

in the Weekly Standard, "[Arafat] proved, even to much of the Israeli left, that the entire theory of preemptive concessions, magnanimous gestures, rolling appeasement was an exercise in futility."

The key to peace is a Palestinian leadership that would appeal to the better nature of the Palestinian people, one that would reflect their aspirations for a prosperous and peaceful future—not one that exploits their misery through a policy of physically and vitriolically attacking Israel. In short, a democratic government. As my friend Douglas Feith expressed the point in an article in Commentary: "A stable peace [is] possible . . . only if the Palestinians first evolved responsible administrative institutions and leadership that enjoyed legitimacy in the eyes of its own people, refrained from murdering its political opponents, operated within and not above the law, and practiced moderation and compromise at home and abroad." This would, of course, be a boon not only for the Israelis, but for the Palestinians—indeed especially for the Palestinians.

For over fifty years, the United States and Israel have been bound together in a relationship that has weathered many efforts to drive a wedge between us. With the coincident election of a new leader in each country, our two great nations have an opportunity to reassess the lessons recent history has to teach us. For my part, I am optimistic that the new American administration will place a great value on our relationship with the Israeli people; and I am optimistic that the Israelis will maintain the strength and morale that they will need to await a change in Palestinian leadership. At that point there will be much more the Israelis can do to secure their future.

The United States should not push Israel into a process or into an agreement with which the government and people of Israel are not completely comfortable, with their security ensured. It is their existence that is at stake, and we must take no actions that jeopardize their security.

My colleague from Wyoming would like to use the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I appreciate the time. I thank my friend from Arizona for his comments on energy. Certainly, I can't think of an issue that affects more people and is more likely to become a crisis again than energy. We had some touch of it and backed off of it a little. California is doing a little better than it was. Gas prices are tending to stabilize or even come down.

The real cause of the problem is still there. I am surprised, frankly, that the Senate leadership hasn't been willing to go forward and at least give us a date as to the time in which we can un-

dertake this question of energy and energy supply. We have gone now 8, 10 years without a policy regarding energy, not having any real direction with regard to what we are going to do. We have become 60-percent dependent on OPEC and overseas oil. We haven't developed refineries, new transmission lines, or pipelines in order to move energy from where it is to where it is needed, and still our leadership here refuses to move forward.

I think we will again be facing the same kind of situation we just had if we don't move to find a long-term resolution, and we can.

We now have a policy from the administration, one that deals with domestic production. There is access to public lands, much of it standing in Alaska or in many places that could indeed have production without damage to the environment. We can do that.

We can talk about conservation. We can talk about renewables. We have to have a policy to cause us to do some of these things.

The transportation is vitally important. In Wyoming, we have great supplies of coal, for example. In order to mine and move that energy to where the market is, you have to have some transmission. There are a number of ways to do that, and we can if we decide to and commit ourselves to do it.

Research, clean coal: Our coal in Wyoming is clean, and it can be cleaner if we have research to do that.

Diversity: We can't expect to have only one source of supply for all the energy we use. We are heavy energy users, and most of us are not willing to make many changes to that.

I am grateful for the comments of my friend, and I hope we can get the leadership here to set the agenda to move toward doing something there.

USING SNOW MACHINES IN YELLOWSTONE PARK

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I know it is now summer, but I will now talk about using snow machines in the Yellowstone Park in the wintertime. It is a question that has become quite political, as a matter of fact. There have been letters sent to the Department of the Interior from the Senate on both sides.

For a number of years, in Grand Teton, in Yellowstone Park, and many of the other parks, the principal access people have had in the wintertime to enjoy their park was with snow machines. It has been done for a long time, really. Frankly, there hasn't been much management of that technique, unfortunately. The park officials have not had much to do with it. They have not sought to organize how and where it is done, separate the snow machines from the cross-country skiers, which can be done so each can have their own opportunity. It has to manage numbers sometimes, for instance, if they become too large around Christmas vacation.

They can make changes, but they have not done that. They have an opportunity, and we have an opportunity to have much cleaner machines, which are less noisy and which are less polluting. The manufacturers have indicated they can and will do this. Of course, they need some assurance from EPA that having done it, they will be able to use these machines. But none of these things have happened. Instead, because of the difficulties that are, in fact, there and without management, an EIS study went on for several years.

Unfortunately, toward the end, instead of going on through with the regular system of input, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior went out and said this is what the answer is going to be. The answer was to do away with individual snow machines in the parks over a period of a couple of years. That isn't what is designed to happen when you have EIS studies and when you involve local communities and local people and then have somebody from Washington come and make the decision. But that is what did happen.

Furthermore, the regulation that was agreed to in the study was put before the public the last day of the last administration when there was no opportunity to do anything about it. So what has happened is that there has been a lawsuit filed. I have introduced a bill that would allow not to continue snow machines the way they have been but, rather, to do the management technique, manage the numbers and the sites, and also set specifications so that manufacturers can meet them and you can go forward.

What is the purpose of the park? It is to preserve the resources and to allow the owners to enjoy them. This is the way that you have access in the wintertime.

So this has become somewhat of a discussion, somewhat of a controversy. I am hopeful that they can come to an agreement—and this administration is working toward coming to an agreement—in which these changes could be made. Nobody is suggesting to continue to do it the way it has been done in the past. But there can be changes made that will indeed allow access and protect the environment and the animals and the rural environment at the same time. We can do those things.

One other word on national parks.

The Grand Teton National Park was expanded in 1950. When that was done, there were a number of lands that were brought into the park, and among them were several school sections that belonged to the State of Wyoming. They are now in the park as inholdings and therefore cannot be managed by the park but cannot be used for anything else. Therefore, we have two losers: One is the park which has these inholdings it cannot handle; second is the school sections are to finance education, and they are not bringing in revenue to the State of Wyoming.

To make a long story short, I have a bill I hope will be before the committee

soon to allow the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Wyoming to come to some agreement in finding a value for those lands by using an appraiser upon which they agree and then work out an arrangement to either trade those lands for other Federal lands outside the park, trade them for mineral royalties, or sell but come to some financial arrangement.

I hope we can get some support for something that will be useful to Grand Teton National Park as well as the State of Wyoming.

I think our time has expired. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1077, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1077) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. 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.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today, the Senate is debating S. 1077, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

On June 1, 2001, President Bush asked Congress to consider a supplemental request for \$6.5 billion, primarily for the Department of Defense. The draft supplemental bill that is before us totals \$6.5 billion, not one dime above the President's request—not one thin dime above the President's request. It contains no emergency funding. The President has said that he will not support such emergency spending, so the Committee has not included any emergency designations in this bill. Unrequested items in the bill are offset.

S. 1077 funds the President's request for additional defense spending for health care, for military pay and benefits, for the high costs of natural gas and other utilities, for increased military flying hours, and for other purposes. The bill includes a net increase of \$5.54 billion for the Department of Defense and \$291 million for defense-related programs of the Department of Energy.

While the Appropriations Committee has approved most of the President's

request for the Department of Defense, I stress the importance of accountability for these and future funds. Financial accountability remains one of the weakest links in the Defense Department's budget process. Just last month, the General Accounting Office reported that, of \$1.1 billion earmarked for military spare parts in the fiscal year 1999 supplemental, only about \$88 million could be tracked to the purchase of spare parts. The remaining \$1 billion, or 92 percent of the appropriation, was transferred to operations and maintenance accounts, where the tracking process broke down.

Perhaps a substantial portion of the money appropriated for spare parts was spent on spare parts; perhaps it was not. But, given the way the money was managed, nobody knows for sure and that, it seems to me, is an unacceptable circumstance, because one thing we do know for sure is that an adequate inventory of spare parts is a key component of readiness and the Defense Department apparently does not have an adequate inventory of spare parts. So we must do better in making sure these dollars for spare parts go for spare parts.

The supplemental funding bill before us today includes another \$30 million for spare parts, this time specifically for the Army. As former President Reagan would have said, here we go again. To forestall a repeat of the problems that arose in accounting for spare parts expenditures provided in the fiscal year 1999 supplemental, the committee, at my request, approved report language requiring the Secretary of Defense to follow the money and to provide Congress with a complete accounting of all supplemental funds appropriated for spare parts. The intent of this provision is to ensure that money appropriated by Congress for the purchase of spare parts does not get shifted into any other program.

The supplemental appropriations bill, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, provides \$300 million for the Low Income Energy Assistance Program, an increase of \$150 million above the President's request, to help our citizens cope with high energy costs. The bill also includes \$161 million that was not requested for grants to local education agencies under the Education for the Disadvantaged Program in response to the most recent poverty and expenditure data. Also provided is \$100 million as an initial United States contribution to a global trust fund to combat AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis. In addition, \$92 million requested by the President for the Coast Guard is included, as is \$115.8 million requested for the Treasury Department for the cost of processing and mailing out the tax rebate checks.

In addition, the bill includes \$84 million for the Radiation Exposure Trust Fund to provide compensation to the victims of radiation exposure. We thank Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN for their leadership in assisting

those who were involved in the mining of uranium ore and those who were downwind from nuclear weapons tests during the Cold War.

The Senate Appropriations Committee's bill includes a number of offsets to pay for these additional items. Members should be on notice that, with passage of this bill, we are at the statutory cap for budget authority in Fiscal Year 2001. I say to colleagues on both sides of the aisle that any amendments that are offered will need to be offset. Exceeding the statutory cap could result in an across-the-board cut in all discretionary spending, both for defense programs and for non-defense programs. I urge Members to avoid the spectacle of a government-wide sequester by finding appropriate offsets for amendments.

There is another reason to insist on offsets for any additional spending. During debate on the recent tax-cut bill, I argued that the tax cuts contained in that bill could return the Federal budget to the deficit ditch. I stressed that the tax cuts were based on highly suspect ten-year surplus estimates and that if those estimates proved illusory, the tax-cut bill would result in spending the Medicare surplus. Now, before the ink is even dry on the President's signature on that tax bill, we may find ourselves headed back into the deficit ditch and headed in the direction of cutting into the Medicare surplus.

Our distinguished Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, KENT CONRAD, has prepared an analysis of the budget picture for Fiscal Year 2001, the current fiscal year, based on recent economic projections from the President's own Director of the National Economic Council, Lawrence Lindsey. The tax-cut bill reduced the surplus by \$74 billion in Fiscal Year 2001 alone. As a result, Chairman CONRAD is projecting a raid on the Medicare Trust Fund in Fiscal Year 2001 of \$17 billion.

Any efforts to increase spending in this bill without offsets will only make this problem worse.

The President asserted in his Budget Blueprint that the authority of the Congress and the President to designate funding as an emergency has been abused. The Administration has indicated in its Statement of Administration Policy of June 19, 2001, that the President does not intend to designate the \$473 million of emergency funding contained in the House-passed bill as emergency spending.

The administration further states that, "emergency supplemental appropriations should be limited to extremely rare events." The Senate supplemental bill contains no emergency designations. Nonetheless, I do believe that it is appropriate for Congress and the President to use the emergency authority from time to time in response to natural disasters and other truly unforeseen events in the nature of disasters.