Washington.

##### *Fish and Wildlife Service*

Earmark of \$2,000 for Everglades for resource management.

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for cold water fish in Montana and Idaho.

Earmark of \$270,000 for the California/Nevada desert resource initiative.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for Central Valley and Southern California habitat conservation planning.

Earmark of \$500,000 for bighorn sheep conservation in Nevada.

Increases in the recovery program include \$5,000,000 for matching grants for Pacific salmon conservation and restoration in Washington.

Earmark of \$288,000 for wolf recovery in Idaho.

Earmark of \$100,000 for wolf monitoring by the Nez Perce tribe.

Earmark of \$600,000 for eider research at the Alaska SeaLife Center.

Earmark of \$600,000 for Lahontan cutthroat trout restoration.

Earmark of \$500,000 for the black capped vireo in Texas.

Increase of \$1,400,000 for Washington salmon enhancement.

Increase of \$4,000 for bull trout recovery in Washington.

Increase of \$500,000 for private lands conservation efforts in Hawaii.

Increase of \$50,000 for rehabilitation of the White River in Indiana in response to a recent fish kill.

Increase of \$252,000 in project planning for the Middle Rio Grande Bosque program.

Increase of \$350,000 for Long Live the Kings and Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group.

Increase of \$575,000 to reduce sea bird bycatch in Alaska.

Increase of \$360,000 for staffing and operations associated with the new port of entry designation in Anchorage, Alaska.

Increase of \$5,000,000 for the Washington Hatchery Improvement Project.

Increase of \$184,000 for marking of hatchery salmon in Washington.

Earmark of \$11,051,000 for the Alaska subsistence program.

Earmark of \$750,000 for the Klamath River flow study.

Earmark of \$500,000 for Trinity River restoration.

Earmark of \$200,000 for Yukon River fisheries management studies.

Earmark of \$100,000 for Yukon River Salmon Treaty education efforts.

Increase of \$2,000,000 for Pingree Forest non-development easements in Maine to be handled through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

The increase provided in consultation for cold water fish in Montana and Idaho are for preparation and implementation of plans, programs, or agreements identified by the States of Idaho and Montana that will address habitat for freshwater aquatic species on non-Federal lands.

Earmark of \$800,000 in new joint ventures funding for the Atlantic Coast.

Earmark of \$750,000 in new joint ventures funding for Lower Mississippi.

Earmark of \$650,000 in new joint ventures funding for Upper Mississippi.

Earmark of \$1,400,000 in new joint ventures funding for Prairie Pothole.

Earmark of \$700,000 in new joint ventures funding for Gulf Coast.

Earmark of \$700,000 in new joint ventures funding for Playa Lakes.

Earmark of \$400,000 in new joint ventures funding for Rainwater Basin.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 in new joint ventures funding for Intermountain West.

Earmark of \$550,000 in new joint ventures funding for Central Valley.

Earmark of \$700,000 in new joint ventures funding for Pacific Coast.

Earmark of \$370,000 in new joint ventures funding for San Francisco Bay.

Earmark of \$400,000 in new joint ventures funding for Sonoran.

Earmark of \$370,000 in new joint ventures funding for Arctic Goose.

Earmark of \$370,000 in new joint ventures funding for Black Duck.

Earmark of \$550,000 in new joint ventures funding for Sea Duck.

Earmark of \$593,000 for Alaska Maritime NWR, AK (Headquarters/Visitor Center).

Earmark of \$500,000 for Bear River NWR, UT (Water management facilities).

Earmark of \$3,600,000 for Bear River NWR, UT (Education Center).

Earmark of \$350,000 for Canaan Valley NWR, WV (Heavy equipment replacement).

Earmark of \$500,000 for Clarks River NWR, KY (Garage and visitor access).

Earmark of \$250,000 for Great Dismal Swamp NWR, VA (Planning and public use).

Earmark of \$800,000 for John Heinz NWR, PA (Administrative wing).

Earmark of \$700,000 for Kealia Pond NWR, HI (Water control structures).

Earmark of \$180,000 for Kodiak NWR, AK (Visitor Center/planning).

Earmark of \$130,000 for Mason Neck NWR, VA (ADA accessibility).

Earmark of \$600,000 for Mason Neck NWR, VA (Non-motorized trail).

Additional \$5,000,000 for National Conservation Training Center, WV (Fourth Dormitory).

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for Noxubee NWR, MS (Visitor Center).

Earmark of \$300,000 for Pittsford NFH, VT (Planning and design/hatchery rehabilitation).

Earmark of \$115,000 for Seatuck & Sayville NWRs, NY (Visitor facilities).

Earmark of \$1,512,000 for Silvio O. Conte NWR, VT (Education Center).

Earmark of \$1,100,000 for White River NWR, AR (Visitor Center construction).

Earmark of \$350,000 for White Sulphur Springs NFH, WV (Holding and propagation).

Earmark of \$200,000 for White Sulphur Springs NFH, WV (Office renovations).

Earmark of \$500,000 for land acquisition at Back Bay NWR (VA).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for land acquisition for Big Muddy NWR (MO).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for land acquisition for Bon Secour NWR (AL).

Earmark of \$1,750,000 for land acquisition for Centennial Valley NWR (MT).

Earmark of \$500,000 for land acquisition for Clarks River NWR (KY).

Earmark of \$2,100,000 for land acquisition for Dakota Tallgrass Prairie Project (SD).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for land acquisition for Edwin B. Forsythe NWR (NJ).

Earmark of \$1,150,000 for land acquisition for Grand Bay NWR (AL).

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for land acquisition for Lake Umbagog NWR (NH).

Earmark of \$500,000 for land acquisition for Minnesota Valley NWR (MN).

Earmark of \$600,000 for land acquisition for Neal Smith NWR (IA).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for land acquisition for Northern Tallgrass NWR (MN).

Earmark of \$800,000 for land acquisition for Patoka River NWR (IN).

Earmark of \$1,300,000 for land acquisition for Prime Hook NWR (DE).

Earmark of \$750,000 for land acquisition for Silvio O. Conte NWR (CT/MA/NH/VT).

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for land acquisition for Stewart B. McKinney NWR (CT).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for land acquisition for Waccamaw NWR (SC).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for land acquisition for Walkill River (NJ).

#### *National Park Service*

Earmark of \$975,000 for the 9 National Trails.

Increase of \$2,300,000 for Harpers Ferry Design Center.

Earmark of \$350,000 to repair the lighthouse at Fire Island NS.

Earmark of \$75,000 to repair the Ocean Beach Pavilion at Fire Island, NS.

Earmark of \$309,000 for repairs of the Bachlott House.

Earmark of \$100,000 for the Alberty House which are both located at Cumberland Island NS.

Earmark of \$500,000 for maintenance projects at the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Park.

Earmark of \$200,000 for a wilderness study at Apostle Islands NL, WI.

Language that directs the National Park Service make sufficient funds available to assure that signs marking the Lewis and Clark route in the State of North Dakota are adequate to meet National Park Service standards.

Language that directs that, within the amounts provided for operation of the Na-

tional Park System, the Service shall provide the necessary funds, not to exceed \$350,000, for the Federal share of the cooperative effort to provide emergency medical services in the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

Language stating that consideration should be given to groups involved in hiking and biking trails in southeastern Michigan and the Service is encouraged to work cooperatively with groups in this area.

Increase of \$100,000 for Gettysburg NMP technical assistance.

Increase of \$250,000 for the National Center for Preservation Technology.

Language that directs that implementation funds for the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area are contingent upon National Park Service approval of the management and interpretive plans that are currently being developed.

Earmark of \$742,000 for Alaska Native Cultural Center.

Earmark of \$100,000 for Aleutian World War II National Historic Area.

Earmark of \$2,300,000 for Chesapeake Bay Gateways.

Earmark of \$300,000 for Dayton Aviation Heritage Commission.

Earmark of \$2,250,000 for Four Corners Interpretive Center.

Earmark of \$500,000 for Lamprey River.

Earmark of \$500,000 for Mandan On-a-Slant Village.

Earmark of \$500,000 for National First Ladies Library.

Additional \$40,000 for Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission.

Earmark of \$500,000 for Route 66 National Historic Highway.

Earmark of \$495,000 for Sewall-Belmont House.

Earmark of \$400,000 for Vancouver National Historic Reserve.

Earmark of \$594,000 for Wheeling National Heritage Area.

Earmark of \$100,000 for Women's Progress Commission.

An additional \$7,276,000 for various locale-specific Historic Preservation projects.

Earmark of \$500,000 for Antietam NB, MD (stabilize/restore battlefield structures).

Earmark of \$1,360,000 for Apostle Islands NL, WI (erosion control).

Additional \$600,000 for Apostle Islands NL, WI (rehab Outer Island lighthouse).

Earmark of \$300,000 for Canaveral NS, FL (Seminole Rest).

Earmark of \$300,000 for Canaveral NS, FL.

Earmark of \$4,000,000 for Corinth NB, MS (construct visitor center).

Earmark of \$779,000 for Cumberland Island NS, GA (St. Mary's visitor center).

Additional \$1,000,000 for Cuyahoga NRA, OH (stabilize riverbank).

Earmark of \$1,300,000 for Dayton Aviation NHP, OH (east exhibits).

Earmark of \$114,000 for Delaware Water Gap NRA, PA/NJ (Depew site).

Earmark of \$350,000 for Down East Heritage Center, ME.

Earmark of \$500,000 for Dry Tortugas NP, FL (stabilize and restore fort).

Earmark of \$129,000 for Edison NHS, NJ (preserve historic buildings and museum collections).

Earmark of \$1,175,000 for Edison NHS, NJ.

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for Ft. Stanwix NM, NY (completes rehabilitation).

Earmark of \$386,000 for Ft. Washington Park, MD (repair masonry wall).

Earmark of \$300,000 for Gateway NRA, NY/NJ (preservation of artifacts at Sandy Hook unit).

Earmark of \$100,000 for George Washington Memorial Parkway, MD/VA (Belle Haven).

Earmark of \$300,000 for George Washington Memorial Parkway, MD/VA (Mt. Vernon trail).

Earmark of \$511,000 for Grand Portage NM, MN (heritage center).

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for Hispanic Cultural Center, NM (construct cultural center).

Earmark of \$3,000,000 for Hot Springs NP, AR (rehabilitation).

Earmark of \$2,500,000 for John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley NHC, RI/MA.

Earmark of \$795,000 Kenai Fjords NP, AK (completes interagency visitor center design).

Earmark of \$10,000,000 for Lincoln Library, IL.

Earmark of \$290,000 for Lincoln Home NHS, IL (restore historic structures).

Earmark of \$487,000 for Longfellow NHS, MA (carriage barn).

Additional \$945,000 for Manzanar NHS, CA (establish interpretive center and headquarters).

Earmark of \$2,543,000 for Missouri Recreation River Research & Education Center, NE (Ponca State Park).

Earmark of \$500,000 for Morristown NHP, NJ.

Earmark of \$500,000 for Morris Thompson Visitor and Cultural Center, AK (planning).

Earmark of \$150,000 for Mt. Rainier NP, WA (exhibit planning and film).

Additional \$7,500,000 for National Constitution Center, PA (Federal contribution).

Earmark of \$6,000,000 for National Underground RR Freedom Center, OH.

Earmark of \$338,000 for New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail, NJ (exhibits, signage).

Earmark of \$800,000 for New River Gorge NR, WV (repair retaining wall, visitor facilities, technical support).

Earmark of \$445,000 for New River Gorge NR, WV (repair retaining wall, visitor facilities, technical support).

Earmark of \$10,000,000 for Palace of the Governors, NM (build museum).

Earmark of \$203,000 for Palo Alto Battlefield NHS, TX (completes visitor center).

Earmark of \$1,614,000 for Palo Alto Battlefield NHS, TX (completes visitor center).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for Shiloh NMP, TN (erosion control).

Earmark of \$3,000,000 for Southwest Pennsylvania Heritage, PA (rehabilitation).

Earmark of \$240,000 for St. Croix NSR, WI (planning for VC/headquarters; rehabilitate river launch site).

Earmark of \$330,000 for St. Croix NSR, WI (planning for VC/headquarters; rehabilitate river launch site).

Earmark of \$445,000 for St. Gaudens NHS, NH (collections building, fire suppression).

Earmark of \$200,000 for St. Gaudens NHS, NH (collections building, fire suppression).

Earmark of \$340,000 for Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, NY/NJ (ferry terminal utilities).

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, NY/NJ (ferry terminal utilities).

Earmark of \$500,000 for Tuskegee Airmen NHS, AL (stabilization planning).

Earmark of \$365,000 for U.S. Grant Boyhood Home, OH (rehabilitation).

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for Vancouver NHR, WA (exhibits, rehabilitation).

Earmark of \$739,000 for Vicksburg NMP, MS (various).

Earmark of \$550,000 for Vicksburg NMP, MS (various).

Earmark of \$788,000 for Washita Battlefield NHS, OK (visitor center planning).

Earmark of \$4,000,000 for Wheeling Heritage Area, WV

Earmark of \$38,000 for Wilson's Creek NB, MO (complete library).

Earmark of \$200,000 for Wright Brothers NM, NC (planning for visitor center restoration).

Earmark of \$1,500,000 to complete the Federal investment at Fort Stanwix NM in New York.

Language expecting the Service to provide the necessary funds, within the amounts provided for Equipment Replacement, to replace the landing craft at Cumberland Island NS and replace the airplane at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area.

Earmark of \$300,000 to initiate a Lincoln Highway Study to initiate a study to define the cultural significance and value to the Nation of the Congaree Creek site in Lexington County, SC, as part of the Congaree National Swamp Monument, and a study for a national heritage area in the Upper Housatonic Valley in Northwest Connecticut.

*Land Acquisition and Conservation Fund:*

Earmark of \$200,000 for Apostle Islands NL (WI).

Earmark of \$1,200,000 for Appalachian NST (Ovoka Farm) (VA).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for Brandywine Battleground (PA).

Earmark of \$1,200,000 for Chickamauga/Chattanooga NMP (TN).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for Delaware Water Gap NRA (PA).

Earmark of \$3,250,000 for Ebey's Landing NHR (WA).

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for Gulf Islands NS (Cat Island) (MS).

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for Ice Age NST (Wilke Tract) (WI).

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for Indiana Dunes NL (IN).

Earmark of \$1,300,000 for Mississippi National River RA (Lower Phalen Creek) (MN).

Earmark of \$2,700,000 for Petroglyph NM (NM).

Earmark of \$2,200,000 for Saguaro NP (AZ).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for Shenandoah NHA (VA).

Earmark of \$1,300,000 for Sitka NHP (Sheldon Jackson College) (AK).

Earmark of \$1,100,000 for Sleeping Bear Dunes NL (MI).

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for Stones River NB (TN).

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for Wrangell-St. Elias NP & Pres. (AK).

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for the purchase of Cat Island, MS (subject to authorization).

Earmark of \$1,000,000 included for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District is contingent upon the final approval by the Secretary of the Interior of the Commission.

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for the intended purchase of patented mining claims in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park by the National Park Service.

Earmark of \$250,000 for the Hawaiian volcano program.

Earmark of \$475,000 for Yukon Flats geology surveys.

Earmark of \$1,200,000 for the Nevada gold study.

Earmark of \$300,000 for Lake Mead/Mojave research.

Earmark of \$300,000 for the Lake Champlain toxic study.

Earmark of \$450,000 for Hawaiian water monitoring.

Earmark of \$300,000 for the Southern Maryland aquifer study.

Earmark of \$180,000 for a Yukon River chum salmon study.

Earmark of \$750,000 for the continuation of the Mark Twain National Forest mining study to be accomplished in cooperation with the water resources division and the Forest Service.

Earmark of \$4,000,000 to create NBII 'nodes' to work in conjunction with private and public partners to provide increased access to and organization of information to address these and other challenges. These funds are to be distributed as follows: \$350,000 for Pacific Basin, Hawaii; \$1,000,000 for Southwest,

Texas; \$1,000,000 for Southern Appalachian, Tennessee; \$200,000 for Pacific Northwest, Washington; \$250,000 for Central Region, Ohio; \$200,000 for North American Avian Conservation, Maryland; \$250,000 for Network Standards and Technology, Colorado; \$400,000 for Fisheries Node, Virginia and Pennsylvania; \$200,000 for California/Southwest Ecosystems Node, California; and, \$150,000 for Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem Node, Montana.

Language stating that funding is provided for light distancing and ranging (LIDAR) technology to assist with recovery of Chinook Salmon and Summer Chum Salmon under the Endangered Species Act. These funds should be used in Mason County, WA

*Bureau of Indian Affairs*

Earmark of \$500,000 for Alaska subsistence.

Earmark of \$176,000 for the Reindeer Herders Association.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for a distance learning, telemedicine, fiber optic pilot program in Montana.

Earmark of \$146,000 for Alaska legal services.

Earmark of \$200,000 for forest inventory for the Uintah and Ouray tribes.

Earmark of \$300,000 for a tribal guiding program in Alaska.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for the distance learning project on the Crow, Fort Peck, and Northern Cheyenne reservations.

Increase of \$1,250,000 for Aleutian Pribilof church repairs, which completes this program as authorized.

Increase of \$50,000 for Walker River (Weber Dam).

Increase of \$200,000 for Pyramid Lake.

Increase of \$2,000,000 for the Great Lakes Fishing Settlement.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

*Forest Service*

Earmark of \$250,000 to the University of Washington silviculture effort at the Olympic Natural Resource Center. The managers have also agreed with Senate direction concerning funding levels for the wood utilization laboratory in Sitka, AK, and for operations of the Forest Research Laboratories located in Princeton, Parsons, and Morgantown, WV, and funds for the CROP study on the Colville National Forest, WA.

Language which directs the Forest Service to provide total operational funding of \$750,000 to the Rapid City, SD, lab.

Language which directs the Forest Service to provide \$502,000 in appropriated funds for the Wind River canopy crane, WA. This funding includes proposed funding for the New York City watershed and the Senate proposed funding for Utah technical education and State of Washington stewardship activities.

An additional \$750,000 for an update of the cooperative study on the New York-New Jersey highlands area.

Language directing \$1,400,000 to the Ossipee Mountain conservation, easement NH, and also to direct no less than \$2,000,000 to the Great Mountain, CT, easement, and no less than \$2,000,000 for the West Branch, ME, project.

Language stating the importance of forest protection in South Carolina and encourage the Forest Service to work with the appropriate State agencies to ensure continuation of these much needed protections.

Increase of \$450,000 for the Chicago Wilderness Study.

Earmark of \$500,000 for cooperative activities in Forest Park in St. Louis, MO.

Earmark of \$250,000 in a direct lump sum payment for the United Fisherman of Alaska to implement an educational program to

deal with subsistence management and other fisheries issues.

Earmark of \$5,000,000 to assist a land transfer for Kake, AK; these funds are contingent upon an authorization bill being enacted.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 to cost-share kiln-drying facilities in southeast and south-central Alaska.

Language stating that the funds provided for reforestation on abandoned mine lands in Kentucky are to be matched with funds provided in this bill to the Department of Energy for carbon sequestration research, as well as other non-federal funds.

Earmark of \$900,000 for the University of Washington and Washington State University extension forestry effort.

Earmark of \$1,878,000 for Columbia River Gorge economic development in the States of Washington and Oregon.

Earmark of \$300,000 for the CROP project on the Colville NF, WA.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for acid mine clean-up on the Wayne NF, OH.

Earmark of \$360,000 for the Rubio Canyon waterline analysis on the Angeles NF, CA.

Increase of \$1,500,000 increase for aquatic restoration in Washington and Oregon.

Increase of \$1,250,000 increase for Lake Tahoe watershed protection.

Increase of \$300,000 for invasive weed programs on the Okanogan NF and other eastern Washington national forests with no more than five percent of these funds to be assessed as indirect costs.

Earmark of \$200,000 for the Batten Kill River, VT, project.

Earmark of \$700,000 for operations of the Continental Divide trail.

Earmark of \$100,000 for the Monongahela Institute effort at Seneca Rocks, WV.

Earmark of \$120,000 for the Monongahela NF, Cheat Mountain assessment, WV.

Earmark of \$100,000 for cooperative recreational site planning on the Wayne NF, OH.

Earmark of \$100,000 for cooperative efforts regarding radios for use at Tuckerman's Ravine on the White Mountain NF, NH.

Earmark of \$68,000 for the Talimena scenic byway.

Language which directs the Forest Service to conduct a feasibility study on constructing a recreational lake on the Bienville NF in SMITH County, MS.

Earmark of \$790,000 for forestry treatments on the Apache-Sitgreaves NF, AZ.

Earmark of \$250,000 for a Pacific Crest trail lands team.

Earmark of \$500,000 for special needs on the Pisgah and Nantahala NFs.

Additional \$2,000,000 for the Quincy Library Group project, CA.

Additional \$5,000,000 for Tongass NF, AK, timber pipeline.

Earmark of \$500,000 in the minerals and geology management activity to support necessary administrative duties related to the Kensington Mine in southeast Alaska.

Earmark of \$600,000 is provided for cooperative research and technology development between Federal fire research and fire management agencies and the University of Montana National Center for Landscape Fire Analysis.

Earmark \$263,000 for Apache-Sitgreaves NF, AZ, urban interface.

Earmark of \$6,947,000 for windstorm damage in Minnesota.

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for the Lake Tahoe basin.

Earmark of \$2,400,000 for work on the Giant Sequoia National Monument and Sequoia National Forests.

Earmark of \$7,500,000 is a direct lump sum payment to the Kenai Peninsula Borough to complete the activities outlined in the spruce bark beetle task force action plan.

Ten percent of these funds shall be made available to the Cook Inlet Tribal Council for reforestation on Native inholdings and Federal lands identified by the task force.

Language emphasizing the need for a cost-share for the Grey Towers, PA, funding.

Language encouraging the Forest Service to work with Tulare County, CA, on plans for recreational facilities.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for the Forest Service to develop a campground in the Middle Fork Snoqualmie Valley in the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, WA.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 to purchase non-development scenic easements in Pingree Forest, ME.

Earmark for Lake Tahoe, NV of \$2,000,000 for cooperative erosion grants in State and private forestry, \$1,250,000 for the NFS vegetation and watershed activity to enhance restoration of sensitive watersheds, \$1,500,000 in capital improvement and maintenance to help fix the ailing road system, and \$1,500,000 in wildfire management funding to enhance forest health by reducing hazardous fuel.

Earmark of \$5,500,000 for management of national forest system lands for subsistence uses in Alaska as proposed by the Senate.

—The Forest Service is encouraged to give priority to projects for the Alaska jobs-in-the-woods program that enhance the southeast Alaska economy, such as the Southeast Alaska Intertie.

Increase of \$2,000,000 is provided for a demonstration of solid oxide technology in Nuiqsut, Alaska.

Earmark of \$278,000 for the Golden, CO, field office.

#### *Indian Health Service*

Earmark of \$225,000 for the Shoalwater Bay infant mortality prevention program.

Increases for the Alaska immunization program include \$70,000 for pay costs and \$2,000 for additional immunizations.

Within the funding provided for contract health services, the Indian Health Service should allocate an increase to the Ketchikan Indian Corporation's (KIC) recurring budget for hospital-related services for patients of KIC and the Organized Village of Saxman (OVS) to help implement the agreement reached by the Indian Health Service, KIC, OVS and the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Corporation on September 12, 2000. The additional funding will enable KIC to purchase additional related services at the local Ketchikan General Hospital.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for the Northwest Portland area AMEX program.

Earmark of \$4,500,000 is provided for construction of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory's facility at Hilo, Hawaii.

#### TITLE V—EMERGENCY/SUPPLEMENTAL PROVISIONS

##### *Department of Interior*

\$1,500,000 for the preparation and implementation of plans, programs, or agreements identified by the State of Idaho that will address habitat for freshwater aquatic species on non-Federal lands in the State.

\$1,000,000 to be made available to the State of Idaho to fund habitat enhancement, maintenance, or restoration projects consistent with such plans, programs, or agreements.

\$5,000,000 for the conservation and restoration of Atlantic salmon in the Gulf of Maine, with funds provided to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the Atlantic Salmon Commission and the National Academy of Sciences for specified activities.

\$8,500,000 to various specific locales to repair or replace buildings, equipment, roads, bridges, and water control structures damaged by natural disasters; funds are to be used for repairs to Service property in the states of Maryland, New Jersey, North Caro-

lina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington.

\$1,200,000 for repair of the portions of the Yakima Nation's Signal Peak Road.

An additional \$1,800,000 for repairs in Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Maryland-Delaware-Washington, D.C., Massachusetts-Rhode Island, Nevada, New Hampshire-Vermont, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Virginia.

##### *Department of Agriculture*

\$2,000,000 for an avalanche prevention program in the Chugach National Forest, Kenai National Park, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and nearby public lands.

\$7,249,000 to the National forest system for damage caused by severe windstorms in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Total earmarks in report ..	\$372,064,000
Total supplemental/emergency earmarks .....	28,249,000
Total combined earmarks	400,313,000

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, first, I congratulate Mr. FITZGERALD, the Senator from Illinois, for his valiant effort to prevent a contract to be let without any competition. I do not understand why contracts that entail expenditure of taxpayers' funds should not be let in a competitive fashion so that the taxpayers can receive the maximum value for their investments in their Government. I congratulate Senator FITZGERALD for his valiant effort.

This year's final agreement provides a much-needed infusion of funding for conservation, wildlife management, and Native American programs. However, once again, I express my objections to the amount of excessive pork barrel spending and extraneous legislative riders included in this final agreement.

The agreement exceeds its overall budget by \$2.5 billion, increasing spending by 25 percent, with funding levels that are close to \$4 billion higher than the House bill and \$3 billion more than the Senate bill.

We are entering a remarkable phase of American political history. The spigot is on, and it is on in a fashion I have not seen in the years I have spent in the Congress.

The new conference agreement has taken pork barrel spending to higher proportions by adding more than \$120 million more in earmarks that either were not included in the Senate or House bill or added funding for unrequested or unauthorized projects. In addition to higher amounts of pork barrel spending, appropriators conveniently designated billions more in emergency spending, including nearly \$30 million in "emergency funds" for locale-specific earmarks.

As I said, I have a list that was printed in the RECORD. Several of our favorites: \$1.25 million for weed programs at Montana State University and Idaho—weed programs that are specific to two universities; \$5.25 million for a new dormitory at the National Constitution Training Center; \$20,000 for office renovations at the White Sulfur Springs National Fish Hatchery. Guess where. West Virginia. We have several fish

hatcheries in my State of Arizona. I wonder if maybe we could get a little refurbishment for our offices, as well as those in West Virginia.

There is \$487,000 for a carriage barn in Longfellow National Historic Site in Massachusetts—a carriage barn.

Here is one of my favorites. I think we should all be impressed by the pressing need for this: \$176,000 for the Reindeer Herders Association. For the Reindeer Herders Association, \$176,000 is earmarked.

That also happens to be out of the Bureau of Indian Affairs funding. Never mind that we have dilapidated housing, terrible schools, nutrition programs that need to be funded in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, my friends, but we put in \$176,000 for that vitally needed Reindeer Herders Association. I am sure Santa Claus is very pleased that these funds will be going to the Reindeer Herders Association.

You will find something very interesting, Mr. President, as I go through the list of earmarks and as people read the RECORD. You will see the names Alaska, West Virginia, Washington State, and Hawaii appear with amazing frequency, which I am sure is pure coincidence.

So we have \$1 million for a distance learning telemedicine, fiber-optic pilot program in Montana.

Here is an important one. Here is a vital item that had to be earmarked: \$1.5 million to refurbish the Vulcan Statue in Alabama. I am not familiar with the Vulcan Statue, but I am sure it needed to be refurbished over any other statue in America that may need to be refurbished.

Here is one that should interest taxpayers and entertain all of us: \$400,000 for the Southside Sportsman Club in New York. Take heart, all Southside sportsmen, help is on the way: \$400,000 for your operations.

There is \$5 million for the Southeast—guess where—Alaska Economic Disaster Fund, which was not included in either the Senate or House proposals, ordered to be used for Craig, AK, to assist with economic development. Times are tough in Craig, my friends. They need \$5 million in Craig.

I urge those who are interested to find out what the population of Craig, AK, might be. I think that might turn out to be a fair amount of money per capita.

There is \$500,000 for administrative duties at the Kensington Mine in southeast Alaska—ta-da, Mr. President—for administrative duties at the Kensington Mine in southeast Alaska.

We have lots of mines in my State. I hope they will consider helping them with their administrative duties in their mines, as well.

Mr. President, the list goes on and on and on.

So \$2 million for the purchase of Cat Island in Mississippi; \$5 million for a land transfer in Kake, AK; \$4.6 million for the Wheeling National Heritage Area in West Virginia, which has received earmarks in previous Interior

appropriations without any authorization. I should point out that new legislative language was tacked on to this report to finally authorize this project, although it certainly never went through the normal process of approval.

I hope the taxpayers will be able to see how we are spending their dollars. It is remarkable.

I believe in the debate one of the candidates was saying: You ain't seen nothing yet. Mr. President, you ain't seen nothing yet. Wait until we get to the omnibus bill which very few of us will have ever seen or read when we vote yes or no on it. We will have a remarkable document, one I think historians in the centuries ahead will view with interest and puzzlement.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

#### ATLANTIC SALMON CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

Ms. COLLINS. I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee for his invaluable help in securing funding for vital, time-sensitive, on-the-ground Atlantic salmon conservation and restoration programs in Maine on an emergency basis. Due to your efforts, \$5.0 million in emergency appropriations were included in the Interior Appropriations conference report for this purpose. It is critical that these funds be on the ground this year in order to demonstrate a federal financial commitment to salmon in my State, and that a listing under the Endangered Species Act is not necessary to conserve and restore Maine's Atlantic salmon.

Mr. GORTON. My home state, too, has experienced the disruption that a federal endangered species listing can cause. I therefore appreciate the importance and urgency of the funds sought by the Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. The emergency appropriation included in the Interior Appropriations conference report will make a substantial contribution to salmon conservation and restoration efforts in the State. The funds will be made available to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (or "NFWF"), which has made a commitment to me to allocate the monies to worthwhile projects as soon as possible. The conference report provides \$5.0 million to NFWF, of which \$2.0 million will be made available to the Atlantic Salmon Commission and \$500,000 will be made available to the National Academy of Sciences. The remaining \$2.5 million will be administered by NFWF to carry out a grant program that will fund on-the-ground projects to further Atlantic salmon conservation or restoration efforts in coordination with the State of Maine and the Maine Atlantic Salmon Conservation Plan.

The conference report contains language indicating that funds administered by NFWF will be subject to cost sharing. Is it your understanding, Mr. Chairman, that this language means

the \$2.5 million administered by NFWF to carry out a grant program must be matched, in the aggregate, by at least \$2.5 million in non-federal funds?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Maine is correct. I expect that the \$2.5 million grant program administered by NFWF will leverage at least \$2.5 million overall in additional, nonfederal funds.

Ms. COLLINS. And is it also your understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the \$2.0 million made available to the Atlantic Salmon Commission and the \$500,000 made available to the National Academy of Sciences will not be subject to any matching requirement?

Mr. GORTON. That is also correct.

Ms. COLLINS. I want to again thank the distinguished Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. In crafting this conference report, he has accomplished a Herculean task with this usual grace and skill. And the \$5.0 million he has helped secure will promote a vigorous and effective salmon conservation and restoration effort in my State.

Mr. GORTON. As I have said before, I greatly admire the Senator from Maine's tenacity and her unfailing devotion to the best interests of her State.

#### LAKE TAHOE LAND ACQUISITION COLLOQUY

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I would like to request your help interpreting the language that was inserted into the conference report pertaining to the use of funds appropriated for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive property at Lake Tahoe. That language states that no funds may be used to acquire urban lots. To my knowledge, "urban lots" is a term that is not defined in this bill or any related statute or regulation. As a result, I want to make sure that we clarify what we intend by the term urban lot.

As you know, the plan to protect Lake Tahoe is predicated in large part of the Lake Tahoe Preservation Act of 1981 (H.R. 7306), commonly known as the Santini-Burton Act, and companion California and Nevada bond acts. Together, these State and Federal acts provide for the purchase and stewardship of environmentally sensitive lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The legislative history of the Santini-Burton Act indicated that approximately \$150 million worth of land in Lake Tahoe would be purchased (approximately \$100 million has been expended to date). The Santini-Burton Act generally identified lands eligible for purchase, and was followed by the adoption of a comprehensive plan identifying specific criteria for purchases. That plan was subject to an Environmental Impact Statement and accompanying public comment process, and this plan remains in effect to this day.

I am confident that, with the correct information in hand, Congress will direct the Forest Service to go forward with the completion of the program. In the meantime, however, the effort to protect Lake Tahoe is likely to sustain

significant damage if the language in the conference report is mistakenly interpreted to reverse long standing policy decisions. That is why I am asking for your concurrence to direct the Forest Service to interpret the language in a manner consistent with the existing program.

Specifically, I want to make it clear that the term "urban lot" does not include environmentally sensitive lands. The current program designates a property's eligibility for acquisition according to its environmental sensitivity because that is the purpose of the acquisition program. Such designations reflect extensive analysis and the support of the local community. This report language should not be interpreted to change this methodology such that acquisition eligibility is based on an unspecified and invariably random geographic distinction. In all likelihood, any ill-conceived geographic standard would exclude the most environmentally sensitive property that the ongoing program is designed to protect.

I believe that the report language is consistent with the current practice of federal land acquisition in the Lake Tahoe basin. Do you share my understanding that the definition of "urban lots" includes only those properties that are presently qualified for urban development?

Mr. GORTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. REID. Then it makes sense for any prohibition on land acquisition referred to in the report language to apply only if to properties that satisfy all of the following criteria: (1) they are not adjacent to current forest system lands, (2) they are within Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's urban boundaries, (3) they are not adjacent to Lake Tahoe, or to waters or streamzones tributary to Lake Tahoe, and (4) they are presently eligible to take residential or commercial development. This clarification integrates the intent of the new conference report language to limit such acquisitions to essential sensitive lands while retaining the basic purpose of the Lake Tahoe land acquisition program.

Mr. GORTON. In response to my colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada, let me say that your understanding of the issues affecting Lake Tahoe is correct. Your concerns seem reasonable, as does your interpretation of the language in question.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the Chairman's understanding and concurrence on this very important issue.

#### REGARDING SEC. 156 AND ACCOMPANYING REPORT LANGUAGE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the Chairman knows, I included language in this bill that directs the Department of Interior to finalize the so-called 3809 regulations, which govern hardrock mining operations on public lands, and to do so consistently with the findings and recommendations of a study completed by the National Research Council or NRC. The language is identical to

language enacted in last year's omnibus bill. I want to emphasize my intent in offering this language, and request the Chairman's understanding and concurrence. Briefly, my intent is to ensure that the Department of Interior finalizes a rule that protects the environment and that takes into account the direction of Congress and the findings and recommendations of the NRC report.

Mr. GORTON. I am glad to assist my friend, the senior Senator from Nevada. In clarifying Congress' intent in enacting these provisions, I agree with his statement that the Committee intends for Interior to study the entire NRC report carefully and to adopt a rule that is consistent with the findings and recommendations of that report.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last year Congress adopted this requirement that Interior finalize 3809 rule changes only if they are "not inconsistent" with the recommendations of the NRC report I already described. Parsing this statutory language to the point of absurdity, the Interior Solicitor quickly wrote and circulated a legal opinion concluding that Congress intended by this action to require Interior's consideration only of material in the report specifically labeled as "recommendations"—amounting only to a few lines of the report—and no other information in the report. And, he went on to conclude that this law imposes no significant limitations on the agency's ability to finalize its proposed 3809 rule. This year we have adopted the consistency requirement again, just as it was written last year. I ask the Chairman, did we enact the language again just to ratify the legal conclusion that Interior could finalize 3809 rules essentially without restrictions?

Mr. GORTON. I thank my friend, and emphasize that we did not act again this year just to ratify the actions of the Department of Interior. The Committee to reemphasize its original intent: That Interior study the NRC report carefully, and that any final 3809 regulations promulgated be consistent with that report.

Mr. REID. One last question that I have concerns a statement made by some of our House colleagues during House consideration of the FY 2001 Interior appropriations bill in which they suggested an interpretation of the ongoing rulemaking including broad discretion to deny mining permits, by redefining the existing statutory definition of unnecessary or undue degradation. Does the Chairman of the subcommittee who helped develop this language agree that our House colleagues are suggesting an interpretation that clearly goes beyond current law and that section 156 specifically states that nothing in this provision shall be construed to expand existing authority.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct. Section 156 states, "nothing in this section shall be construed to expand the existing statutory authority of the

Secretary." The interpretation suggested by our House colleagues would require additional statutory authority which Interior does not have and is specifically denied by this bill.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chairman for his help in clarifying the Committee's intent.

#### U.S. FOREST SERVICE NATIONAL FIRE RETARDANTS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Chairman of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee on an issue that affects the Forest Service and forest fire fighting in the West.

Mr. GORTON. I would be glad to engage in such a discussion with my friend, the distinguished Chairman of Forest and Public Lands Subcommittee of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the U.S. Forest Service has announced its intention to move to gum thickened/sodium ferrocyanide aerially applied fire retardants in the 2004 bid process. The Service is to be commended for this initiative that seeks a more effective and environmentally friendly means to address the wildfires with which we have become so painfully accustomed in the West. Indeed, the Forest Service's own research shows that gum thickened retardants are 25-40 percent more effective than un-thickened retardants. The criteria called for in 2004, though, can be met today. Is it the Committee's view that the U.S. Forest Service should be striving for a more environmentally friendly product and should use such a product as soon as possible?

Mr. GORTON. I agree with that view. It should be the U.S. Forest Service's priority to use the most effective, environmentally protective aerially applied fire retardants.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the after-effects of wildfires are devastating to the landscape. Mother Nature has a way of bringing life back to the land when all appears lost. However, even Mother Nature cannot erase for years the stains on the lands caused by some aerially applied fire retardants. This is especially of concern where historical and archeological resources, national parks, wilderness areas and urban/wilderness areas are concerned. Would you agree that U.S. Forest Service should preserve the option for local foresters to use less staining fugitive retardants where, in their judgment, it is warranted?

Mr. GORTON. I would agree that the U.S. Forest Service should preserve the option to use such fire retardants in order to minimize the long-term visual impacts of wildfires.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Forest Service has historically supported competition in the supply of fire retardants through the inclusion of a viability clause in its bids. For the first time, the upcoming 2001 bid process may be conducted by sealed bid. It

is unclear whether viability will be a consideration. This is a critical issue in a fire season like the one we just experienced. Would you agree that the U.S. Forest Service should support competition in the supply of aerially applied fire retardants?

Mr. GORTON. I would agree that maintaining dual suppliers of high performance, environmentally acceptable fire retardants is critical to the mission of the Service.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chairman for this clarification.

#### GREAT FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT, PATERSON, NEW JERSEY

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Senator GORTON, about one aspect of the conference report.

Mr. Chairman, the conference report to the Interior Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2001 does not include funding for construction projects in the Great Falls Historic District, located in the City of Paterson, New Jersey.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct. Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. Chairman, by way of background, the Great Falls Historic District was established in Section 510 of Public Law 104-33, the Omnibus Parks bill of 1996. This legislation, which I coauthored, is designed to preserve the historic character of the City of Paterson, New Jersey. Like Lowell, Massachusetts, Paterson holds a prominent place in our nation's industrial past. Few people realize that Paterson was the first planned industrialized city. Alexander Hamilton himself chose the area around the Great Falls for his laboratory, and he established the Society for Useful Manufacturers right in Paterson. The work of its citizens and the wealth of its natural resources soon caused Paterson to thrive, and it became a mecca for countless numbers of immigrants, including my own family. The skills and spirit of these immigrants made Paterson one of our nation's leading centers for textile manufacturing, earning the nickname "Silk City."

Mr. Chairman, the 1996 legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide grants through the Historic Preservation Fund for up to one-half of the costs of preparing a plan for the development of historic, architectural, natural, cultural, and interpretive resources within the Great Falls District. The Secretary may also provide matching funds for implementation of projects identified in the plan. The total federal authorization for the Great Falls Historic District is \$3.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, since the authorizing legislation establishing the Great Falls Historic District specifically enables the City to receive up to \$250,000 in matching federal funds for preparation of a historic preservation plan, the Secretary could provide these funds through the funds provided in the conference report for the Historic Preservation Fund.



Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct. This bill includes appropriations from the Historic Preservation Fund that could be used for eligible projects such as that for the Great Falls in Paterson.

Mr. BYRD. I concur with the Chairman that the Great Falls project is eligible to receive Historic Preservation Funds, for preparation of its plan.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Great Falls Historic District would be eligible to receive up to \$250,000 of these funds for preparation of a historic preservation plan, and that, once these plans are completed, an additional \$50,000 in matching funds is available from the Historic Preservation Fund for technical assistance and \$3 million is available for restoration, preservation, and interpretive activities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include a letter from the Mayor of the City of Paterson to the regional director of the National Park Service, expressing the City's interest in moving forward with development of the Great Falls development plan. I hope that this letter will confirm to the Service and to the Chairman and Ranking Member, that the City is fully prepared to provide the necessary match to develop the plan. I am confident that the City will work closely with the Service on development of a plan, and that, once it is completed, the City may apply for the remaining authorized funds for completion of specific projects.

Mr. GORTON. I appreciate the Senator's interest in this matter, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member.

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

CITY OF PATERSON,  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
Paterson, NJ, October 4, 2000.

MARIE RUST,  
Northeast Regional Director, National Park  
Service, 200 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia,  
PA.

Re: Public Law 104-333.

DEAR MS. RUST: This is to reaffirm our sincere interest in, and need of, the funding of Public Law 104-333. Ever since the authorization of the 3.3 million dollars for the Great Falls Redevelopment Act we have been anxiously awaiting the appropriation. We are committed to provide the necessary local match.

The preparation of the Development Plan required by the Act is an essential first step in documenting the feasibility of a National Park. After the Plan, our two primary activities in the district remain to be the redevelopment of the former ATP Site including the Gun Mill and the rehabilitation of the raceway. Both projects are essential to the achievement of the economic development objectives of the Urban History Initiative. The initial Gun Mill stabilization has been successfully completed. We are awaiting the execution of the Programmatic Agreement so that we may continue with the engineering and other site preparation and stabilization work for the former ATP Site. The overall raceway and prioritization has been completed. Final plans are ready for the Upper Raceway section.

We continue to pursue other sources of funding including TEA-21 Enhancement, the New Jersey Historic Trust, New Jersey Green Acres, and others. If these are not successful I will ask the City Council to bond any remaining local share. This is to assure you that we will secure the local match for whatever amount Congress appropriates.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN G. BARNES,

Mayor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have been a long time supporter of CARA—the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. The concept behind CARA was a visionary one—to take revenues generated from the extraction of offshore oil and gas resources and reinvest them permanently and automatically in our nation's invaluable wildlife, coastal, and public land resources.

The CARA proposal that was developed in a cooperative, bipartisan way by the Senate Energy Committee offered an opportunity for this Congress to make an historic contribution to conservation and to truly leave behind a legacy that we could be proud of and from which our children would benefit.

Instead, we are faced with a situation in which this overwhelmingly popular bill will never be considered on the Senate floor.

The House passed its version of CARA back in May by an overwhelming vote of 315 to 102; it was a vote that brought in supporters from across the political spectrum and around the country. More recently, a letter signed by 63 Senators was sent to the Senate leadership requesting that CARA be brought to the floor.

Yet the Republican leadership has refused to let this bill move forward.

I ask my colleagues, what does it take to get a vote around here? How can we say that we are doing the people's business, if a bill that is as broadly supported as CARA cannot even be voted upon?

We have now been presented with a package in the Interior appropriations bill that purports to fulfill the goals of CARA. I am tremendously disappointed to say that this package does very little to accomplish the goals of CARA.

CARA would have provided nearly \$45 billion to important conservation programs over the next 15 years. The Interior proposal provides roughly \$6 billion and only makes those funds available for the next 6 years.

But far more disappointing than the discrepancy in funding levels is the fact that the Interior proposal does little to guarantee that these funds will actually be made available each year for specific conservation purposes.

Instead, the Interior proposal will force important and beneficial programs like Urban Parks and Recreation to battle against other important programs like the Historic Preservation program for funding each year.

What made CARA remarkable was the fact that it would have provided the Urban Parks program, or state fish and wildlife agencies, or endangered species recovery efforts, with a predictable and reliable amount of funding.

This feature would have ensured that important conservation efforts would NOT be subject to the uncertainties of the annual appropriations cycle, but instead could be certain that funding would be available over the long term. And as a result, these conservation programs could have finally planned and implemented ambitious, long-term conservation efforts. The Interior appropriations proposal fails to provide this sort of certainty.

I will vote for the Interior appropriations bill. The bill funds many important programs that I care about and in making a nod to CARA it will provide some increased funding for things like the state's portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I am also pleased that the most egregious anti-environmental riders that appeared in earlier versions of this bill have been removed.

However, I hope nobody will interpret my vote for this bill as a sign of support for what I view as a hijacking of CARA. I remain deeply disturbed that a bill that had the potential to do as much good as CARA will never see the light of day.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, it is with great regret that I rise today to oppose the Conference Report to the Interior Appropriations bill.

I want to begin by praising my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations who have worked so hard on this bill and conference report. I know they have faced many difficult issues, competing demands for limited resources, and the pressure of time as this Congress winds down. And there are many good provisions in this bill, including several that will benefit my home State of New Hampshire. The bill includes two projects that have been particularly important to me and for which I requested funding—the Lamprey River & St. Gaudens. I appreciate the efforts of the Appropriations Committee to provide that funding.

Unfortunately, notwithstanding these and other good provisions, the bill fails to deliver what we as elected officials have promised the American people. I want to take this opportunity to explain, especially to my fellow Granite Staters, why I am voting against the Interior Appropriations Conference Report.

First, I am deeply disappointed that this bill does not include full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund or for the many important programs included in the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. In failing to provide this funding, I believe that we have truly squandered an opportunity that may never exist again. Even more importantly, I believe we failed to live up to the promise we made years ago to dedicate a percentage of the revenues from oil and gas production on the Outer Continental Shelf to the conservation and enhancement of fish, wildlife, lands and waters.

Congress came close to keeping that promise when the House passed by an



overwhelming margin of three to one a landmark conservation bill—the so-called Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA). The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee passed a companion bill in July. The CARA bill reflects our collective commitment to investing in the environment for ourselves and for future generations.

I am proud that I was able to play a part in bringing attention to the bill in the Senate. On May 24, 2000, I held a hearing on the Senate bill in the Committee on Environment and Public Works. Although that Committee, which I chair, did not have primary jurisdiction over the bill, I felt it was important to hold the hearing to help build support for the legislation and to highlight some of the very important programs that would be enhanced by the passage of the bill. These programs included funding for the Endangered Species Act and Pittman-Robertson Act, both of which are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Environment and Public Works. I said it then, and I want to reaffirm it today. Now is the time for the Federal government to step up to the plate and assist in the efforts to protect our natural resources—not by grabbing up more Federal land, but by working in partnership with States and private landowners and providing much-needed funding for critically underfunded programs. The CARA bill would have done that.

Instead, the Interior Appropriations Conference Report includes a mere shadow of the real CARA.

Instead of providing full permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Interior Conference Report appropriates only \$600 million for one year and only \$90 million of that is allocated for stateside funding. The CARA bill I cosponsored would have provided the States with a guaranteed \$450 million a year to conduct numerous worthwhile conservation projects, including creating new parks and building soccer fields. The limited appropriation provided by the Conference Report, by contrast, with no guarantees for future years, isn't CARA; it's business as usual.

The bottom line is that Americans like to spend their time outdoors. Over half of all Americans will tell you that their preferred vacation spots are national parks, forests, wilderness areas, beaches, shorelines and mountains. And almost all Americans—94 percent believe we should be spending more money on land and water conservation.

I agree with those Americans who believe that it's time to invest some of the budget surplus in our environment. For years now, we have been telling the tax payers that there isn't any money available for conservation programs and that it's up to landowners to bear the burdens of saving our land and natural resources. Well, in my opinion, those days are over. It's past time for the federal government to contribute its fair share, and the Interior Con-

ference Report falls far short in that respect.

Second, I am extremely troubled by the fact that the Conference Report provides no protections for private property rights. CARA did. The real CARA bill provided an unprecedented level of protection for the private land owner. For example, the Senate CARA bill that I cosponsored expressly prohibited the federal government from using any CARA funds to implement regulations on private property. In addition, all Federal acquisitions of land through the Land and Water Conservation Fund would have been subject to significantly more restrictions than under current law. Not one of those private property rights protections is included in the Interior Appropriations Conference Report.

Third, I cannot support the language in the Conference Report that establishes a vague new Federal "wildlife conservation program" that imposes new, but undefined, obligations on the States and gives broad discretion to the federal Fish and Wildlife Service to define those obligations. The Interior Appropriations Conference Report directs the Fish and Wildlife Service to create a new \$300 million state grant program subject only to the approval of the Committee on Appropriations. That is inappropriate.

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is responsible for overseeing wildlife programs; it is our prerogative and responsibility to review, discuss, and ultimately authorize any wildlife program. Yet, this new program was inserted at the last minute, behind closed doors, without any public debate or consultation with the Committee of jurisdiction. For that reason, I must oppose its inclusion in this Conference Report. The concept may be a good one, but this is not the right process or the appropriate vehicle.

Finally, I must oppose the Conference Report because of the adverse impact it will have on thousands of citizens of New Hampshire who depend upon and enjoy the White Mountain National Forest.

When the Senate passed its Interior Appropriations bill in July, it included an important provision excluding the White Mountain National Forest from this Administration's broad policy of prohibiting the construction of all new roads in previously undisturbed areas of national forests, the so-called roadless policy. We excluded the White Mountain National Forest from this "one-size-fits-all" roadless policy, not because we want thousands of miles of new roads in the White Mountains, but because these decisions should be made at the local level through the forest planning process, by the people who live near, enjoy, and use the National Forest.

I have deep concerns about the Administration's roadless policy because I believe it is intended to limit public access and legitimate public use of our national forests. But even more impor-

tantly, in the context of the White Mountain National Forest, it would specifically override an existing forest management plan that maintains a balance between economic activity, recreation and environmental protection—a forest management plan that was developed through a collaborative process involving state and local government officials, local citizens, and federal officials. I firmly believe that States and local citizens should play a significant role in making the management decisions relating to the forest lands in their communities, including the decisions about roads.

It was for that reason that I strongly supported the language that was included in the Senate bill that allowed the citizens of New Hampshire to make those decisions through the forest planning process for the White Mountain National Forest, rather than simply mandating a blanket roadless policy from Washington, D.C. That important provision, however, has now been dropped from the Conference Report. I believe that Washington D.C.'s roadless policy will hurt New Hampshire. It will have significant economic, social, and ecological impacts. And it will undermine the cooperative dialogue that took place during the revision of the forest plan. Therefore, I cannot support a Conference Report that does not include language protecting the White Mountain National Forest from unnecessary and inappropriate interference from Washington's bureaucrats.

The Interior Appropriations bill passed by the Senate last July also included a specific exemption for North Country residents from the user fees that the National Forest Service charges for access to the White Mountain National Forest. That exemption has now been deleted.

I have long been opposed to user fees in the White Mountain National Forest because I believe it is fundamentally unfair to local residents. In areas, like the North Country of New Hampshire, where the Federal Government owns much of the land, communities lose a significant portion of their property tax base which they need to fund schools and other necessary social programs and infrastructure. Residents in these communities then have to make up the shortfall. The user fee, on top of the loss in local tax revenue, imposes an unfair burden for local citizens. It is wrong for the Federal government to charge local residents in the North Country a fee for enjoying the White Mountain National Forest when they are already subsidizing the Forest.

As I stated at the beginning, there are many good provisions in this Interior Conference Report. I applaud the work that my colleagues have done and appreciate the support they have given to important New Hampshire projects. Therefore, it is with great reluctance that I oppose the Conference Report.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about two provisions of great concern to my

state of Minnesota. While this conference report clearly missed the opportunity to make a historic, long term, commitment to our environmental heritage, I rise in support of this legislation because it does represent an important first step in many conservation accounts, and includes vital funding to restore Minnesota's National Forests.

First of all, I want to make clear that I am disappointed that the full Conservation and Reinvestment Act, CARA, was not included in this Interior Appropriations bill. CARA, as reported out of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is landmark legislation that would commit \$3 billion annually for 15 years to conservation and natural resource protection. CARA would provide \$37.4 million of stable funding annually to the conservation and protection of Minnesota's natural resources.

However the compromise in this bill does not reflect the spirit or intent of the full CARA bill. First of all this Conference report does not guarantee multiple year funding for the states, which was the entire premise of CARA. When it comes to protecting our coastlines (on the North Shore in Minnesota) and open spaces (in Northern Minnesota), expanding our urban parks (in the metro Twin Cities area), or investing in wildlife conservation, the annual appropriation approach has proven not to work in the past and is unlikely to work in the future. In addition, the report does not include dedicated funding for wildlife conservation programs, which puts Minnesota's wildlife conservation needs in competition with other state conservation programs, and makes it possible that Minnesota would receive no funds for wildlife preservation from this legislation. While, overall I am encouraged that this legislation more than doubles conservation funding from the \$742 million in the current fiscal year to \$1.6 billion in FY 2000, we should not lose sight of the fact that this conference report is clearly no substitute for a full funded CARA bill.

On a related matter, I am pleased the conference committee has restored the balance of the Forest Service's request for Minnesota's National Forests. During consideration of the Interior Appropriations bill, Senators GORTON and BYRD agreed to my amendment to include \$7.2 million in additional emergency funds for Minnesota's National Forests. And today the Senate will take an important step that will restore the balance of emergency funds requested earlier this year by the Superior, Chippewa and Chequamegon National Forests' for blowdown recovery efforts.

Furthermore, this legislation includes an important regular, FY 2001 appropriation for the Superior National Forest, that my colleague from Minnesota and I were able to work on together. These monies would be available to the Forest Service next year

and are vital to continued recovery efforts in northern Minnesota.

These national forests bore the brunt of a massive once-in-a-thousand year wind and rain storm that devastated parts of northern Minnesota on July 4, 1999. The storm damaged over 300,000 acres in seven counties, including as much as 70 percent of the trees in our national forests, and washed out numerous roads. The damage caused by this storm has severely hindered the U.S. Forest Service's ability to responsibly manage the Chippewa and Superior National Forests.

The most troubling aspect of this storm for the people of northern Minnesota is the continued extreme risk of a catastrophic fire resulting from the tremendous amount of downed and dead timber. Funding provided to the Forest Service through this legislation will be used for immediate and future recovery efforts, and to reduce the threat of a major wildland fire.

The storm has changed affected portions of the forests for years to come and has created new risks and experiences for visitors and residents. Since July 4th, the Superior and Chippewa National Forests officials have been working with state, county, and local officials on storm recovery activities and planning to meet future needs.

Immediately after the storm the Forest Service, in conjunction with State, County and local governments began a search and rescue operation that lasted for 15 days from July 4 to July 19, 1999. Fortunately not a single life was lost in the storm, however there were 20 medical evacuations from the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, BWCAW. The most severe case was a broken neck. In addition, the forest Service conducted a search of 2,200 camp sights in the BWCAW to ensure no one was trapped. And finally USFS crews cleared approx. 200 miles of roads, and reconstructed 6 miles of emergency roads.

Once the emergency search and rescue was completed, the U.S. Forest Service turned their attention to reducing hazards that could negatively affect visitors, residents and local businesses that depend on the BWCAW and the National Forests. The Forest Service brought in 191 people including an administrative team and several crews from across the country to return facilities to a safe condition so they could be reopened and used during the rest of the year.

And now the Superior National Forest is proposing to reduce the risk of fire escaping the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, BWCAW, by using prescribed burning within the wilderness. The 1.1 million-acre BWCAW, located in northeastern Minnesota adjacent to the Canadian border, is one of the most heavily used wildernesses in the United States.

The proposal is to reduce the increased risk of wildfire associated with the July 4, 1999, storm. The proposed action is to treat approximately 47,000

to 81,000 acres of the wilderness with prescribed fire over a five to six year time period.

The goal of this project is to improve public safety by reducing the potential for high intensity wildland fires to spread from the BWCAW into areas of intermingled ownership, which include homes, cabins, resorts and other improvements, or across the international border into Canada. This will be accomplished in a manner which is sensitive to ecological and wilderness values, and protects fire personnel and BWCAW visitor safety during implementation.

While the Forest Service has been engaged in this work for many months, it is clear that much is yet to be done, and that it is going to take many years to dig out from under the storm and to restore the forest to a more normal and healthy state. However this cannot happen without adequate funding. This is a victory for all of Minnesota, and I am grateful to my colleagues for their support. I am very pleased that the Senate approved the remainder of these badly needed funds today, especially for the people of northern Minnesota, who cannot wait.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the conference report for Interior appropriations before this body today makes a significant investment in Wisconsin's only unit of the National Park System, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. The Lakeshore recently celebrated its 30th anniversary on September 26, 2000, and I rise today to express my gratitude to the Senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) for working with me to ensure that some of the highest priority needs at the Lakeshore are met.

I have been raising the need for these funds since 1998. On April 22 of that year, I introduced legislation, named for former Senator Gaylord Nelson who was the sponsor of the federal legislation that created the Lakeshore, to try to make sure that the Park Service has the funds included in this bill today. This bill helps to fund a wilderness suitability study of the Lakeshore as required by the Wilderness Act. Most of the Lakeshore is managed as wilderness, yet the required study has not yet been completed so that Congress can evaluate whether there is a need for a formal legal designation. This bill retains amendment language that I offered during the Senate consideration of Interior appropriations and provides \$200,000 for that purpose.

The bill also provides funds to the Park Service to protect the history Raspberry and Outer Island lighthouses which are threatened by erosion. The 21 islands of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore have six lighthouses, the greatest number of lighthouses on any property in federal ownership anywhere in the country. They are all at least 100 years old, and many of them are still used as aids to navigation and are in need of Federal help.

By providing funds in this bill to ensure the success of the Lakeshore we contribute to another larger success—our efforts to clean and protect our environment and provide places for people to rest and refresh themselves. I have been very pleased in the willingness of the bill's managers to support my efforts to draw attention to this park. They have other, bigger parks that also have funding needs. But the managers understood my appeal on behalf of the people of Wisconsin with these funds. They know, as I do, that when the American people sit among the hemlocks on Outer Island, walk along the shore, travel to Devils Island, observe the waters of Lake Superior, they know protection of the Apostles is worth a federal investment.

The investments in the Apostles are authorized investments, part of the requirements that we gave the Park Service when we created the Lakeshore. As delighted as I am that these funds have been included by the managers, I remain concerned about the fact that this bill provides funds and policy direction for unauthorized projects, authorizes new projects and continues to contain a number of policy riders that affect environmental protection. Because these riders remain, I will vote against the bill.

I am concerned that this body is becoming habituated to the practice of environmental legislation by rider. This leaves Members of this body, like myself, who are very concerned about legislation which has the potential to adversely effect the implementation of environmental law, or change federal natural resource policy, with limited options. We must, by either striking the riders, or trying to modify their efforts, do the work of the authorizing committees on the floor of this body. With limited floor time on spending bills, and with the pressure to pass appropriations bills or risk shutting down or disrupting important Government programs, we do not do the best by the environment that we can and must do in our legislative efforts.

I believe that the Senate should not include provisions in spending bills that weaken environmental laws or prevent potentially environmentally beneficial regulations from being promulgated by the federal agencies that enforce federal environmental law.

For more than two decades, we have been a remarkable bipartisan consensus on protecting the environment through effective environmental legislation and regulation. I believe we have a responsibility to the American people to protect the quality of our public lands and resources. That responsibility requires that the Senate express its strong distaste for legislative efforts to include proposals in spending bills that weaken environmental laws or prevent potentially beneficial environmental regulations from being promulgated or enforced by the federal agencies that carry out Federal law.

Every year I hold a town hall meeting in each one of Wisconsin's 72 coun-

ties. When I hold these meetings, the people of Wisconsin continue to express their grave concern that, when riders are placed in spending bills, major decisions regarding environmental protection are being made without the benefit of an up or down vote.

When this bill passed the Senate initially on July 18, 2000, I was one of two Senators to vote against it because of legislative riders. I know that the bill managers worked long and hard to keep a number of the most controversial riders, many of which I was concerned about, off of this bill and I commend them for that. However, I am also concerned that there is a category of riders to which we have become habituated: riders on Alaska red cedar, riders on mining regulations, riders on grazing permits. There are also new authorizing provisions in this bill, such as developing forensic laboratory service fees for Fish and Wildlife investigations into wildlife mortality, and a new program to develop a reduced fee program for developing a reduced fee program to accommodate nonlocal travel through the National Park System. Why aren't these matters being discussed in the authorizing committees? These issues may have merit, but I think they should be handled by the committees of jurisdiction.

We cannot continue to put the Appropriations Committee in the position of having to decide which of these riders are more or less important. These measures need to be referred to the authorizing committees, and we need to restore the trust of the American people that we are proceeding with the people's business in a fashion which allows for open debate and actual deliberation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today in strong support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 4578, the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001.

As a member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and the joint House-Senate conference committee, I appreciate the difficult task before the distinguished subcommittee chairman and ranking member to balance the diverse priorities funded in this bill—from our public lands, to major Indian programs and agencies, energy conservation and research, and the Smithsonian and federal arts agencies. They have done a masterful job meeting important program needs in this final bill.

The pending conference report provides an unprecedented \$18.9 billion in new budget authority and \$11.9 billion in new outlays to fund the Department of Interior and related agencies. When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account the Senate bill totals \$18.9 billion in BA and \$17.4 billion in outlays for fiscal year 2001. The Senate bill is exactly at the revised section 302(b) allocation for both BA and in

outlays filed by the Appropriations Committee earlier today.

I would particularly like to thank Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD for their commitment to Indian programs in this year's Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. They have included increases of \$160 million for Bureau of Indian Affairs education construction, \$214 million for the Indian Health Service, and nearly \$102 million for the operation of Indian programs.

I commend the subcommittee chairman and ranking member for bringing this important measure to the floor with significant resources totaling \$1.6 billion to address the aftermath of the devastating summer and fall forest fires, including my initiative to undertake hazardous fuels reduction activities within the urban/wildland interface to protect our local communities—the so-called Happy Forests initiative.

This bill also includes an important, bipartisan compromise to establish a new Land Conservation, Preservation and Infrastructure Program that will dedicate \$12 billion over the next six years to conservation programs. This is an unprecedented commitment to conservation efforts by the Federal Government. I am pleased to support this initiative in its final form.

I appreciate the consideration given by my colleagues to several priority items for my constituents in New Mexico, which are included in the final bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the final version of the fiscal year 2001 Interior and related agencies Appropriations bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

H.R. 4578, INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 2001, SPENDING  
COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT  
(Fiscal year 2001, in millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Conference Report:			
Budget authority .....	18,883	59	18,942
Outlays .....	17,284	70	17,354
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority .....	18,883	59	18,942
Outlays .....	17,284	70	17,354
2000 level:			
Budget authority .....	14,769	59	14,828
Outlays .....	14,833	83	14,916
President's request:			
Budget authority .....	16,413	59	16,472
Outlays .....	15,967	70	16,037
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority .....	14,723	59	14,782
Outlays .....	15,164	70	15,234
Senate-passed bill:			
Budget authority .....	15,875	59	15,934
Outlays .....	15,591	70	15,661
CONFERENCE REPORT COMPARED TO			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority .....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays .....	.....	.....	.....
2000 level:			
Budget authority .....	4,114	.....	4,114
Outlays .....	2,451	-13	2,438
President's request <sup>1</sup> :			
Budget authority .....	2,470	.....	2,470
Outlays .....	1,317	.....	1,317
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority .....	4,160	.....	4,160
Outlays .....	2,120	.....	2,120
Senate-passed bill:			
Budget authority .....	3,008	.....	3,008

H.R. 4578, INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 2001, SPENDING  
COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

(Fiscal year 2001, in millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Manda- tory	Total
Outlays .....	1,693	.....	1,693

<sup>1</sup> The comparison between the conference report and the President's request is skewed because the conference report includes \$1.5 billion in emergency firefighting funds that the President indicated he would request, but for which OMB never submitted a formal request to the Congress, so the amount is not reflected in the President's request.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am in line for time, but I would be happy to yield to the Senator for 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Ten minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I just need the 30 minutes that were reserved for me. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, as I have many times in the last couple of months, to speak about an issue that is so important for so many Members in the Senate, and our colleagues on the House side, and to supporters everywhere, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act.

We will be voting on the Interior appropriations bill in just a few moments. I plan, with all due respect to those who have worked on this bill—and I acknowledge their hard work—to vote no because it fails to embrace the principles outlined in the Conservation and Reinvestment Act.

I express my respect for the members of the Appropriations Committee. They have a very tough job. They are charged with a great responsibility. While we have disagreed over this particular issue, we have worked together as we have tried and continue to try to reach a bipartisan compromise over this great battle for a legacy for our environment.

In particular, I thank Senator TED STEVENS from Alaska, our chairman, and Senator ROBERT BYRD from West Virginia, our ranking member, who have been very attentive to the calling and the requests of the CARA supporters in this regard. While we have disagreed on this issue, it has not been personal. My remarks today are intended strictly to be constructive and hopefully to help us chart a course to navigate in the future on this important issue.

I will read into and submit for the RECORD the excellent comments from

individuals and Governors and mayors reflected in newspapers around our country, literally from the west coast to the east coast, from the south to the north, from interior communities to coastal communities, literally thousands and thousands of positive editorials and articles written about what we are attempting to do. From the State of Illinois, we have had some of our best editorials on this subject, of which the Presiding Officer has been a supporter.

From the Seattle Post, May 18, a few months ago this year, talking about CARA:

It is a bold approach to environmental conservation and restoration. If ever there were a win-win for all the squabbling factions permanently encamped in the corridors of Capitol Hill to argue about the environment, this bill has to be it.

From the Providence Journal, RI, September 19:

Even with the unusual level of bipartisan support that this measure has, it could easily get lost in the last days of an election-year session. Citizens should press Congress to get it on to the desk of President, who would sign it.

While time is short, where there is a will there is a way, and the people of Rhode Island surely believe that.

From the Los Angeles Times, September 18:

This measure should be plucked from the pack and made law.

Chicago Tribune, from the home State of the Presiding Officer:

As Congress churns through its last days before adjournment, one issue of environmental impact should not be left in the dust, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, or CARA.

The New York Times just last week:

Before adjourning next month, Congress should approve two of the most important conservation bills in many years. One bill, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, would guarantee \$45 billion over 15 years for a range of environmental purposes, including wilderness protection.

Again, from my own paper, the New Orleans Times Picayune, which a few months back, actually, in its frustration in trying to communicate our message, said:

Senators from inland states don't seem to understand why Louisiana and other coastal states should receive the bulk of this environmental money generated by offshore revenues and maybe that is because their states aren't disappearing.

From the Tampa Tribune:

The Conservation Reinvestment Act is a necessary and sensible measure that would allow our nation to safeguard its natural heritage. It deserves Senate support.

Finally, from the Detroit Free Press, one of our most supportive editorials, in June of this year:

One of CARA's most exciting aspects, in fact, is the ability to focus on smaller projects than the Federal Government normally would, including urban green spaces, walkways, small slices of important habitat. For those with visions of a walkable riverfront in Detroit, of selective preservation of natural spots in the path of development, CARA is a dream come true—if the Senators controlling its fate will set it free.

I don't think CARA is going to get set free in the vote that we are going to have in just a few minutes, but that is the process. We will continue our fight. We will continue to talk about this important issue, and we will be organized and ready for next year.

In addition, there are still days left in this session where CARA could be, or something more like it, set free so that we can begin and can continue some of the very important environmental work going on in the country.

Let me say, not all of that environmental work takes place in Washington, D.C. Not all of that environmental work takes place among Federal agencies, although they have a role. A lot of this work takes place in our hometowns all across the Nation, with our Governors' offices, with our mayors and our county commissions, on ball fields and soccer fields, on cleanup days and Earth Days all over the Nation. That is the hope that CARA would bring that will be left on the table today.

I will submit all of these for the RECORD in my closing remarks.

In addition, let me make the point that some people have claimed that the CARA legislation was just helping coastal States. I will submit for the RECORD a wonderful editorial today from a place right in the middle of our Nation, the Kansas City Star, about the Conservation Reinvestment Act, realizing that time is short, but I want to read what they say from Kansas and Missouri:

This is not the time to give up. Despite the apparent bipartisan agreement, this latest version of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, also known as CARA, should not be the one approved by Congress.

Let us try to unite and find the will to salvage what we can, and perhaps there is a possible way to do that.

Let me read for the RECORD, as I begin closing, a letter to the editor of all the ones that were received, and there were literally hundreds written by many distinguished people from around our country, the one we received that just stood out above all the others was a wonderful letter written by Lady Bird Johnson and by the distinguished leader, Laurance Rockefeller, who is the uncle to our colleague from West Virginia whom we so admire and respect and for whom we have such affection. Laurance Rockefeller is 98 years old. I will read into the RECORD what Lady Bird and Laurence Rockefeller said about the actions we should be taking now:

The 20th century can rightly be called America's conservation century. From President Theodore Roosevelt forward, Americans began to embrace their land rather than just use it. This ethic of conservation has created, protected and preserved tens of millions of acres of open space in America, encompassing everything from national parks to neighborhood soccer fields.

But conservation is not something that concludes just because a century does. We are not done, nor will we ever be. While protecting our natural resources is often a

quiet, steady exercise, sometimes moments of great opportunity arise. We are at such a moment now.

They go on to write:

The U.S. Senate has before it legislation that would do more to protect America's heritage than anything in a generation. The Conservation and Reinvestment Act is in the true spirit of the early conservationists: It plans for the future while solving the immediate; it provides for recreation as well as preservation; it ensures significant state and local input and control; and it has bipartisan support. The House has passed the bill and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee has approved it. With the administration supporting the legislation, all that is needed is Senate action in the remaining days of this Congress.

CARA's origins stretch back to 1958, when President Eisenhower created the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to conduct a three-year inquiry into America's growing outdoor needs. Its findings suggested a new approach: Not only should the Federal Government step up its lagging land acquisition program to round out our National Park System, but it should also embark on a new venture to provide matching funds that state and local governments could use to meet a broader set of outdoor needs.

In 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law a bill creating the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which not only affirmed these commitments but set American conservation on a course it still follows.

The foresight embedded in LWCF—an emphasis on Federal/state/local partnerships, long-term planning, permanent acquisition and urban recreation—was strengthened later in the 1960s by tapping money from offshore oil and gas leases to fund LWCF projects. The wisdom of doing so was strikingly simple: Utilize the exploitation of one public natural resource in order to protect and conserve another. Congress had made a promise and found a way to keep it. And for years, the LWCF worked wonders. More than 37,000 projects have been sparked by the initiative, helping states and localities acquire 2.3 million acres of parkland and adding 3.4 million acres of new Federal lands to our national bounty. The LWCF has funded open space in literally every county in America, and is responsible for everything from helping preserve Civil War battlefields to purchasing land for Rocky Mountain National Park to building the baseball field down the street from your house.

After 15 years of generally faithful adherence to LWCF's unique bargain, Presidential administrations and Congress began to redirect large chunks of fund revenues from their intended purposes to other budget items. Since 1980, more than \$11 billion has been diverted from these projects, creating a staggering backlog of Federal, state and local land protection needs.

They continue and write:

We urgently need to restore the promise. That's what CARA will do. CARA represents the first good opportunity in 20 years to set our conservation path back on track. It not only fully funds the LWCF, but also addresses critical needs in wildlife management, urban parks, coastal protection—

Which is so important to my State and to many of our States, particularly Mississippi, Alabama, and all along the east and west coasts—

and historic preservation. Most important, it establishes a dependable source of funding for these programs. The prescience of those who created the fund was that conservation especially could not be a haphazard thing;

population growth, the inexorable march of development and simple wear and tear on resources require a permanent commitment. CARA returns us to that premise, providing approximately \$3 billion a year and a firm precedent for future funding.

CARA returns us to another important ideal: bipartisanship.

Sometimes that is in too short supply here in Washington.

Republican Don Young of Alaska and Democrat George Miller of California did a masterful job of steering CARA through the House, winning a 315-102 vote. In the Senate, Republican Frank Murkowski of Alaska and Democrat Jeff Bingaman of New Mexico brought the bill out of committee with support from Senators of both parties. In these gridlocked times, CARA's bipartisan treatment is a reminder that policy can sometimes overcome politics.

They conclude by saying:

We hope the full Senate will heed that reminder and act on CARA now.

We have worked as partners on conservation issues for almost four decades. Our hope has always been that American leaders would act so that their children—all children—would have something to look forward to. By reviving the Land and Water Conservation Fund before Congress goes home this year, it can provide just that.

Unfortunately, the bill before us does not do what this vision outlined. It does do many good things, but it falls short of this vision. In the last 10 minutes that I have, I want to finalize my comments by making just a few more points and submit a letter for the RECORD.

According to the Webster's Dictionary, "legacy" means something handed down from an ancestor or predecessor or from the past, or to bequeath.

For more than 3 years, many in this body, dozens of Members of the House of Representatives, hundreds of mayors and Governors, thousands of environmentalists and wildlife groups, and millions of Americans have been calling for a true environmental legacy.

Those of my colleagues who will, in a few minutes, support the Interior appropriations conference report will do so for many good reasons. My great friend from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, spoke eloquently yesterday about the money in this bill to fight the wild fires raging across the western plains. That is a very good reason to support this bill.

As the temperature gets ready to dip across America this winter, there is great need for a home heating oil reserve, and that is in this bill. That is a very good reason to support it.

In my State of Louisiana, the Cat Island Refuge, which is the oldest cypress forest in North America—and it may be the only one left—gets money in this bill. The New Orleans Jazz Commission and the Cane River National Heritage Area, the oldest settlement in the Louisiana Purchase, are reasons to support this bill.

However, if anyone here is looking for a true legacy, a long-term commit-

ment to our vanishing coastlines, our disappearing wildlife, and our crumbling parks and historic treasures, you will not find that in this bill.

The true legacy would have been the Conservation Reinvestment Act—a bill which has bipartisan support by a vast majority of the Congress and support from the President of the United States. However, today we will be asked to vote on what really amounts to sort of a CARA cardboard cutout—one that kind of looks like the real thing, but it is really flimsy and hollow, one which fails to deliver the great promise that we had at this opportunity for our children and our grandchildren.

For 3 years, a monumental and historic coalition built around this bill and congressional leaders designed it in a way to merit support across the aisle and across the Nation.

Early on, some environmentalists charged it was a pro-drilling bill. So we clarified the language to make sure it was drilling neutral to gather their support.

I think—and there are some of my colleagues on the floor who can attest to this—that perhaps we failed to go as far as we should have. But I believe we made great strides in meeting the concerns of some of those who claimed that this bill would have compromised private property rights and would have allowed the Federal Government to buy up land without willing seller provisions and congressional approval.

We worked mightily to meet those objectives, and we believe the compromise that we came up with was fair and good along these lines.

I know for the past few years I have cajoled, bargained, and spoken to so many of my friends and colleagues to listen to the merits of this proposal. I am sure on more than one occasion when they saw me coming, they ran the other way. But I believe this is so important that we should take this step now.

When I am asked how we can afford to do this, my answer is simple: How can we afford not to?

Since 1930, Louisiana has lost more than 1,500 square miles of marsh. The State loses between 25 and 30 miles each year—nearly a football field of wetlands every 30 minutes in my State.

By 2050, we will lose more than 600 square miles of marsh and almost 400 square miles of swamp.

That means the Nation will lose an area of coastal wetlands about the size of Rhode Island—about the size of your State, Mr. President. We are about ready to lose it.

In the past 100 years, as so eloquently spoken about yesterday by our colleague from Florida, Senator BOB GRAHAM, southern Florida's Everglades have been reduced to one-fifth their former size.

In the past 30 years, the population of blue crabs in the Chesapeake Bay has been barely hanging on, much to the dismay, I know, of Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SARBANES, who fight

vigorously for renewal in the Chesapeake.

In the middle of this century, a boat-er could look down into Lake Tahoe's depths and see 100 feet. Today that is more like 60, or 70, and dropping every day. Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BOXER know that CARA could be one of the answers—not the only answer but truly one of the answers to help.

These facts are staggering. More importantly, it will take decades to turn it around.

So let's begin now.

I ask each of my colleagues to put themselves in the shoes of our Governors, our mayors, and our natural resource officials. All of these local officials are charged just as we are with developing long-range strategies to combat vanishing coastlines, disappearing wildlife, and crumbling treasures. But if we don't enact CARA, or something very close to it, a funding stream they can count on year in and year out, their efforts will be marginalized.

The Gulf of Mexico does not wait for congressional approval to claim 30 square miles of Louisiana every year. Hurricanes do not lobby congressional appropriators before they claim precious beaches in Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and the eastern seaboard. Mother nature does not testify in front of Congress before she floods our parks, eats away at the Everglades, and takes her toll on our historic treasures.

Let us look closely at what we are doing here today. I ask that we not be lulled into believing that this is anything more than a minor downpayment on a debt we owe to our children.

In the past 2 years, I think we have made much progress in recognizing the contribution of the coastal States—particularly States such as Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, and Alabama—which generate these offshore revenues in the first place.

Because I have received assurances from both leaders, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, and Senator DASCHLE of South Dakota, that both coastal impact assistance and wildlife protection can be addressed in other bills in this Congress, I have withdrawn my objections to final passage of this bill.

Although CARA supporters will lose the vote today, we will grow stronger. We will come back energized and ready to fight for what our country really needs—a true environmental legacy. The coalition knows that this is a downpayment. And, like all who are owed a debt, we will come to collect.

Winston Churchill once said:

Want of foresight. . . unwillingness to act when action would be simple and effective . . . lack of clear thinking, confusion of counsel until the emergency comes . . . until self-preservation strikes its jarring gong. . . these are features which constitute the endless repetition of history.

Colleagues, let us heed these words. Let us come next year prepared with a willingness to act. Let us think clearly before the emergencies come. Let us

not wait until our environmental preservation hangs in the balance. And let us listen to the cause of the American people—people from my State, people from your State, people from all of our States who say they need something on which they can depend—a steady stream of revenue; a partnership that they can depend on to help preserve what is best about America while protecting private property rights, while protecting the great balance between land ownership and land maintenance, while protecting the great needs of our coastline and our interior.

We need a bill that America can grow on and depend on and prosper from in the decades ahead.

I thank again the appropriators for their hard work. I thank the authorizers for their tremendous vision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of wonderful people who need to be thanked for their efforts and, in doing so, not conceding that there is not still some time left to make some corrections and improvements but recognizing that the time is short and we will continue to pursue this avenue. But this is a list of coalition members from the National Wildlife Federation; Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association; National Governors' Association; the Nature Conservancy; Louisiana Department of Natural Resources; Americans for our Heritage and Recreation; International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies that worked so hard on this effort; U.S. Soccer Foundation; National Wildlife Federation; Coastal Conservation Association; Outdoor Recreation Coalition of America; Trust for Public Lands; Coastal States Organization, which Jack Caldwell helped to head up; National Coalition of State Historic Preservation Officers, particularly the Governor of Oregon who was so helpful, and many other Governors; the Wilderness Society; Southern Governors Association; my Governor, Governor Foster, who lent a hand early on; Land Trust Alliance; and the Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana.

Those are just a few. There are so many more and I know my time is probably up.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of many of the staff people who helped make this possible.

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

#### CARA COALITION MEMBERS

Mark Van Putten, Jodi Applegate, Jim Lyon, Steve Schimburg—National Wildlife Federation  
Sandy Briggs—Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association  
Jena Carter, Diane Shays—National Governor's Association  
Tom Cassidy, Jody Thomas, David Weiman—The Nature Conservancy  
Sidney Coffee—Louisiana Department of Natural Resources  
Tom Cove—Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association  
Jane Danowitz—Americans for our Heritage and Recreation

Glenn Delaney, Naomi Edelson, Max Peterson—International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Jim Range—International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies/The American Airgun Field Target Association

Gary Taylor—International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Herb Giobbi—U.S. Soccer Foundation

Pam Goddard—National Wildlife Federation

Bob Hayes—Coastal Conservation Association

Myrna Johnson—Outdoor Recreation Coalition of America

Lesly Kane—Trust for Public Land

Tony MacDonald—Coastal States Organization

Nancy Miller—National Coalition of State Historic Preservation Officers

Andrew Minkiewicz, Kevin Smith—Governor Kitzhaber of Oregon

Rindy O'Brien—The Wilderness Society

Beth Osborne—Southern Governor's Association

Bob Szabo—Van Ness—Feldman Law Firm

Russell Shay—Land Trust Alliance

Mark Davis—Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana

#### ACTIVELY SUPPORTIVE MEMBERS AND STAFFS

Senator Thomas Daschle—Mark Childress, Eric Washburn

Senator Trent Lott—Jim Ziglar

Senator Bingaman—Minority Energy Committee Staff: Bob Simon, Sam Fowler, David Brooks, Mark Katherine Ishee, Kyra Finkler

Senator Murkowski—Majority Energy Committee Staff: Andrew Lundquist, Kelly Johnson

Senator Mike DeWine—Paul Palagyi

Senator John Breaux—Fred Hatfield, Stephanie Leger, Mallory Moore

Senator Max Baucus—Brian Kuehl, Norma Jane Sabiston, Jason Schendle, Aylin Azikalin, Alyson Azodeh

All democratic colleagues on Energy Committee and Senator Fitzgerald.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I end by saying that sometimes it takes a bold act to receive something on which we can really build. CARA is a bold act.

In a bill with \$15 billion, asking for a few hundred million for States and local governments, a few hundred million for our coastal communities, a few hundred million for wildlife, was not too much to ask. I am very hopeful in the years ahead we can meet the promise of CARA.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed excerpts of editorial support.

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

#### WHY CARA? WHY NOW?

##### EXCERPTS OF EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR THE CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT

"It's a bold approach to environmental conservation and restoration. If ever there were a win-win for all the squabbling factions permanently encamped in the corridors of Capitol Hill to argue about the environment, this bill has to be it." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, May 18, 2000.

"The Conservation and Reinvestment Act has the magic to get through Congress in an election year: money for lots of states, creative compromises and an odd-couple pair of sponsors from the right and left."—*Seattle Times*, May 9, 2000.

"Even with the unusual level of bipartisan support that this measure has, it could easily get lost in the last days of an election-



year session. Citizens should press Congress to get it onto the desk of President Clinton, who should sign it."—*Providence (Rhode Island) Journal*, September 19, 2000.

"This measure should be plucked from the pack and made law."—*Los Angeles Times*, September 18, 2000.

"By passing the act, the Senate will demonstrate that in the current prosperity, America is not forgetting its other riches, those bestowed on it by nature."—*San Jose Mercury News*, September 17, 2000.

"As Congress churns through its last days before adjournment, one issue of environmental impact should not be left in the dust: the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, or CARA."—*Chicago Tribune*, September 16, 2000.

"Before adjourning next month, Congress should approve two of the most important conservation bills in many years. One bill, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, would guarantee \$45 billion over 15 years for a range of environmental purposes, including wilderness protection."—*The New York Times*, September 13, 2000.

"One of the most important and comprehensive pieces of conservation legislation in U.S. history deserves immediate passage by the Senate. It is a bill most Americans have never heard of: The Conservation and Reinvestment Act, or CARA."—*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, September 11, 2000.

"This is a rare piece of legislation. Its purpose is clear and simple. Its funding is ready. Its public benefit would be immense, and so would its public support, if anyone could hear about it through the blare of electioneering. All it needs is attention by our senators in the next three weeks."—*San Diego Union-Tribune*, September 7, 2000.

"Senators from inland states don't seem to understand why Louisiana and other coastal states should receive the bulk of the environmental money generated by offshore oil revenues. And maybe that's because their states aren't disappearing."—*The (New Orleans) Times-Picayune*, July 18, 2000.

"Back in the '60s, Congress set aside \$900 million yearly from offshore oil revenue for the Land and Water Conservation Fund to finance purchases of important natural beauty spots. But over the years Congress routinely robbed the fund to spend the money elsewhere, and Iowa was routinely shut out when the remainder was divided. CARA restores the fund and adds much more."—*The Des Moines Register*, July 8, 2000.

"This landmark legislation deserves a chance, and it will be a shame if opponents manage to use the clock or unreasonable arguments to kill it. While senators out West worry about the federal government gaining more control over land, those of us who live in Louisiana worry about the acres of coast that are crumbling into the Gulf of Mexico. One fear is speculation, the other is all too real."—*The (New Orleans) Times-Picayune*, September 19, 2000.

"The Conservation and Reinvestment Act is a necessary and sensible measure that would allow our nation to safeguard its natural heritage. It deserves the Senate's support."—*The Tampa Tribune*, July 7, 2000.

"CARA is considered to be the most significant conservation funding legislation any Congress has ever considered."—*Times Daily (Florence, Alabama)*, July 10, 2000.

"The Conservation and Reinvestment Act is a strong and balanced realization of the philosophy that government revenues generated by exploiting natural resources ought to be spent, in large part, on protecting resources elsewhere. That's philosophy that Congress has long honored on paper, and should now put into practice."—*The (Minneapolis) Star Tribune*, July 3, 2000.

"One of CARA's most exciting aspects, in fact, is the ability to focus on smaller

projects than the federal government normally would, including urban green spaces, walkways and small slices of important habitat. For those with visions of a walkable riverfront in Detroit, of selective preservation of natural spots in the path of development, CARA is a dream come true—if the senators controlling its fate will set it free."—*Detroit Free Press*, June 27, 2000.

"The most important land conservation bill in many years is now before the United States Senate, and time is running out."—*The New York Times*, June 27, 2000.

"It's a reasonable, bipartisan way for America to create long-term funding for conserving our natural heritage."—*The (Salem, Oregon) Statesman Journal*, June 14, 2000.

"CARA is a good program that promotes local initiative toward parks, resource conservation and historic preservation. We hope our senators change their positions and give the support it deserves."—*The Idaho Statesman*, June 13, 2000.

"We need to make it clear that we, the American people, want the Senate to pass the most significant wildlife, parks and recreation legislation in over 30 years."—*The Pueblo (Colorado) Chieftain*, June 11, 2000.

"This is a quality-of-life bill for the future, one that holds enormous promise for the protection of dwindling natural and cultural resources. Passage means benefits for the current generation of Americans, and a chance to continue those gains for generations yet to come."—*The Buffalo (New York) News*, May 22, 2000.

"So long as good sense continues to prevail, this legislation may signal the beginning of an era, none too soon, in which environmental impact has a more prominent seat at the table."—*Winston-Salem Journal*, May 19, 2000.

[From the *Kansas City Star*, Oct. 5, 2000]

#### CONSERVATION MONEY

The proposed Conservation and Reinvestment Act, which would transfer millions of dollars from federal off-shore oil leases to financially starved local and state parks and wildlife programs, is in trouble.

Thanks to a deal devised by congressional negotiators on the Interior Department appropriations bill, the House has approved a pale version of the landmark legislation that earlier had been endorsed by two-thirds of the House, more than half of the Senate and President Clinton.

The President has endorsed this inferior agreement, saying that "while we had hoped for even more" he wanted to praise the conservation, wildlife and recreation groups, as well as citizens, who worked so hard for the conservation act.

This is not the time to give up. Despite the apparent bipartisan agreement, this latest version of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, also known as CARA, should not be the one approved by Congress. It falls far short of the original that has been pushed by conservation groups, cities, counties and states.

Under a strong bipartisan effort, Congress has been on the verge of restoring the money to its rightful uses. Of the \$3 billion CARA would provide, Missouri annually stands to gain \$34.7 million and Kansas \$17.3 million for natural resource preservation and parkland acquisition. Kansas and Missouri cities and counties could use their share of the money to improve state and local parks, purchase land for parks, and other recreational purposes.

The substitute version falls short in the money it would guarantee over the long term. In one example, \$350 million annually for nongame wildlife programs has been cut to \$50 million.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Minority Leader Tom Daschle have announced their intention to push to restore CARA to its former self. They are backed by the nation's governors, who have sought significant conservation funding for state needs. The original version is the one that should be passed.

Approval of CARA could be one of the most significant victories of this Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent to take the remaining time of the Senator from Arizona, which I believe is 4 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Would the distinguished Senator allow me to use 5 minutes of my time as the ranking member on the subcommittee?

Mr. THOMAS. Go right ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I trust that the distinguished Senator will not leave the floor. I hope he will follow me immediately. If he is in great haste, I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. THOMAS. Go right ahead.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in the short time available before the Senate votes on final passage of the Interior appropriations conference report, I want to again urge my colleagues to support this measure. It is a good compromise that balances the needs of our parks, our forests, our wildlife refuges, and our trust responsibilities to American Indians, against the resources made available to us. That task—the task of reconciling identified needs with limited resources—is not easy.

I am particularly pleased with the level of funding in this bill for fossil energy research. The new power plant improvement initiative, along with the other fossil energy research programs in the Department of Energy, are critical to this nation's energy security. Working to curtail our reliance on imported oil, and ensuring that our current fleet of power plants are efficient and environmentally sound, should be the cornerstone of the next administration's energy policy. I can assure the next president, whomever he may be, that I, for one, am ready to assist in that endeavor.

Mr. President, I also wish to take a moment to thank the chairman of the full committee, Senator TED STEVENS, for his interest in this bill, for his continued support, and for his willingness to work with Senator GORTON and me to ensure that we were able to get to this point. In particular, I am grateful for his help in making additional resources available to the Interior subcommittee. Without those resources, we could not have crafted this bill.

Finally, Mr. President, let me again thank my colleague, the subcommittee chairman, Senator GORTON. He and his staff have truly been a pleasure to work with.

When I talk of staff, let me briefly mention my own staff person, Peter Kiefhaber. I believe this is his first bill, first major bill, to assist me on this

floor throughout the markup, throughout the hearings. He has done a masterful job as a new person in that position. I thank him and I congratulate him.

I yield the floor now. I yield my remaining time to Senator GORTON.

I, again, thank the distinguished Senator for yielding when he had the floor, to allow me to make this brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask to take the 4 minutes that was available to the Senator from Arizona.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I appreciate the opportunity to visit just a moment on a subject that is very close to my heart and very close to my interests. I am from Wyoming, a State that has open space throughout a great deal of the State. It is the eighth largest State in the United States and still the smallest population. I grew up near Yellowstone Park. Those are things I feel very strongly about.

I want to do two things—one, to comment on the good proposal of the Senator from Louisiana and her passionate defense of it. I understand that. I respect that a great deal. There are some things that are disadvantageous about CARA that we have talked about. One, of course, is the idea it makes it mandatory spending for 15 years. This is an entitlement. As we look at our budget now, about a third of our budget is up to the Congress to allocate. The rest of it is entitlements.

I came from serving in the Wyoming Legislature where the legislature now only has control over 25 percent of the dollars. I think that is a dangerous position, and entitlements become a real problem.

Also, as we look toward the land acquisition, there are a number of things we need to be concerned about in this year's budget. From this administration, there was more interest on the purchase plan than the maintenance plan. We have 379 parks in this country, most of which are in desperate need of infrastructure help, but it seems as if the more popular thing to talk about is the acquisition of more land. Fifty percent of my State belongs to the Federal Government; 85 percent of Nevada in the west along the Rocky Mountain area, most of the land now belongs to the Federal Government.

We asked in committee if we could have some kind of protection in this allocation of CARA of \$45 billion, that we would not have any more Federal land; that, indeed, if Federal lands were to be purchased, we would have an opportunity to dispose of some Federal land so there would be basically no net gain. It seems to me that is reasonable. The supporters of CARA were not willing to talk about that.

In conclusion, I think there is a great deal of merit in the bill before the Senate. It isn't, of course, what everyone

wants. There are more expenditures to it than some like. It does reflect help however, for the losses that were incurred because of the forest fires—6.6 million acres in the West burned this year and the costs associated and the losses associated there.

I am going to support this bill. I am pleased. I thank the chairman for his good work in getting this bill before the Senate.

I will comment on the fact that not only in this bill but in a number of bills there are authorizations for things I think are inappropriately authorized in appropriations bills. In this bill there are some parks, for example, and set-asides which certainly ought to come from the authorizing committee, not from the Appropriations Committee.

I understand what happens. We get toward the end of the year, and there are things there, people want something to happen and we are in danger of having a lot of that happen in the next week or so. I hope it does not. We have a system where there is an authorization and there is an appropriation.

I don't think anyone in this place is more anxious to have dollars available to do something with conservation, to do something with preservation, to do something with easements, to do something with maintenance of the land we already have, but I think we have to make sure those bills, indeed, have the composition that makes them the kinds of things that we need to have in this Congress and that is to have them authorized yearly or at least in shorter spans than 15 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, before I make some general remarks, I will respond to the three—and I think there have only been three—critics of this bill.

For the better part of 3 days, the Senate has indulged in the remarks of the Senator from Illinois over one item out of many hundreds in this bill. Normally speaking, items such as the Lincoln Library are included in bills such as this because the Senators from the States concerned believe they are important and because we believe they are reasonable national priorities. I think I can assure the Senator from Illinois and the body that, had I known we were going to go through this process, there would have been no money for this project in this bill at all. It may very well be there will be no more tomorrow.

I do think a library for Abraham Lincoln's papers in Springfield, IL, is an appropriate project. The State of Illinois and various local entities and individuals are providing the great majority of the money that is going into that project. The Senator from Illinois has engaged in a filibuster, required the vote of 89-8 on cloture, all over the bidding practices with respect to the way in which that project is under-

taken, as to whether or not they ought to be Federal bidding practices or the State of Illinois' bidding practices—bidding practices of the State of Illinois that I believe he had something to do with creating while he was a member of the legislature of that body.

Even under the bill as it appears here, the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to review the design, method of acquisition, and the estimated cost, and can deal with anything that the Secretary believes to be untoward in this entire question. But I have to say that to spend 3 days of the time of the Senate on this internal dispute involving Members of Congress and others from the State of Illinois was an imposition on the time of the Senate at any time, but especially when the Senate is attempting to finish many important bills of which this is one, but only one. We will go forward with it at this point. We will pass the bill at this point. I believe the President of the United States will sign it at this point. But I can certainly not remember any other instance in which a Member from a State that is getting a benefit from the bill has looked so carefully at the teeth of a gift horse.

The second question I raise is about some of the criticisms from my good friend, the Senator from Arizona. He complains about money in this bill for carriage barn rehabilitation at the Longfellow National Historic Site. That is a national park site. That is the very kind of thing that we must rehabilitate. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, when he lived at his place, had a carriage barn. I don't know whether the Senator from Arizona feels we should let it fall down, but my own view is our first duty is to maintain the national park sites that we have at the present time. The Senator from Wyoming has just referred to that. How that constitutes pork, or a reason to vote against this bill, is, I must say, beyond my understanding.

He complains about dollars for the southeast Alaska disaster fund that he claims were not included in either the House or the Senate bill. In fact, they were included in the Senate bill under a different account number.

He complains about \$30 million for site-specific earmarks or emergency funds, one quarter of which turn out to be—slightly more than one quarter—for hazardous fuels reduction activities carried on by Northern Arizona University.

When I was on the floor, he was complaining about the rehabilitation of a fish hatchery in White Sulphur Springs, WV, which was requested by my good friend and colleague, the Senator from West Virginia. Again, I am puzzled why it is we should not provide such office rehabilitation at a site that is a specific function of the people of the United States.

In other words, I don't find those criticisms to have any particular merit whatsoever. This is our business. It is the business of this bill to see to it

that the lands and historic sites and facilities of the United States of America are properly maintained. I think one of the great shortcomings, one of the overwhelming shortcomings that we have had in the last few years is that we have not been maintaining these sites to the extent they ought to be maintained. One of the goals, which I have accomplished in this bill, is to increase the amount of money for that maintenance, both in the regular bill and in this supplement to this bill that is the third item of controversy here today.

This bill is criticized by the Senator from Louisiana as not including the full authorization for the so-called CARA bill, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. She is certainly correct; it does not. That bill is an almost \$3-billion-a-year entitlement for some 15 years, the net result of which is that the items included in it are deemed to be more important, should that bill pass the Congress of the United States, than saving the Social Security system, than education, than health care, or any of the other items for which we appropriate every year. In my view, it is utterly inappropriate as an entitlement that automatically comes off the top, before all the other priorities of the people of the United States.

On the other hand, many of the items preferred in that CARA legislation are highly worthy items, items for which this subcommittee chairman is delighted to have what now amounts to a greater authorization. Many of them will be more liberally funded in the future as a result of the proposals that are a part of this bill now.

It is said—it was said in that criticism—that this bill sends all the money through the Federal bureaucracy rather than CARA sending it directly to the States. First, it doesn't send all the money through the Federal bureaucracy. Many of these programs are existing programs that result in formula grants to the States, and others are competitive grants to the States. At this point, the Congress can, through its authorizing committees, change the distribution formula for any one of these programs, either to make them more direct or more focused. CARA, of course, doesn't send all its money directly to the States, either. It does include large amounts for payment to coastal States but they are for new programs which are not even authorized at this point and will not be unless some bill of that nature is passed.

Second, this is criticized by some conservatives for not providing protections for private property. The Interior bill funds currently authorized programs. It doesn't authorize them; it funds currently authorized programs and therefore, by definition, includes every protection for private property that exists in any one of those authorizing laws. If there are shortcomings in this field, it is not the fault of the Appropriations Committee but of the very

authorizing committee that presented CARA to us in the first place.

For Federal land acquisitions that are funded by this CARA-lite, in future years everyone is going to be subject to the same process as is used at the present time. They are all going to go through appropriations committees. I can assure my colleagues, I cannot think of a case where this committee has approved a project that did not have the support of the relevant Members of Congress, except maybe for this one in Illinois, which has been the subject of debate for some 3 days. So that objection is simply not valid.

It is also pointed out this bill does not provide States and local governments with a predictable funding stream. You bet your life it does not, and it was not so designed. Why should we give a predictable funding stream for grant programs to State and local governments in precedence to the very programs for which we are directly responsible? We do not have a fully predictable or legally enforceable funding stream for schools. We don't have it for most of our health care programs. We don't have it for research and development programs. We don't have it for a wide variety of the programs that are subject to debate every year. It is just for that reason that we do not have it. They should be subject to debate and revision with respect to priorities every year. That is why we have a Congress.

On the other hand, this new title does provide a decidedly increased likelihood that these grant programs will be sustained and will increase in future years.

What this bill does is to say that if you do not spend this money on the programs outlined in this bill, you cannot spend it on something else, but it will go to reducing the national debt. It is only a couple months. Members on both sides of the aisle vociferously were saying that a reduction of the national debt was the most important single economic activity in which we could engage. Chairman Greenspan was quoted constantly on the floor of the Senate. We forgot that when some decided we needed these "predictable funding streams," that is to say, entitlements which come directly out of debt reduction.

I have never been able to see the logic of a 15-year guaranteed funding stream that could not easily be adjusted if the programs were ineffective or if we went into economic times in which there were higher priorities.

Those are some of the critiques of the particular proposal, additional portions of which are likely to be included in the appropriations bill for Commerce-State-Justice, particularly the oceans portions of it which will be debated later.

Finally, Senator GRAHAM from Florida criticized the bill for not providing adequate funds for national parks. While CARA would have guaranteed an extra \$100 million per year for the Na-

tional Park Service—Mr. President, I am allowed to take time from Senator STEVENS.

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

Mr. GORTON. The answer is, of course, CARA did not either. CARA gave money to the National Park Service above the line but not below the line, and very likely future Congresses will simply reduce the discretionary portion of that account by the amount guaranteed in CARA itself.

It was at my insistence that this CARA-lite does include an item, I believe \$150 million a year, for national park maintenance. I think that is one of the most important elements of the bill itself.

The vote on cloture indicated the broad support for this bill, as did the overwhelming bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives. For that overwhelming bipartisan support, I owe particular thanks to Senator BYRD for helping me in developing the conference agreement and shaping it in a way that merits the support of Members on both sides of the aisle. His new staff minority clerk, Peter Kiefhaber, has been a tremendous asset during the course of his first year. He has been ably assisted by Carole Geagley of the minority staff and Scott Dalzell, who has been with us on detail from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

I thank my own exemplary staff: Bruce Evans, who is sitting here with me, Ginny James, Leif Fonnesebeck, Christine Drager, and Joe Norrell, as well as our detailee, Sheila Sweeney, and Kari Vander Stoep of my personal staff. All have also worked so many hours on this bill that I do not dare count them for fear of feeling ashamed. They have worked extremely hard, but they have been successful and have every reason to be gratified with their work.

I note for the record this is the last year in which I will be privileged to work with my counterpart chairman, Congressman RALPH REGULA from the House of Representatives. He will have another subcommittee next year, and I tell you, I will miss him. I have never dealt with anyone in this body or in the other body with whom I have had a more positive and affirmative, constructive working relationship, often with a great many laughs because of his marvelous sense of humor. RALPH REGULA will have left a substantial legacy of increased priority for the maintenance of our Federal lands and facilities and a great approach in a matter of principle.

In summary, this is a popular bill that has every right to be popular because it meets with many of the needs of deferred maintenance for past neglect. It has many projects in it that are of great importance to Members on both sides of the partisan divide in this body and our significant national priorities as well, and will get us through another year with respect not just to these natural resources used in energy

research and cultural institutions in the United States but in a way I think worthy and which I recommend heartily to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. GORTON. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. GORTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Leg.]

#### YEAS—83

Abraham	Durbin	Mikulski
Akaka	Edwards	Miller
Allard	Enzi	Moynihan
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Baucus	Gorton	Murray
Bayh	Grams	Nickles
Bennett	Grassley	Reed
Biden	Gregg	Reid
Bingaman	Hagel	Robb
Bond	Harkin	Roberts
Boxer	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hollings	Roth
Bunning	Hutchinson	Santorum
Burns	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Byrd	Inouye	Schumer
Campbell	Johnson	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kerry	Snowe
Cochran	Kohl	Specter
Collins	Kyl	Stevens
Conrad	Lautenberg	Thomas
Craig	Leahy	Thompson
Crapo	Levin	Thurmond
Daschle	Lincoln	Torricelli
DeWine	Lott	Warner
Dodd	Lugar	Wellstone
Domenici	Mack	Wyden
Dorgan	McConnell	

#### NAYS—13

Breaux	Gramm	Sessions
Brownback	Helms	Smith (NH)
Feingold	Inhofe	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	Landrieu	
Graham	McCain	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Feinstein	Kennedy
Jeffords	Lieberman

The conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate now be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### THE HEATING OIL RESERVE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think Senator DOMENICI will be seeking recognition. First, I want to take 2 minutes to alert my colleagues to what I think is a very significant issue.

Much has been made of late about the status of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the recommendation by Vice President GORE that we withdraw 30 million barrels out of the SPR so we can build up our heating oil reserve. Let me tell you what is happening to that.

The administration forgot a very important detail when they put that oil up to bid for the refiners. They didn't mandate that the crude oil be refined into heating oil or that it be used to build inventories here in the United States for the benefit of the Northeast States that need that heating oil inventories built up.

What will happen to the crude oil or refined product? It will go into the marketplace, and it is going to Europe because Europe is paying a higher price for heating oil than the United States. Currently, 167,000 barrels a day of distillate is exported.

Let me tell you what came out of the Houston Chronicle, and I quote:

The buyers can do what they wish with the oil, such as sell or swap it, said Department of Energy spokesperson Drew Malcomb, although whoever ends up with the oil has to get it out of storage by the end of November.

The extra crude won't result in any additional heating oil because all the heating oil facilities already are operating at maximum capacity, Brown said.

There you have it. You have an administration that said we had an emergency, we had to go into SPR, address our heating oil situation, while sending a message to the Mideast that we are reducing our savings account. Then we find we may not build up our domestic heating oil inventories at all with this oil, it is going up for sale into the market and ending up in Europe because the administration didn't mandate that if you bought the oil, you had to keep it here in the United States.

Senator STEVENS and I have experienced some demands relative to our inability to move our oil out of our State.

It is inconsistent to me that the administration could make such a poor business deal. We have not accomplished anything with SPR. We have simply increased our exports of heating oil. I think it is a charade.

I thank my colleague from New Mexico. But I did want to call that to your attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Houston Chronicle entitled "Oil from Reserve in High De-

mand" and two tables on distillate exports.

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

OIL FROM RESERVE IN HIGH DEMAND—  
BIDDERS GRAB 30 MILLION BARRELS

(By Nelson Antosh)

Trading companies and refiners looking for a good deal on crude have snapped up all 30 million barrels that the federal government is releasing from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The Energy Department announced Wednesday that 11 companies, some of them with names little known even within the industry, had submitted the best bids for the oil being held underground in Louisiana and Texas.

The buyers in effect promised to return to storage 31.56 million barrels between August and November of next year, thus paying a premium of about 5 percent.

But by using the futures market, the successful bidders will be able to pay back with oil cheaper than what it is today, even if the real market price for crude may be higher by then.

"A good transaction for value," said Mary Rose Brown of Valero, a San Antonio-based company that will be refining its federal crude. The difference between Wednesday's futures and the payback cost is \$3.25 per barrel, she said.

The futures price for next October is \$28.53, said Kyle Cooper of Salomon Smith Barney in Houston, who reasons that all the reserve sale does is "move around crude."

In contrast to next October, the sweet crude contract for next month settled Wednesday on the New York Mercantile Exchange for \$31.43 per barrel.

The buyers can do what they wish with the oil, such as sell or swap it, said DOE spokesman Drew Malcomb, although whoever ends up with the oil has to get it out of storage by the end of November.

Valero will be taking 1 million barrels of sour crude from the Bryan Mound storage site near Freeport and splitting it between its refineries in Texas City and Freeport.

That crude will be co-mingled with other supplies and be made into a full range of products, including gasoline.

The extra crude won't result in any additional heating oil because all the heating oil facilities already are operating at maximum capacity, Brown said. Valero even shifted some of its distillate output at a New Jersey refinery from premium-priced jet fuel into home heating oil.

"The product will go where the market is," said Malcomb, although he said his agency would prefer that it be refined into heating oil and be shipped to the Northeast.

Vitol, a trading company in Houston that also owns a refinery in Canada, will get 1.05 million barrels of sweet crude out of a storage site in Louisiana and 550,000 sour barrels out of Bryan Mound.

The company will apply for an export license, but logically it is a better value if sold along the Gulf Coast, said a Vitol employee who preferred not to be identified.

Marathon Ashland Petroleum LLC, a Houston-based venture that is a major refiner, was the high bidder on 2.4 million barrels of sour crude and 1.5 million barrels of sweet crude.

The DOE did not release the amounts that individual companies promised to return to the reserve, because that could influence any future sales.

Morgan Stanley Dean Witter of New York was the high bidder on 2 million barrels.

Lesser known names were Euell Energy of Aurora, Colo., which was the high bidder on