

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOUTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the substitute amendment No. 974, the text of S. 420, as passed by the Senate, for H.R. 333, the bankruptcy reform bill:

John Breaux, Harry Reid, Byron Dorgan, E. Benjamin Nelson of Nebraska, Kent Conrad, Thomas Carper, Chuck Grassley, Daniel Inouye, Joe Biden, Robert Torricelli, Joseph Lieberman, Blanche Lincoln, Max Baucus, Zell Miller, James Jeffords, Tim Johnson, and Patrick Leahy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the matter is laid aside until Tuesday, July 17, 2001, at 9 a.m.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2217, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Byrd amendment No. 880, to make a technical correction.

Nelson of Florida amendment No. 893, to prohibit the use of funds to execute a final lease agreement for oil and gas development in the area of the Gulf of Mexico known as "Lease Sale 181."

AMENDMENT NO. 893

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 4 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the Nelson amendment No. 893.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I say to Senator GRAHAM, if he would like some time of the 2 minutes for closing, I will certainly yield to him.

Madam President, yesterday we had the Durbin amendment, and it was not tabled by a vote of 57-42. It was on the issue of oil drilling in national monuments, national treasures.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, the beaches of Florida are national treasures to us because of the importance of the beaches to our economy. If there is an oilspill, and a slick comes in on one of our beaches, it will shut down a beach, such as Clearwater Beach, for years and years. In an economy with a \$50 billion tourism industry, in the Nation's fourth largest State, that is simply not worth the risk to us in Florida.

For the first time, the eastern planning area of the gulf, which heretofore

has not been drilled, save for one test drill up here, is being invaded by this offering for lease of 1.5 million acres coming across the line. It is inevitable, in the march eastward, it would go straight toward Tampa Bay.

This is a matter of national treasure to us. You all honored that yesterday in adopting the Durbin amendment, by not allowing drilling in the areas of national monuments. Senator GRAHAM and I ask that you join with us today in helping us preserve our national treasure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I rise to oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to join with Senator BREAUX, myself, and others—a bipartisan group—in opposing this amendment.

We have a problem in this Nation. Our demand for energy is too high and our supply is not great enough. We use 30 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. We only have 25 trillion cubic feet. We think the Gulf of Mexico, in places far from the shores of Florida, has an ample supply of natural gas.

Let us not move in the wrong direction. Our country needs us to respond in a positive way. This is not a new area. It is rich with natural gas. It was a compromise reached by a Democratic administration with many environmental organizations and with the industry. It is moderate.

If you are for rolling blackouts and high prices, vote with Senator NELSON. If you are for reasonable energy policy, vote with me when I move, on behalf of Senator BREAUX, to table this amendment.

I yield the Senator 30 seconds.

Mr. BREAUX. How much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Chair.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues, lease sale 181 was proposed by President Bill Clinton. It was this entire tract of area that I show you on this map. Democratic President Bill Clinton proposed it. The Democratic Governor of Florida at the time was Governor Lawton Chiles, our former colleague. He agreed to lease sale 181 because he took into consideration where it was located. They signed off on it.

In addition to that, the Democratic energy bill offered by our chairman, JEFF BINGAMAN, calls for going forward with lease sale 181. The potential natural gas in this lease sale, which has now been reduced in size by 75 percent, could supply 7 years' worth of natural gas to the State of Florida.

I ask, if we can't drill for oil and natural gas in the Gulf of Mexico, where in the world are we going to find it?

I think we should table the Nelson amendment. It is bad energy policy. It is not appropriate to undermine the carefully balanced proposal by President Clinton and also now by President Bush. We should table the amendment.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 893.

The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 231 Leg.]  
YEAS—67

Akaka	Dorgan	Miller
Allard	Ensign	Murkowski
Allen	Emzi	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Bingaman	Frist	Roberts
Bond	Gramm	Santorum
Breaux	Grassley	Schumer
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Cantwell	Helms	Smith (OR)
Carper	Hutchinson	Snowe
Chafee	Hutchison	Specter
Clinton	Inhofe	Stevens
Cochran	Johnson	Thomas
Collins	Kyl	Thompson
Conrad	Landrieu	Thurmond
Craig	Lincoln	Torricelli
Crapo	Lott	Voinovich
DeWine	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	McCain	
	McConnell	

NAYS—33

Bayh	Edwards	Levin
Biden	Feingold	Lieberman
Boxer	Graham	Mikulski
Byrd	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Carnahan	Hollings	Reed
Cleland	Inouye	Reid
Corzine	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dayton	Kerry	Stabenow
Dodd	Kohl	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is my understanding that we automatically go to the Interior bill, is that right, for the purpose of further debate and amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Oregon has an amendment he wishes to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 899

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). The pending amendment will be set aside and the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. SMITH of Oregon] proposes an amendment numbered 899.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To direct the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to take certain actions for the recovery of the lost river sucker and the shortnose sucker, and to clarify the operations of the Klamath Project in Oregon and California, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert: "None of the funds made available under this or any other Act may be used to provide any flows from the Klamath Project other than those set forth in the 1992 biological opinion for Lost River and shortnose suckers and the July 1999 biological opinion on project operations issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service, until the Fish and Wildlife Service takes the following actions identified or discussed in the April 1993 recovery plan for Lost River suckers and shortnose suckers:

(a) establishes at least one stable refugial population with a minimum of 500 adult fish for each unique stock of Lost River and shortnose suckers;

(b) secures refugial sites for upper Klamath Lake suckers;

(c) uses aeration for improving water quality and to expand refugial areas of relatively good water quality within Upper Klamath Lake;

(d) improves larval rearing and refuge habitat in the lower Williamson and Wood Rivers through increased vegetative cover;

(e) extirpates exotic species that are predators of the suckers;

(f) assesses the need for captive propagation and the potential for improving sucker stocks through supplementation, and the Secretary has submitted a report, including recommendations, to the Congress;

(g) implements a plan to monitor relative abundance of all life stages for all sucker populations;

(h) develops a plan to reduce losses of fish due to water diversions;

(i) determines the distribution and abundance of suckers in all waterbodies in the Upper Klamath Basin;

(j) implements the plan for wetland rehabilitation pilot projects;

(k) implements the most effective strategy to provide fish passage upstream of the Sprague River Dam;

(l) implements the plan to enhance spring spawning habitat in Upper Klamath Lake and Agency Lake;

and develops water management plans and land management plans, including sump rotations where appropriate, for the national wildlife refuges that receive water from the Klamath Project; and subsequently completes an evaluation of the impact of these actions on the recovery of the suckers before determining whether further modifications to project operations are needed and submits such evaluation to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Congress.

MR. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, many Americans are becoming familiar with a part of my State and a part of California known as the Klamath Basin because of the coverage of a tragic situation that has developed there in a contest between suckerfish and farmers. If I may be permitted, I will put some context to this conflict.

I am the first Senator to be elected from Oregon who comes from its rural parts—eastern Oregon—in 70 years. I represent all of my State, but I have a special passion to represent those rural parts that I have watched be devastated for too long by Federal action.

I believe the Endangered Species Act is a noble act with noble purposes, but I believe it is being used by some to very ignoble ends.

My actions today are not to subvert the Endangered Species Act. This is not reform. This is an act asking that its terms be implemented in a way that will relieve genuine human suffering in a way that may prevent the violence that has already been visited upon Federal property in a contest between farmers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the essential ingredient to life in the West, and that is water.

What has happened to the community of Klamath Falls, by conservative estimates, will cost that county \$200 million. I thank the Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and others, who helped me to get \$20 million of relief to these people. Obviously, it is 10 percent of what is needed, even by conservative estimates.

What I propose to do today is to try to go back to a biological opinion that was in place just last April that would have permitted this drought to be managed as were the droughts in 1992 and in 1994, in which the suckerfish survived, as did the agricultural community around it.

When I speak of the agricultural community, I have to also mention the wildlife refuges that get their water from this basin but which are now drying up. So farmers and fowl are left with nothing under the new biological opinion.

I do this because, in 1993, the Fish and Wildlife Service laid out a plan of action for what it could do to save the suckerfish, so that 200,000 acres of land continue to receive water and that fish could survive. But none of these proposed action plans were pursued. For example, it recommended the removal of the Sprague River Dam, which would have made available tremendous spawning areas for the suckerfish. But that wasn't done. And there were many other actions that could have been taken to provide aeration, to improve the condition of this lake, so that the suckerfish could survive and the farmers along with it.

But now what we are doing is we are raising this lake 3 feet—it is a very big lake, very shallow, but it is being raised 3 feet—and cutting off all the water to farmers and fowl. It is being done to save the suckerfish, and now, while it is being saved, it is warming up. So the coho salmon that will soon be returning expecting to receive the cool waters of the Klamath will receive waters the temperature of a swimming pool. So, potentially, even the coho salmon—which is also a listed species—could be adversely affected by this biological opinion.

Well, there are two agencies of the Federal Government that are competing. One biological opinion is Fish and Wildlife with regard to the suckerfish. The other is the biological opinion of the National Marine Fish-

eries Service and the Commerce Department that affects the coho salmon. Both biological opinions essentially ask for 100 percent of the water which means cutting off 100 percent of the people.

The point I want to make is that would not be necessary if the Federal Government over the last 8 years would have kept its part of the bargain and done what it could to mitigate the impact to the sucker so that farmers would not be victimized.

What I do is simply reinstate the previous biological opinions that were in effect before this spring until the Federal Government can complete action on numerous recommendations of its 1993 recovery plan. Again, they were not acted upon over the last 8 years. Why? They say budgetary reasons.

I want this to be a priority. I want the budget to fix this problem. I do not want the whole budget burden thrown on the backs of rural people, but that is what was decided to be done.

I want to put some other context to this. This is a current farm family in Klamath Falls. These are the human faces being affected by what is being done. Foreclosure notices are already going out. Let me tell my colleagues about their parents. These are the parents. This is the front cover of *Life* magazine, January 20, 1947. This is a veteran of the Second World War. These are people who came home, having saved liberty, having defended democracy, having made the United States the power in the world that it is today, the force for good that it is today.

In his wisdom, Franklin Roosevelt, even before the war, began to open up this land so that people would have a way to escape the Great Depression, coming home from the war, and a place to go to work.

This is the land, the valley. I do not know whether my colleagues can see it, but this couple is overlooking the Klamath Basin—farms being developed, hay being raised, corn being raised, potatoes being raised that fill our shelves today. Look at the hopes and dreams in the faces of these people.

This is a little girl at an assembly of people at a rally a few weeks ago. Her sign says: "Mommy says I can't eat, but fish can."

That is what we are driving them to, and it is not right because they are being told they are of lesser value under our law than the shortnosed sucker.

This is a picture of the shortnosed sucker. It is a bottom-feeding fish. It lives in this shallow lake. It has gone through many droughts along with the farmers. It has survived, stressed, I am sure, just as humans are stressed in conditions of drought.

I am not saying this fish has no value. I have never thought the suckerfish is very good looking, but it has a mother, and that mother, I am sure, loves this fish. I know the Native Americans in this area value this fish,

and I am not suggesting in any way that we are not interested in saving this fish.

I am saying the purpose of the Endangered Species Act was not to engage in a process of rural cleansing, of throwing off their property people who had been given great promise and hope for the future. They are meeting the mailmen with foreclosure notices because the Federal Government decided it is going to breach its promise.

Let me show you, Mr. President, the deeds of the lands they were given. These are veterans. I doubt you can see it, but this is a deed assigned to a veteran of the Second World War to go to Klamath. The veteran's name goes in this space, and it is signed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

My point is that when we proceed to engage in environmental restoration, we must not forget that we have a human concern as well. We can do both, I am absolutely convinced of it, but we cannot do both under this condition.

This Klamath circumstance is different than other endangered species conflicts that always seem to pit the man against the beast. This is different. This is about something that is possible, where we can save the fish and we do not sacrifice the people.

I want to keep Franklin Roosevelt's promise alive today because these reclamation projects were greatly expanded under his leadership and an inland empire was built of rural people, but now those people are being told they are of lesser value than the suckerfish. I do not think Franklin Roosevelt would agree. I do not agree.

Mr. President, I plead for my colleagues to remember the human faces in this picture, to remember the promises made, and to help me help these people. This is not about a fish versus a farmer, unless we go down the road of these current biological opinions which have not been peer reviewed, in which the people there have no confidence. They are biological opinions that began with a determined outcome, and all of the activities that were said would be pursued—to provide off-stream impoundment, take out a dam, provide some aeration—none of those things was done.

The only way I am going to get the Interior Department to understand that it cannot forget its human stewardship, that the Bureau's promises still ought to matter, is to go back to the old opinion and tell them that the new one cannot happen until they keep the promises made in 1993. In the meantime, this fish will survive, but my farmers will not if we do not begin to reverse course.

It is too late for this year's crops, I grant you that, but it is turning into a dust bowl that existed prior to Franklin Roosevelt's vision, and foreclosure notices are going out. At least now we can offer some hope that we, on our watch, will not permit this to be repeated. We need to give them some

more money to make sure that no farm is lost to foreclosure because of Government inaction and then this action. But we have to help. We have to say this will not happen again.

I do not know how to plead this in as personal terms as I can for the help of this body to head off a disaster. This is not fish versus farmers. It does not have to be that. But it is that now under what has happened over the last 8 years.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. In relation to the Smith amendment, I move to table. I ask for the yeas and nays. And I further ask unanimous consent that the vote be held at 1:45. There are a number of people who are unable to come to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second on the motion to table?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that prior to the 1:45 vote, the Senator from Oregon be granted 2 minutes and the Senator from California be granted 2 minutes to explain the amendment to the Members of the Senate.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Nevada for making a motion to table the Smith amendment, which we will vote on at approximately 1:45. I wanted to thank my friend from Arizona who has an amendment he wants to lay down. He was gracious to allow me to go ahead of him and just not to interrupt the debate.

I hope the motion to table the Smith of Oregon amendment does carry. We all share deep concerns about the current drought in southern Oregon and in northern California. My constituents have also been hard hit by this very dry year. But I think we cannot legislate on an issue that is so far-reaching by bringing an amendment to the floor before we have even looked at the possible remedies.

I joined my colleague from Oregon in seeking \$20 million in economic relief for losses facing Klamath Basin farmers, and I certainly pledge to continue working with him to seek more funding and a long-term solution to this very

vexing problem of getting enough water for everyone who needs it and everyone who deserves it.

The whole history of my State is, in many ways, built around the water issue. It is something we deal with all the time because we have more ag than any other State. It is one of our biggest businesses in California. We also know our State thrives because of tourism, our environmental ethic is very strong, and because we have such a magnificent State we get the tourists.

Of course, we have more people than any other State in the Union—now almost 34 million people. So you have a constant debate, if you will, a constant struggle, if you will, between all the stakeholders. Everyone has something at stake with the water supply: The farmer, urban users, suburban users, and certainly the wildlife which do not have a voice, but we have to be their voice.

I can't join my colleague from Oregon in undermining the Endangered Species Act. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in a recent opinion tells us that without this water the endangered fish will go extinct.

Science tells us through the Fish and Wildlife Service that there are two species of fish that will become extinct if we carry out the plan of the Senator from Oregon.

If we are going to take an action that would lead to the extinction of two species of fish, it ought to be done with a little different format and not come as an amendment to the appropriations bill.

I agree that it is very possible that the Fish and Wildlife Service has not fully implemented its 1993 recovery plan for these fish. I call on them to implement that plan. But cutting off water to the fish this year doesn't solve that problem. It will cause the extinction to take place.

I know that the immediate needs of my constituents in the farm areas and those in Oregon will not be helped this year. The reality is that most of the region's farmers didn't plant this year because they knew about this drought. Taking the water from these fish and the needs of these species is not going to help the farmers now. But economic relief will help them. I am certainly committed to that.

We need to answer the dire needs of the farmers of the Klamath Basin. But driving the fish to extinction while providing little real gain to our farmers is certainly the answer.

It is very hard to look constituents in the eye when they have a problem and say: If we help you make a move now that you say will help you even though, in fact, in this case it wouldn't really help this year, we can't do it because there is a bigger question; that is, the delicate balance in terms of who needs this water. It is hard to do that. But I think we can't come running to the floor every time to undermine laws that are in place—for real reasons. I happen to believe that we have the Endangered Species Act because we have

to protect God's creatures. That is my own feeling. In fact, it is a responsibility that we have as a people to do that. If we don't do it, it is not going to happen. We have to move to protect these species.

Again, there may be a reason to take another look at this matter, but I hope we will move to table. I am certainly committed to having some hearings and moving forward with more economic relief for the farmers that are affected in this Klamath River Basin.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, is the parliamentary situation such that there will be a vote at 1:45?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is to be a vote at 1:45 and there is 4 minutes of debate set aside prior to that vote.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, if the Senator from Arizona needs the extra 4 minutes, we would be happy to work that out.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 904

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be set aside.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 904.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for any purpose relating to Vulcan Monument, Alabama)

On page 153, line 22, before the period, insert the following: "of which no funds shall be used for any purpose relating to Vulcan Monument, Alabama".

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, it is with great disappointment I again speak before the Senate about the compounding practice of porkbarrel spending, particularly in this year's Interior appropriations bill. Earlier this year, the administration and, I believe, our leadership pledged to curb the Federal Government's practice of funding extraneous porkbarrel spending.

I applaud the administration for its responsible fiscal stance. There is a chance for us to get serious. It might sound amusing. But let me tell my colleagues that, according to the Washington Post, House Members requested 18,898 earmarks in appropriations bills passed thus far. Considering this bill in the Senate on Interior, the subcommittee reports that it received 1,799 requests for select projects. That is a threefold increase since 1993.

It is shameful.

This year's Interior appropriations bill is no different. It includes \$433 million in wasteful and unnecessary spend-

ing projects that have not been reviewed to determine if they are indeed the highest funding priorities. This amount is \$153 million higher than the bill last year.

Let me highlight a few examples for you: \$5 million to pay for fish screens in the Northwest power planning area; an increase of \$2 million for the National Fish Health Lab at the Leetown Science Center—you will notice that most of these are designated geographically—an additional \$350,000 for the Chicago Wilderness Program; \$1 million for noxious weed management at Montana State University; \$150,000 to rehabilitate a barn at the John Hay National Wildlife Refuge in New Hampshire; \$3.5 million to renovate a single lodge in a wildlife refuge in North Carolina; \$700,000 for exhibits at the Rangle National Park in Alaska; and an extra \$160,000 set aside for public education on the Yukon River Salmon Treaty. I think that is also Alaska.

One of my favorite monuments of porkbarrel spending, another \$2 million is provided to continue refurbishing the Vulcan Monument in Alabama. This particular monument also received \$1.5 million last year. Now we are going to spend \$3.5 million to refurbish the Vulcan Monument.

Earmarks for Alaska continue to exceed unprecedeted levels, some of which are questionable inclusions in this bill. For example, an increase of \$1.3 million is earmarked for an Alaska Native aviation training program.

I happen to sit on the Commerce Committee. We were never asked to authorize that.

Another \$250,000 for the Alaska Market Access Program; \$1.1 million for the Cook Inlet Agriculture Association; and \$2 million for construction of kiln drying facilities.

My colleagues are well aware the National Park Service still faces a \$5 billion backlog in capital maintenance and resource needs, and we are spending \$2 million for the construction of kiln drying facilities.

After years of unchecked, questionable spending, we are in the unfortunate position of facing critical budget constraints that will hamper our ability to fund fully many necessary Federal programs. Instead, we are cutting deep into the taxpayers' pockets once again by expecting them to shell out more than \$433 million in porkbarrel spending included in this bill.

I have compiled a 24-page list of objectionable earmarks and provisions in H.R. 2217. Unfortunately, it is too lengthy to include in the RECORD. But it will be available on my Senate Web page.

Now we come to the amendment.

Here is the Vulcan God of Fire and Iron. The colossal statue of Vulcan God of Fire and Iron was in the Palace of Mines and Metallurgy, where it represented the great iron and fuel industries of Alabama. The figure was cast in iron from a model by G. Morelli, a New York sculptor. It was brought to

St. Louis in sections in over seven freight cars and mounted on a pedestal of coal and coke. The statue of Vulcan God of Fire and Iron stood 50 feet high and weighed 100,000 pounds. It was the largest iron casting ever made, and next to "Liberty Enlightening the World," was the largest statue ever constructed. At the close of the Exposition the figure was removed to Birmingham and set up in Capital Park to remain as a permanent monument. It is a very impressive statue.

Now, in the bill before the Senate today—which, I mentioned, contains over \$430 million in spending items that have not been properly reviewed to determine their worthiness for Federal funding—there is another \$2 million to add to the \$1.5 million last to continue Vulcan's face-lift.

At first blush, having the Federal Government give money to a Roman god may appear to violate the constitutional separation of church and state. Others, with some reason, may believe that this is a rather strange use of limited tax dollars. After all, while the on-budget Federal surplus is rapidly dwindling, why should Federal dollars pay for a face-lift of a statue of a Roman god in Alabama?

But, Mr. President, I worry this appropriation may set a dangerous precedent for others to follow that will only add millions and millions to the billions and billions and billions in pork barrel spending doled out year after year.

For example, what is to stop a Senator from sunny Arizona or New Mexico from demanding Federal dollars for a statue of Apollo, god of the Sun?

Or how to we prevent a Senator from California to beseech money for a statue of Bacchus, god of wine?

Or a Senator from Georgia, home to the great city of Athens, from asking for Federal funds to pay tribute to the Goddess Athena?

Or even a Senator from the home of some of the best hunting this side of the Mississippi, West Virginia, from getting Federal funds for Artemis, the ancient Greek goddess of the hunt?

Maybe this is the time to stop this. Not one more Federal dollar should be spent on this kind of foolishness.

I ask my colleagues to extinguish this Roman god of fire and strike a victory for taxpayers—and Metis, the goddess of prudence—by throttling down our insatiable appetite for pork barrel spending—starting today.

Finally, Mr. President, there are statues—for a moment of seriousness—all over this Nation that require refurbishing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, 4 minutes have been reserved at this time for the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. McCAIN. Finally, Mr. President, as I said before, there are statues all over this Nation erected to worthy, wonderful, and patriotic Americans as well as people from other countries that need refurbishment. If we are going to start down this path of millions of dollars to refurbish a statue of Vulcan, I don't know where it all ends.

I yield the floor and ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Arizona, it appears the two parties in relation to the prior amendment are going to talk for a couple minutes.

Mr. McCAIN. Fine.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 899

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under the previous order, the Senator from California has 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon has 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I thank the majority whip and the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee for offering to have a hearing. I hope we have a hearing. But, frankly, I need the people of Klamath Falls to know where we are, so I am asking that we proceed with the unanimous consent agreement that is already in place, that we have a vote. And I know I may lose this vote. But I say to my colleagues, these are Federal projects. These were Federal promises. This is a Federal action now that is crushing people, some of whom have been there for 100 years or more. I think it is deplorable that this Government would have had a biological opinion and a whole list of actions they said they would take, and 8 years later there is nothing done except a new opinion that says no water for people, no water for farms.

It is time for us to start caring about rural folks who are increasingly powerless. I ask for a vote on their behalf.

I yield back my time.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized under the previous order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if I could just be told when I have used 30 seconds, and I will leave the remainder of the time for Senator JEFFORDS, my chairman. And I thank him for coming down here.

Water is a vexing issue in California. We have had water wars for a long time. You have to figure out how everyone can be at the table: The farmers, the urban users, suburban users, and the environmental people—people with environmental concerns—because obviously the wildlife has no voice. We have to make sure we protect the wildlife.

If this amendment goes through today—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 30 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for 10 seconds—two species of fish are gone—that is it, extinct. That is the scientific word from Fish and Wildlife. I hope we will defeat this amendment.

I ask my friend to continue this conversation.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, unfortunately, I have to rise in support of the motion to table. I had hoped my good friend from Oregon would agree to withdraw his amendment so that I could hold a hearing and ascertain for him and the public whether or not there should be an exception granted to the Endangered Species Act with respect to this particular problem. Unfortunately, I understand he does not desire to do so.

This is a critical issue and for us to summarily do this would be really inconsistent with the purposes of the Endangered Species Act. That act is an important one, and it is one that has saved many species which have resulted in huge breakthroughs in medicine and in other ways.

We have to be very careful about what we do with respect to endangered species. So I will support the motion to table.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the amendment would prevent the Fish and Wildlife Service from providing water for fish in the Klamath basin. The water at issue here is water the Service has determined is necessary to prevent the extinction of threatened and endangered species like the suckerfish and coho salmon in Oregon and California.

Only 2 days ago, we approved a supplemental appropriations bill. During that debate we heard many Members argue for additional spending for very important priorities. Fiscal constraints prevented us for meeting many of them. But one of the priorities we did address in that bill dealt with the very subject of this amendment.

The bill provided \$20 million to assist Oregon farmers who have been impacted by the drought and species concerns in the Klamath basin—\$20 million. They are not the only farmers who have been impacted by drought (it's a problem that affects Nevada's farmers and ranchers this year as well), but to my knowledge they are the only farmers that received special aid in the supplemental.

The State of Nevada faces many of the same problems my colleague has spoken about here this afternoon. I would like to work with him to address

those problems without modifying the Endangered Species Act in the manner he proposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 899. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 232 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Dorgan	Lieberman
Baucus	Durbin	Lincoln
Bayh	Edwards	Mikulski
Biden	Feingold	Miller
Bingaman	Feinstein	Murray
Boxer	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Breaux	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Byrd	Harkin	Reed
Cantwell	Hollings	Reid
Carnahan	Inouye	Rockefeller
Carper	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Chafee	Johnson	Schumer
Cleland	Kennedy	Specter
Clinton	Kerry	Stabenow
Corzine	Kohl	Torricelli
Daschle	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dayton	Leahy	
Dodd	Levin	

NAYS—48

Allard	Enzi	Murkowski
Allen	Frist	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Snowe
Collins	Hutchison	Stevens
Conrad	Inhofe	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	McCain	Warner
Ensign	McConnell	Wyden

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 904

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with permission of the managers of the bill, I ask that the two Senators from Alabama each have 2 minutes to speak in opposition to the McCain amendment, and Senator McCAIN have the final 2 minutes to speak in favor of his amendment.

This appears to be the last amendment we are going to have on this bill. The managers have informed me, along with the two leaders, that around 4 o'clock we will have a vote on final passage. It will take that much time to work on the managers' amendment to get together the loose pieces.

I ask unanimous consent that we proceed now to a vote on the McCain amendment after the two Senators from Alabama speak and the Senator from Arizona speaks, and I also ask unanimous consent that when that vote is completed, the Senator from Oregon be recognized to speak for 5 minutes in relation to the Smith amendment of which we just disposed.

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

The Senator from Alabama, Mr. SHELBY.

MR. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the McCain amendment to the Interior appropriations bill. I am troubled, quite frankly, that I have to defend Federal funding for historic preservation of the Vulcan Monument, which is of great importance to the people of Alabama and the South.

The Vulcan Monument in Birmingham, AL, is a unique and enduring hallmark of the city. It was constructed in 1904 to mark the 100th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase and stands as a symbol of economic transformation in the South. Much like the Arch, the Golden Gate Bridge, the Statue of Liberty, and the Liberty Bell represent their respective cities and are symbols representing greater achievements for their communities and our Nation, the Vulcan stands as an important historical landmark for Birmingham and represents the rebirth of industrial development in the South.

I want the record to be clear that while Federal funds are important to the restoration of the Vulcan Monument, city and local fundraising efforts are leading the way towards completing the restoration project. While the Federal share for restoration efforts reaches \$3.5 million, private citizens throughout the region have contributed over \$10 million.

This is an excellent example of a public-private partnership trying to preserve an important historical treasure for the South and our Nation. It happens to be in Birmingham, AL.

I believe this amendment is misguided, and I pray it will be defeated.

MR. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I know Senator SHELBY travels throughout Alabama every year in every county, as do I. When we do so, we learn something about the State. As a kid going into Birmingham, I saw the Vulcan statue, the symbol for the steel city of Birmingham. It is a preeminent symbol of Alabama, and there will be no other statue in the State with as much prominence.

With the local citizens raising \$10 million, with my support and certainly that of Senator SHELBY, the contribution from the Federal Government will help complete this historical renovation and restoration. It is a good use of the money, in my opinion as a Senator from Alabama. It is a good priority use of money for historic development.

I oppose the McCain amendment.

MR. MCCAIN. Mr. President, let me quote from an October 23, 2000, issue of "U.S. News & World Report" entitled "Washington Goes On A Spending Spree."

... a 56-foot, iron rendition of the Roman god of fire and metalwork. Built as an entry for the 1904 World Fair, it won the grand prize in the Palace of Metallurgy. Steward Dansby, executive director of the Vulcan Park Foundation, says officials at the organization talked to Alabama Sen. Richard Shelby about helping to fund the renovation.

"Why are federal tax dollars being spent on a statue in Birmingham?" asked Dansby. "Because Vulcan is symbolic of American industrial strength. He represents the working person and. . . [This is the best part.] These are federal dollars that would have gone somewhere."

There are statues all over America that need refurbishment. I hope everybody lines up with statues that need to be refurbished because the store seems to be open.

I know this amendment will not pass, but everybody ought to be on record as to whether they support this kind of porkbarreling.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 904. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

MR. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 87, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 233 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Allard	Feingold	Kyl
Bayh	Graham	McCain
Carnahan	Gramm	Smith (NH)
Ensign	Hollings	Stabenow

NAYS—87

Akaka	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Dorgan	Mikulski
Baucus	Durbin	Miller
Bennett	Edwards	Murkowski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Reed
Brownback	Hagel	Reid
Bunning	Harkin	Roberts
Burns	Hatch	Rockefeller
Byrd	Helms	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hutchinson	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Johnson	Snowe
Cochran	Kennedy	Specter
Collins	Kerry	Stevens
Conrad	Kohl	Thomas
Corzine	Landrieu	Thompson
Craig	Leahy	Thurmond
Crapo	Levin	Torricelli
Daschle	Lieberman	Voinovich
Dayton	Lincoln	Warner
DeWine	Lott	Weilstone
Dodd	Lugar	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Enzi

The amendment (No. 904) was rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon is recognized for a period of 5 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 899

MR. WYDEN. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senate voted on an Endangered Species Act amendment with special impact for farmers and rural people in my home State. I voted against the motion to table with great reluctance and wanted to take just a

couple minutes to explain my vote this afternoon.

I think it is dangerous to legislate biological opinions about species without the opportunity to thoughtfully review the effects of such a far-reaching amendment. I think it is just as dangerous to force our citizens in rural communities into dire circumstances when a law that has accomplished many good things contains serious administrative flaws that are producing an increasing number of bad things.

It was my intent, if the Endangered Species Act amendment had not been tabled, to offer a second-degree amendment to it. My amendment would have allowed the Senate to pick up on the very generous offer made by Chairman JEFFORDS to try to get this job done right.

My amendment would have sought to try to address the problems in the Klamath Basin in a comprehensive way, in a fashion that would have helped farmers produce water conservation and improve water quality and, at the same time, would have protected species.

I think it is very clear that the challenge with the Endangered Species Act is to bring folks together. The challenge is to get everybody at the table—all of the stakeholders; farmers, environmental leaders, scientists, and others—to try to come up with ways that keep the important protections of the Endangered Species Act and, at the same time, encourage the administrative flexibility so we can have more homegrown solutions.

I am absolutely convinced that the objectives of the Endangered Species Act make a lot of sense. But what you do in the Klamath Basin has to be different than what you do in the Bronx. And what you do in Detroit to protect a species is different than the challenge in Coos Bay, OR.

I look forward very much to picking up on the generous offer of Chairman JEFFORDS to work with our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to find comprehensive solutions to this Endangered Species Act challenge.

As I say, I voted against the motion to table today with great reluctance. I am very anxious to work with our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, for a more comprehensive solution.

MR. PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama, Mr. SHELBY, will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 975

MRS. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside, and further, I ask

unanimous consent to send an amendment to the desk, that it be in order, and it also be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 975.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the steel loan guarantee program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. MODIFICATION TO STEEL LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-51; 15 U.S.C. 1841 note) is amended as follows:

(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR LOAN GUARANTEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “a private bank or investment company” and inserting “an institution”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (f)(1) is amended by striking “private banking and investment”.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Subsection (h) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2005” and inserting “2015”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) GUARANTEE LEVEL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any loan guarantee provided under this section shall not exceed 85 percent of the amount of principal of the loan.

“(B) INCREASED LEVEL.—A loan guarantee may be provided under this section in excess of 85 percent, but not more than 95 percent, of the amount of principal of the loan, if—

“(i) the aggregate amount of loans guaranteed at such percentage and outstanding under this section at any one time does not exceed \$500,000,000; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount of loans guaranteed at such percentage under this section with respect to a single qualified steel company does not exceed \$100,000,000.”.

(3) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Subsection (i) is amended by striking “of fiscal years 1999 and 2000, and annually thereafter,” and inserting “fiscal year”.

(4) TERMINATION OF GUARANTEE AUTHORITY.—Subsection (k) is amended by striking “2001” and inserting “2003”.

(5) MONITORING, REPORTING, AND FORECLOSURE PROCEDURES.—Subsection (l) is amended by adding at the end the following: “All monitoring, reporting, and foreclosure procedures (and other matters addressed in the guarantee agreement) established with respect to loan guarantees provided under this section shall be consistent with customary practices in the commercial banking industry. Minor or inadvertent reporting violations shall not cause termination of any guarantee provided under this section.”.

(6) DEFINITION OF STEEL COMPANIES.—Subsection (c)(3)(B) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) is engaged in—

“(i) the production or manufacture of a product identified by the American Iron and Steel Institute as a basic steel mill product,

including ingots, slab and billets, plates, flat-rolled steel, sections and structural products, bars, rail type products, pipe and tube, and wire rod;

“(ii) the production or manufacture of coke used in the production of steel; or

“(iii) the mining of iron ore; and”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 101 of the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Act of 1999 is further amended by striking subsection (m).

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to any guarantee issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 878

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CRAIG, proposes an amendment numbered 878.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To help ensure general aviation aircraft access to Federal land and the air-space over that land)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. BACKCOUNTRY LANDING STRIP ACCESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available by this Act shall not be used to permanently close any aircraft landing strip described in subsection (b) without public notice, consultation with appropriate Federal and State aviation officials, and the consent of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(b) AIRCRAFT LANDING STRIPS.—An aircraft landing strip referred to in subsection (a) is a landing strip on Federal land that—

(1) is officially recognized by an appropriate Federal or State aviation official;

(2) is administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(3) is commonly known for use for, and is consistently used for, aircraft landing and departure activities.

(c) PERMANENT CLOSURE.—For the purposes of subsection (a), an aircraft landing strip shall be considered to be closed permanently if the intended duration of the closure is more than 180 days in any calendar year.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, first, I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, and the ranking member, Senator BURNS, for the hard work they have put into this year’s Interior and related agencies appropriations bill. It is a changing process and they have done an excellent job in balancing the competing interests within the confines of our effort to make sure we maintain a balanced budget.

At this point, I want to explain the amendment I present. I intend to withdraw the amendment when I am finished discussing it for reasons that will become apparent as I discuss it. In the past couple of years, we have seen a disturbing trend in the Department of the Interior and in the Department of Agriculture regarding our Forest Service relating to back-country airstrips. The administration has begun to follow a pattern of allowing back-country airstrips to either go into a state of disrepair—here they become unusable—or to actually close, permanently close some of them, which is a serious problem to those parts of our public lands that need the services that these back-country airstrips can supply.

Idaho, right now, is home to more than 50 of these landing strips, and our State is known nationwide for its air access to public lands and wilderness and primitive areas. Unfortunately, in the past, many of these airstrips in Idaho, and in other parts of the country, have been rendered unserviceable through the neglect I talked about earlier, or the decisions to close the airstrips without adequate public notice or any justification being provided.

There is a concern about this because these airstrips provide not only access to the back country for recreational use, but they are critical for maintenance and some of the management purposes of the agencies in managing our public lands and fighting forest fires, for example, or in providing the necessary access by agency personnel to perform their work on public lands, and also as part of rescue missions when they find the need to provide for rescue. It is those who use the back-country airstrips who are often the ones who provide the valiant efforts to make rescues of people who are in distress in our national public lands.

Senators CRAIG and MURKOWSKI are cosponsors with me on the legislation to address this issue and to require the agencies to work with State and local communities and to engage in a process of public notice and justification. In fact, it is our hope that, ultimately, we will be able to pass this legislation on a permanent basis. That would require the agencies to obtain the consent of the State personnel who are involved with the management of our airways and aviation concerns.

At this point, we were prepared to offer this amendment to the bill this year to the Interior appropriations bill, which would have, simply for the period of this appropriations bill, required the agencies to consult with the State agency officials involved in aviation management in the States, and to assure that the right kind of consultation would occur between the various State and Federal officials before closure of any of these landing strips in our back-country areas.

However, we have been working with the administration to try to obviate the need to propose this amendment. I am pleased to say, that I am now able

to report to the people in the country that both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture have agreed—and I will be submitting letters for the RECORD in writing to indicate this agreement—that they will honor the purposes of this amendment and make it the policy of those two agencies to comply with the requirements of this amendment and to continue to work with us on our permanent legislation so we can address this issue on a permanent basis.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if I can interrupt the Senator from Idaho in an effort to develop a colloquy with the Senator with regard to encouraging various agencies to work with the States on the issue of backcountry airport access.

Mr. CRAPO. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is probably not applicable in areas of high concentration of private land, but out West, we have vast areas of virtually nothing. You can only appreciate that if you get in a small airplane and fly over the western part of the United States or my State of Alaska.

I had a group of Senators in a single-engine airplane a few years ago. We had been in the air 2½ hours cruising along at about 80 knots. Finally, one of them said: How much more wilderness do I have to see to, indeed, believe there is a lot of wilderness to be seen and beauty to be seen?

Nevertheless, when that engine quits, you have a problem. If you do not have some of these areas available—I know many of our friends from the east coast and populated areas cannot quite appreciate why we need them, but we vitally need them.

I join with my colleague in what I understand is a general commitment from the agencies, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, to work with the States to identify what is in the interest of the States from the standpoint of safety access.

I commend him in that effort and hope when legislation is necessary that our colleagues will understand we need this in the wide open spaces out West. I see my friend from Montana who also agrees with this. I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Alaska for his strong support on this issue. He is, as I indicated, a cosponsor of the legislation we will be pursuing and was supporting us in the effort to put this amendment on this bill again as it was last year.

Just so we can understand correctly, I want to read into the RECORD what the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture committed to so we can begin the process, which I think is a very important first step in moving toward resolution of this issue.

The first letter is from Secretary Gale Norton, the Secretary of the Interior:

DEAR SENATOR CRAPO: The U.S. Department of the Interior is committed to work-

ing with you and other Members of Congress to develop a comprehensive process to ensure that state and local governments and citizens have an opportunity to participate in issues relating to backcountry airstrips located on lands managed by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Our Nation's backcountry airstrips are important to many activities that take place on our public lands. Airstrips provide remote access for aerial firefighting efforts, they are an essential safety tool for pilots operating in rural and mountainous areas, and they provide a vital link to the outside world for many rural communities.

It is important to ensure that legitimate uses of backcountry airstrips are protected. It is also a priority for this Department that any proposals to alter use of federal lands must go through open and public process that includes close consultation with local communities. I commit to work with you, and other members of the congressional delegation, the State of Idaho, and local communities on any proposals to change the use of backcountry airstrips on lands managed by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The second letter is from the Department of Agriculture:

DEAR SENATOR CRAPO: The U.S. Department of Agriculture is committed to working with you and other Members of Congress to develop a comprehensive, long-term approach for managing backcountry airstrips on lands managed by the USDA Forest Service.

We agree that it is appropriate to maintain airstrips that provide critical air access to rural, backcountry, or wilderness areas; that contribute to pilot safety; or that support aerial firefighting efforts. The Department also agrees that these airstrips should not be permanently closed without prior consultation with State aviation and other appropriate officials.

We appreciate your leadership on this issue and look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

ANN VENEMAN,  
Secretary.

Mr. President, because we have now obtained the commitment of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior that they will work with us in a public process and in a consultative process with the State officials involved in managing aviation issues, and because they have acknowledged the important critical needs of maintaining these backcountry airstrips in good condition, and instead of closing them, keeping them open and available for use, we do not believe it is necessary to pursue this amendment on this legislation.

I appreciate the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture agreeing and working with us to avoid the need for this amendment, and we appreciate their commitment to work with us in the future on permanent legislation that will fully resolve this issue statutorily.

Therefore, Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 878) was withdrawn.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to respond to the Senator from Arizona who earlier today, in listing programs in this bill he felt were inappropriate—I believe he used the word “pork” or some other derogatory reference to those programs—cited a \$150,000 proposal in this bill to build a barn at the John Hay estate in New Hampshire.

I honestly believe the Senator from Arizona has done a disservice to the people of New Hampshire by citing this item as one of the items on his list. It appears to me the research on that list may be rather weak if he is putting on the list items such as this. I want to give the history of this situation.

The John Hay estate is owned by the Fish and Wildlife Service. John Hay was Abraham Lincoln's secretary. He was Theodore Roosevelt's and William McKinley's Secretary of State. He served for years as a public servant of extraordinary import in our Nation's history in the latter part of the 19th century and into the beginning of the 20th century, playing a major role in a number of very significant events, especially in the period 1890 to 1905 when he died.

As part of his lifestyle, he was a Renaissance man. He had been, as I mentioned, secretary to Lincoln and is quite famous for his notes on Lincoln. In Washington, he started something called the Five of Hearts, a very famous historical group that met regularly at his home, which is now the Hay-Adams—Hay-Adams was not actually his home. His home was where the Hay-Adams is. That is the physical location.

That group involved five people of incredible intellectual capacity, and they became known as the Five of Hearts. He was part of that group and his wife was also.

As part of his effort and as part of the culture of that time actually, he wanted to set up a community which would be a respite from the hectic life of policy and government, and he chose the shores of Lake Sunapee in New Hampshire to try to do that. He came to New Hampshire and purchased a significant amount of land at that time—over a thousand acres—and an old farm and began to try to attract to that part of New Hampshire during the summer people who were world leaders in order to think and relax in what was really a bucolic atmosphere; it still is. It is a fabulous pastoral setting.

It is a lot like what Saint-Gaudens, who was another significant person in that period and tremendous artist in our history, had done in another part of New Hampshire called Cornish.

He built a farmhouse; he took the old farmhouse and renovated it. It was situated on 1,000 acres. Of course, with any farmhouse there was a barn, as one might expect in that period. His family has owned that property for years and years. In the late 1980s, his daughter gave the property as part of her estate to the U.S. Government because she

thought it was so important it be preserved as part of history because it is a truly unique piece of property.

One of the things he did on that property was bring in some extraordinary plants. In his travels he collected plants of alpine nature and built an alpine yard which is one of the rarest gardens in this country and has been designated so by the national garden groups. He built other gardens around the home. He had Theodore Roosevelt there and planted trees. There is a Theodore Roosevelt tree which grows outside the house.

The house itself was architecturally unique and presents a classic example of a Greek revival farmhouse in the New England tradition which existed in the late 19th century. But most of those homes have been lost either through fires or being torn down over the years.

The gift of this property to us, the people of America, by his family was an extremely generous act. At that time it was given to us, it involved only 100 acres but over a mile of frontage on the lake. Frontage on the lake is extremely expensive. The house itself was not in good repair, and the barn was not, and the gardens were at risk because the gardener who had been managing them for over 50 years was getting a little old and decided to give it up.

So as a result of a community effort with over 600 people involved, called the Friends of John Hay, we restored this home. There has been a fair amount of Federal dollars committed to trying to restore the home over the years. Senator Rudman, my predecessor, got the initial funds, and I have been successful in obtaining funds to restore the home. Why? Because, of course, it is a Federal property and we have responsibility. It would be as if we owned the home, and we may well own the home of Abraham Lincoln of Illinois, for all I know, and are restoring that home. But it is a Federal responsibility for which we have responsibility.

More importantly than that, it is a property that had such a magnetic effect in the region as a truly unique, historical site architecturally and because of the gardens, that the community around the property has risen up with great energy, enthusiasm, and support. There are over 600 people who participate now in maintaining the gardens in what is a voluntarism that is rather significant and instructive and now has the gardens back to where they should be, as the home is back to where it should be.

As part of this property, as I mentioned, there was a barn. The barn was also an architecturally unique building, with unique windows and unique buttresses inside. But more importantly, as part of the property, being a traditional New England home, it set the nature of the property.

This winter, for those who had the good fortune to go to New Hampshire and ski, we had great snow. We had

such great snow, it never stopped snowing all winter long. Throughout our State and Vermont and Maine—Vermont does not get as great snow as we get, but they still get snow—a lot of homes, buildings, schools, in fact, found their roofs caved in. Regrettably, what happened at the Hay estate was, the barn, which was a historical barn, had a snow base on it which it could not maintain, even after 100 years—maybe not 100; maybe 85. Regrettably, the barn collapsed under the weight of the snow.

I guess it is the position of the Senator from Arizona that when a building that is on a historical site, which is the responsibility of the Federal Government to maintain, collapses, we should simply leave it there: Historical building that collapsed? Just leave it there. I guess that is the position of the Senator from Arizona.

What these funds were for—\$150,000, which is not a great deal of money when you consider the character and size of the barn—was to restore the barn, put it back together, put it back up, and hopefully put in buttresses which will withstand the next major snow, which, of course, we hope to have again for our skiers.

The fact is, for the Senator from Arizona to come down here and represent it as somehow pork or inappropriate that the Federal Government has a responsibility to maintain a historical site of such significance, which had such huge community involvement when there was a disaster affecting that site which was the result of an act of God—by the way, an excessive snow year is pushing the envelope on how you define what are appropriate expenditures at the Federal level.

I cannot think of anything more appropriate than for the Federal Government to manage the property that has been given to the people of this country in a reasonable way. The reasonable thing to do, of course, is to rebuild the historical barn so the integrity of the property is maintained.

I believe the Senator from Arizona is misguided on this point. I want to put that in the RECORD. I will be happy to invite the Senator from Arizona on his next trip to New Hampshire, which appears to be reasonably frequent, to stop by at the Hay estate and see the barn, see the estate, see the gardens, maybe meet with the 600 people who work there on a regular basis as volunteers, and ask them whether that barn is an important part of that estate and whether the Federal Government has a responsibility to at least rebuild the barn when the people are volunteering literally thousands of hours to maintain the estate for free. I look forward to the Senator stopping by at the John Hay estate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair and wish the Presiding Officer a good afternoon and hopefully a short one.

It was my understanding there was a distinct possibility with the upcoming

expiration of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act, which expires in August, a renewal of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act might be offered as an amendment to the Interior appropriations bill. If that had been the case, I was prepared to offer a second-degree amendment to the ILSA renewal with respect to our energy dependence on Iraq. I have an amendment at the desk that would do just that.

I will not call up that amendment at this time, but I would like to alert my colleagues of the significance of what is going on with regard to Iraq. I think the occupant and other Members are aware of the Smith-Schumer letter which addresses the ILSA issue by extending for 5 years the moratorium on trade with both Iran and Libya.

The important thing to note is the 71 signatures in favor of extending that moratorium. As we know, it takes a 50-vote point of order to waive rule XVI, which is legislation on appropriations. I am not going to violate that.

We have a great inconsistency here. I have been coming to the floor for a long time talking about energy policies. I am referring today, of course, to our continuing dependence on petroleum from Iraq. We import somewhere between 500,000 and 750,000 barrels of oil from Iraq every day. That is about \$6 billion worth in the last year.

Let me share with the Presiding Officer what the curve is relative to the increase in our oil imports from Iraq to the United States. It started in 1997 and has had its ups and downs. In 1998 we had a takeoff, and we are currently importing somewhere in the area of 700,000 barrels a day.

We had an interesting occurrence about 6 weeks ago where Iraq was unhappy with its treatment by the U.N. and made a decision to reduce its production by 2.5 million barrels a day for a month. That took 60 million barrels a day off the market.

Now, there were many in this body who thought OPEC would simply increase their production and offset that. That was not the case. OPEC simply decided to wait 30 days. As a consequence, the 30 days have passed, and Saddam Hussein did not get what he wanted from the U.N., but he did turn back his production level.

As a consequence, I think it is important to recognize what is happening with regard to Iraq. Many people forget we had a war over there in 1990 and 1991. That war cost us some 148 American lives. We had 400-some wounded. We had several taken prisoner. We were successful. The purpose of the war was very simple, it was to keep Saddam Hussein from invading Kuwait and going on into Saudi Arabia and basically controlling the world's supply of oil. Make no mistake about it, that was a real war.

The consequences of that are rather interesting to reflect on now. If we look at the situation with regard to our friend, Saddam Hussein, we find American families are now going to

Saddam Hussein for energy. Iraq is the fastest growing U.S. source of oil imports: Again, 750,000 from Iraq; about 2.3 million from the Persian Gulf countries; the OPEC countries, about 5 million barrels a day.

I am not going to stop there because I think that is where the issue is kind of left in the minds of many Americans. But let's think about realities. Since the gulf war, we have enforced an aerial blockade. Perhaps some of my colleagues could share with me the difference between an aerial blockade and a surface blockade. A surface blockade with the Navy is generally considered an act of war. We have been enforcing this no-fly zone. We call it a no-fly zone, but it is really an aerial blockade. We have flown nearly 250,000 individual sorties, flights, over Iraq, enforcing this aerial blockade. We have done it to prevent Saddam Hussein from threatening our allies in the region.

We are spending billions of dollars to keep Saddam Hussein in check. What are we doing with the oil? We take his oil, we fill up our airplanes, and send our pilots to fly over Iraq. They are shot at by Iraqi artillery. Then they return, fill up on Iraqi oil, and do it again.

I find that disconcerting, to say the least. I am indignant. It is unacceptable. I could use many adjectives. But Saddam Hussein is heating our homes in the winter, getting our kids ready for school each day, getting our food from the farm to the table, and we pay him pretty well to do that.

Let me refer to what is happening as a consequence of this. I will get back to this chart a little later. We can view it with some reflection because it represents a very significant trend.

Let's talk about what Saddam Hussein does with the money we pay him. He pays his Republican Guards to keep him alive; he supports international terrorist activities—we are aware of that; he funds his military campaign against American interests, American service men and women and our allies; and he is desperately trying to shoot one of our aircraft down.

When that happens, if it happens, God forbid, I don't know what the reaction is going to be. But I know what my personal reaction is. This risk has been evident to the American people and the American Congress. We have condoned it. We have not done anything about it. Why not?

The inconsistency, of course, is we are proposing to extend our sanctions on Iran and Libya for another five years. We have not imported a drop of oil from Iran in 20 years. I am not suggesting we should. But we do not even mention Iraq.

In addition to paying his Republican Guards, supporting international terrorists, he builds an arsenal of weapons of mass destruction with biological capability. Who does he threaten? He threatens our ally, Israel. As a matter of fact, he ends virtually every speech with, "Death to Israel."

I don't know how more pointed I could get. Maybe I am missing something in this. Is this good policy? For a number of years the United States has worked closely with the United Nations on the Oil For Food Program. The program allows Iraq to export petroleum in exchange for funds which can be used for food, medicine, and other humanitarian products. But despite more than \$15 billion available for those purposes, Iraq has only spent a fraction of that money for the needs of the Iraqi people. Instead, the Iraqi Government spends it on missile capability, defensive and offensive capability, a highly trained military. One has to wonder why, when billions of dollars are available to care for the people of Iraq; many of whom are malnourished, many of whom are sick, many of whom have inadequate medical care; why would Saddam Hussein withhold the money available and choose, instead, to blame the United States for the plight of his people? Why is Iraq reducing the amount they spend on nutrition and prenatal care? Why are they reducing that amount when millions of dollars are available? Why does \$200 million of medicine from the U.N. sit undistributed in Iraqi warehouses? Why, given the urgent state of humanitarian conditions in Iraq, does Saddam Hussein insist that his country's highest priority is the development of sophisticated telecommunications and transportation infrastructure? Why, if there are billions available and his people are starving, is Iraq only buying about \$8 million in agricultural products from the United States?

I do not have any quarrel with the Oil For Food Program. It is well intentioned. I do have a problem with the means with which Saddam Hussein has manipulated our growing dependency on Iraqi oil.

Three times since the beginning of the Oil For Food Program Saddam Hussein has threatened, or actually halted, oil production, as I indicated, disrupting energy markets, sending world prices skyrocketing. Why did he do this? I guess he wants to send a message to the United States. The message might be: I have leverage over you.

Every time I look at this chart I look at the increased leverage associated with Saddam Hussein and OPEC and the cartel. We do not have cartels in this country. We cannot. We have anti-trust laws against it. But we are feeding this cartel with our appetite for crude oil.

The harsh reality is, as much as we would like to relieve our dependence on oil with alternative energies—we have alternative sources of energy. We have coal, we have natural gas, we have hydro, we have nuclear, but you do not move America or the world on that kind of energy. You move America and the world on oil. We do not have a substitute for that. We do not have anything realistic to replace it.

We are going to become more dependent unless we address the alternative

and that is to reduce our dependence here at home by conservation and opening up new sources where we are likely to find a significant volume of oil.

One of the things in my energy bill as a specific goal and target is to reduce the dependence on imports of oil to less than 50 percent by 2010. You can do it in one fell swoop if, indeed, the oil in ANWR is what it purports to be, somewhere between 5.6 billion and 16 billion barrels a day. The question is, Can you do it safely; and the answer is clearly yes.

There is one other thing I would like to mention that has not gone into the ANWR argument to any extent. That is the interests of the residents of the area. That particular issue involved 95,000 acres of land that are in ANWR, up here at this very top of the world, in this area, Kaktovik—these Natives have 95,000 acres of land. I have a chart that shows the Native ownership. But the Native ownership is basically such that it has no access to the existing pipeline. It has no access from the standpoint of producing, even for the villagers there, the gas that is in the village site for use by the villagers. They are simply precluded.

We use the term "corked" in Alaska. Corked means that when you are out fishing and you have your net the way fish are swimming, somebody takes their net and goes in front of you.

That is just what has happened up here with our Native people. The Native people have 95,000 acres of private land. They are precluded from recovering even their own natural gas for development and usage. That is wrong.

As we look at reality, and as we look at our increased dependence on imports, by the votes we have seen here, whether it is on lease sale 181 or some of the issues relative to our national monuments, we had better come to grips with reality. Where are these deposits going to come from if they do not come from areas that are still open?

This is a chart that shows the areas that are closed. The west coast and the east coast are off limits. Take lease sale 181. Three-quarters of that is off limits. The entire overthrust belt is off limits as a consequence of actions by the last administration.

I make this point simply to highlight the reality. Here we are talking about extending moratoriums against Iran and against Libya with no mention of Iraq. We have placed our energy security in the hands of a madman, Saddam Hussein.

The administration has attempted valiantly to reconstruct a sensible multilateral policy towards Iraq. Those attempts, unfortunately, have not been successful. We are still dependent on foreign imports, and a significant portion is coming from Iraq.

I think before we can construct a sensible United States policy towards Iraq, we need to end the blatant inconsistency between our energy policy and

our foreign policy. We need to end our addiction to Iraqi oil. We need to basically go cold turkey. To that end, in a moment I will introduce legislation which would prohibit oil imports from Iraq, whether or not under the Oil for Food Program, until it is no longer inconsistent with our national security to resume these imports. I hope that this will be an initial step toward a more rational and coherent policy towards Iraq.

As a consequence, I am withdrawing my amendment at the desk. I trust my colleagues have picked up to some extent the points I have brought out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute as if in morning business to introduce my bill. Then I will yield the floor.

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

The amendment is withdrawn.

Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1170 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I think we are at a stage in the debate on the bill that I can now say we have completed all of our work.

I compliment the chairman and the ranking member for their extraordinary work in the last couple of days in getting us to this point. Let me also thank Senator GRAMM of Texas for his work in the last couple of hours in working with Senator BYRD on a concern of great import to Senator BYRD.

There has been no request for a roll-call vote on final passage. I am now in a position to announce that there will be no more rollcall votes tonight.

There are no rollcall votes scheduled for tomorrow, nor will there be votes on Monday.

My hope is that we will be able to move to the energy and water appropriations bill on Monday for debate only, and then we will move into debate on amendments beginning as early as Tuesday. I hope Senators will file their amendments and will be prepared to offer them even though we will not have votes on Monday. I encourage them to do that.

I am hopeful we can get at least two appropriations bills done, if not more, next week.

We have a lot of work to do. But there are no more votes tonight. As promised, I have also made a commitment that a number of nominations—if I recall, something on the order of 20

nominations—will be offered shortly. We are about ready to do that. There is at least one that will be the subject of some discussion. But I know of no requests for rollcalls on those nominations. No more rollcall votes tonight.

We will begin work on Monday, hopefully, on energy and water.

I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I wish to take this opportunity to offer a few observations as we are closing up this Interior appropriations bill. I must thank the senior Senator from West Virginia for his work as chairman of this committee. His staff has been remarkable. They are easy to work with, and they have accommodated, I think, as many people in this body as they possibly could.

Peter Kiehaber has done a commendable job in his first year as the clerk for the majority. His willingness to work with my staff has ensured that this bill has reached its bipartisan form. He has been assisted by a number of very capable staff members, including Ginny James, Leif Fonnesbeck, Brooke Livingston, and a detailer from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Scott Dalzell.

On my side of the ring, I thank my staff members who work with me on the minority side.

Bruce Evans lent his expertise after spending numerous years as the majority clerk under the very able chairmanship of Senator Slade Gorton of Washington. I have a lot more respect for the former Senator from Washington and the work he did because this is my first year on Interior appropriations. I personally thank Bruce for continuing his service in the Senate and helping me through my first year as chairman and then ranking member on this bill.

I also thank Christine Drager for her assistance on a number of extremely difficult accounts, as well as Ryan Thomas, who moved from my personal office to the Appropriations Committee to lend a helping hand in crafting this legislation.

While I am thanking those who have helped in the formation of this legislation, I want to single out Mark Davis. Mark has joined my office as a congressional fellow from the U.S. Forest Service. I want my colleagues to know that it was Mark's efforts that ensured we received all of your requests, and all the requests were considered. He sifted through the request letters, organized your request lists, and tracked your staff down to make sure we had the information necessary to help us meet the desires of each Member and make

some very tough decisions. I thank him for his service.

Madam President, this has been somewhat of a difficult process. We were not able to fully meet the desires of every Member who offered an amendment to this bill. However, the chairman and I have attempted to remain fair while avoiding adding legislative riders that would slow the progress of this bill.

It is imperative that this bill be moved through Congress and be sent to the President as soon as possible. It is now mid-July and we have a lot of work ahead of us.

Again, I thank my chairman, Senator BYRD of West Virginia. I could not have asked for a better chairman as I enter the first year working on Interior appropriations. I thank him very much for his patience because he helped me through some of the rough spots. I thank him for that.

I yield the floor, and 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. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I express my heartfelt gratitude to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Montana, who is the ranking member on the subcommittee of the Department of the Interior.

I thank him for his very able representation of his people. I thank him for the consideration he has accorded to all other Senators as we have developed this bill, brought it to the floor and managed it together. I thank him for his equanimity, his very friendly and accommodating spirit. I thank him for being CONRAD BURNS. I thank him for the contribution he has made in the development of this bill in working with me as we have attempted to manage the bill and bring it to a conclusion.

I thank our respective staffs on both sides of the aisle for their courtesies to us and to our colleagues. I thank our colleagues for their cooperation and understanding. I thank the leaders on both sides for the assistance they have given to us. I particularly thank our Democratic whip.

I believe that Members will remember my taking the floor on many occasions to speak on the theme that the dog is man's best friend. Harry Truman said, "If you want a friend in Washington, you better go buy a dog." Well, I believe that. Members often hear me extol the virtues of the dog. Not only can we say that a dog is man's great friend, but for those of us who have to manage bills on the floor, it has been my experience that the majority whip is the best friend that a manager of a bill can have.

I have seen a goodly number of whips in my time on the Senate floor. The Office of Whip goes back a long way, into

the 1600s, as a matter of fact, when it was said in the British Parliament that the whipper-in—the individual who kept the hounds from straying from the field during the fox chase. In those days, whips were sent in the form of circular letters to members of the opposition, members of the King's party to northern England, and sent as far away as Paris, France, to tell members to come in on a certain day and be prepared to vote on a certain matter. That was the whip's job.

The whip's position here has grown into an institution. During the early 1900s, during the first quarter of the 20th century, the offices known as majority whip, majority leader, minority leader, minority whip came into being. They are not constitutional offices, but these are offices that have been developed over the years.

The whip system in the House is much more refined and more highly developed than it is in the Senate, not quite so highly developed as it is in the British Parliament. In our body, we do not have the whip system they have in the House, but we have an extraordinarily good whip in HARRY REID from Nevada.

I was what I consider a good whip here for a good many years. I served with Mike Mansfield when he was majority leader. I was the majority whip, and I sat on the floor all the time. I never left the floor but a few minutes at a time. This whip, HARRY REID, performs that same function. He is on the floor. He is helping Senators with their needs. He is helping the managers of the bills to arrive at agreements. He is helping the managers of the bills to reach time agreements on amendments once they have been offered. He does an extraordinarily good job.

I express those compliments concerning HARRY REID. I think he is a better whip than ROBERT BYRD was. He has more patience than ROBERT BYRD had. I would say he has more political gumption than ROBERT BYRD probably had. He is a great whip. I salute him.

I have no hesitancy at all in saying if somebody does a better job than I can do, I salute them for it. He does an excellent job. I thank him.

He helped me and Senator STEVENS on the supplemental bill. He has helped Senator BURNS and myself on this bill. I thank him again.

Madam President, we will be going to conference next week on this bill, and Senator CONRAD BURNS and I will, again, stand shoulder to shoulder with the other members of our team on both sides of the aisle, and we will be working with the House Members in an effort to bring from the conference a bill the President will sign into law.

I merely wanted to express those few compliments, those few expressions of gratitude, and to say I am very glad that the Senate has reached the point now of finalizing the action on this bill prior to it being sent to conference.

The Senate has now approved the fiscal year 2001 Supplemental appropria-

tions bill and the first fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill, the fiscal year 2002 Interior and related agencies appropriations bill. We have scheduled nine bills for action in the Senate Appropriations Committee during July and we hope to have Senate action on those bills before the August recess.

We have a long tradition on the Senate Appropriations Committee of working together on a bipartisan basis to produce fiscally responsible and balanced appropriations bills. Working together with my distinguished colleague and good friend TED STEVENS, we have gotten off to a good start this year.

The fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill passed the Senate on Tuesday by a vote of 98-1. It totaled \$6.5 billion, not one thin dime over the President's request. It is a balanced bill that approved most of the President's request for defense and included a number of other priority programs such as funding for Education for the Disadvantaged, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and the Global AIDS program. It included no emergency funding. All unrequested items were fully offset so that we remain under the statutory cap on spending for fiscal year 2001.

Today, we have approved the fiscal year 2002 Interior appropriations bill by a voice vote. We have exercised discipline. The budget resolution sets very tight limits on overall discretionary spending. And this bill stays within the 302(b) allocation that the Appropriations Committee approved pursuant to the budget resolution.

In both bills we held the line. We stayed within our budgetary boundaries. We took a deep breath and were able to squeeze in between those narrow walls. But the walls are getting tighter. We have been given a difficult task. Much has been asked of us; a tremendous amount is expected when it comes to providing for the national need.

We are attempting to conduct the people's business—to pass the thirteen bills that fund government in a timely fashion. The clock is ticking. We hope to go to conference soon so that this bill can be sent to the President before the August recess.

The House and Senate Budget Committee are now projecting that we will be dipping into the Medicare surplus in fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002 and that this trend is likely to continue for several years. This is taking place before a single appropriations bill has been sent to the President.

I believe that this change in our budget outlook will result in very tight limits on discretionary spending over the next few years. I don't like it, it won't be good for America, but it is a reality. As we consider the fiscal year 2002 bills, it will be very important that we understand the long term consequences of our actions. We should not be taking actions this year that will lock us into long term costs. We have a long tradition on this committee for

working together on a bipartisan basis to produce responsible bills, one year at a time.

There will be a strong temptation to approve provisions this year that will mandate costs for specific programs in future years. We simply can not go down that road when we know that we are facing tight spending limits over the next few years.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that during the pendency of H.R. 2217, the managers be permitted to offer a managers' amendment; that once the amendment is reported, it be considered agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any amendments laid aside be modified and agreed to, as modified; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that no further amendments be in order; that the bill be advanced to third reading; that the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I again thank Senator BYRD for his leadership on this legislation. We set a record for an Interior appropriations bill due to the chairman's leadership. Two days is about as fast as we have done an Interior appropriations bill. That is a great credit to his leadership. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that any statements by Senators in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD as though spoken.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—NOMINATION OF J. STEVEN GRILES

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote on final passage of H.R. 2217, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of J. Steven Griles to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior; that the Senate immediately vote on the confirmation of the nomination, with no intervening action; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that there then be a period for debate regarding the nomination; and that following that debate, the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement be

modified to reflect that the vote occur on the nominee following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAIG. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask for no more than 2 minutes following the comments of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. REID. I say under my own consent request, it is likely that the junior Senator from Florida will also want to speak. He has indicated that when we take our voice vote, he wants to be one of those known as having voted no. So I reserve some time for him, too, if he desires to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator modify his request?

Mr. REID. Yes.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 976

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the managers' amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for himself and Mr. BURNS, proposes an amendment numbered 976.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 976) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all the pending amendments are agreed to.

The amendment (No. 880) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 975), as modified, as agreed to, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. MODIFICATION TO STEEL LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-51; 15 U.S.C. 1841 note) is amended as follows:

(1) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Subsection (h) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "2005" and inserting "2015"; and

(B) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

**"(4) GUARANTEE LEVEL.—**

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), any loan guarantee provided under this section shall not exceed 85 percent of the amount of principal of the loan.

"(B) INCREASED LEVEL ONE.—A loan guarantee may be provided under this section in excess of 85 percent, but not more than 90 percent, of the amount of principal of the loan, if—

"(i) the aggregate amount of loans guaranteed at such percentage and outstanding under this section at any one time does not exceed \$100,000,000; and

"(ii) the aggregate amount of loans guaranteed at such percentage under this section with respect to a single qualified steel company does not exceed \$50,000,000.

"(C) INCREASED LEVEL TWO.—A loan guarantee may be provided under this section in excess of 85 percent, but not more than 95 percent, of the amount of principal of the loan, if—

"(i) the aggregate amount of loans guaranteed at such percentage and outstanding under this section at any one time does not exceed \$100,000,000; and

"(ii) the aggregate amount of loans guaranteed at such percentage under this section with respect to a single qualified steel company does not exceed \$50,000,000.".

(2) TERMINATION OF GUARANTEE AUTHORITY.—Subsection (k) is amended by striking "2001" and inserting "2003".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to any guarantee issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

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

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

**INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES**

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the critical shortfall in Indian Health Service funding. The Indian Health Service is unable to provide basic health services to American Indians and Alaska Natives. We are failing to uphold a promise we made many years ago in federal-tribal treaties as well as federal statute.

The Indian Health Service is tasked with providing full health insurance for American Indians and Alaska Natives, but is so underfunded that patients are routinely denied care that most of us take for granted and, in many cases, call essential. The budget for clinical services is so inadequate that Indian patients are subjected to a "life or limb" test. Unless their condition is life-threatening or they risk losing a limb, their treatment is deferred for higher priority cases; by the time they become a priority, there are often no funds left to pay for the treatment.

I attempted to address this crisis by offering an amendment to the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution. The amendment called for a \$4.2 billion increase for the clinical services budget of the Indian Health Service. Seven of my colleagues cosponsored this amendment, which passed the Senate, but was not included in the bill that returned from conference.

I again attempted to address this situation in the Interior Appropriations bill, but it appears that we will be unable to do that at this time due to the inadequate budget allocation facing the Interior Appropriations Sub-

committee. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee on how we might address this situation in conference and advance the goal of living up to our commitment to provide essential health services to American Indians and Alaska Natives.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I am happy to address that issue with the majority leader. Can the leader tell me what would be required to offer the basic health services we promised to American Indians and Alaska Natives?

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, we have estimates of the funding that would be required to provide basic clinical services to American Indians and Alaska Natives. The President's fiscal year 2002 budget requests \$1.8 billion for Indian Health Service clinical services. While this is an increase over the fiscal year 2001 appropriation, it will not allow the Indian Health Service to meet the basic level of health needs for American Indians and Alaskan Natives. For many years now, appropriations for the Indian Health Service have not even kept pace with medical inflation or population growth. The per capita spending on health care for each Indian Health Service beneficiary is only one-third of what is spent per capita for the general U.S. population. The Department of Health and Human Services and the Indian Health Service produce a tribal needs-based budget that calculates the true cost of meeting the health needs of Native Americans. According to these estimates, a \$4.2 billion increase in the 2002 budget is required to meet the most basic health care needs.

The impact of serious, chronic underfunding of the Indian Health Service is immense. The disparities in health outcomes between American Indians and Alaska Natives as compared to other Americans is appalling. Infant mortality is just one example. An American Indian baby is 50 percent more likely to die before the age of one than a Caucasian baby. In some counties of my state, the infant mortality rate is 33.6 per 1,000, more than 5 times the Caucasian rate. The same disparities exist for diabetes, tuberculosis, alcoholism, liver disease, and fetal alcohol syndrome, all of which plague America's native communities at rates far above the incidence for other Americans. Sadly, the mortality rate for American Indians and Alaska Natives is higher than for all races in the United States; life expectancy is the lowest.

I know the distinguished chairman is concerned about these conditions, and I know that his efforts to increase Indian Health Service funding have been undermined by an inadequate budget allocation for this subcommittee. I certainly appreciate the severe constraints on the Appropriations Committee, particularly in light of the tax cut legislation recently enacted and the budget reestimates that indicate the projected budget surpluses are

dwindling. Still, I hold out hope that, as he and the other conferees negotiate with our colleagues in the House, they can find some way to provide additional funding for the clinical services budget of the Indian Health Service. I would not make this request unless I were truly convinced that we have fallen far short on our commitment to provide health care services to American Indians and Alaska Natives.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I assure the majority leader of my commitment to that effort. While we certainly will not be able to address all of the funding shortfall this year, I, too, am hopeful that we can find additional funds in conference to begin to address that shortfall.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I am concerned that there are members of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians who are currently not allowed to be provided with health care services under the Indian Health Services Contract Health Services program. It is my understanding that there is a procedure which would allow the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians to include the approximately 300 tribal members who reside in Ripley, TN, within their authorized service area.

The Ripley community lacks the most basic health services. There are no resources for preventive health education and no access to either Indian Health Services or tribally operated facilities.

The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians has demonstrated a commitment to these tribal members by providing updated housing and other infrastructure and services. The tribe is currently constructing an appropriate health care facility at the Ripley Community. However, it is concerned that it does not yet have the authorization from Indian Health Services to provide those services.

I am sensitive to the constraints in the Interior Appropriations bill, which did not allow an increase in the Contract Services Program. I am hopeful that we can work with our colleagues from the House of Representatives in the conference for this bill to find additional funds for this program, to increase the likelihood that tribal members, no matter where they live, will be able to have access to the health services their tribe can offer.

Regardless of the funding situation, I hope that the Indian Health Services officials here in Washington, D.C., will review this situation and work closely with Chief Phillip Martin, the tribal council, and other officials of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, to expand its Contract Health Services area.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Mississippi has my assurance that I will support his effort to assist the tribe in his State. I encourage the Director of Indian Health Services to pay particular attention to the request of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians to serve its tribal members in Ripley, TN.

#### ATLANTIC SALMON CONSERVATION

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, my colleague from Maine and I would like to engage the subcommittee chairman and ranking member if we may.

Mr. BYRD. Please proceed.

Ms. COLLINS. I want to thank my colleagues from West Virginia and Montana for the support they have provided in their bill for Atlantic salmon conservation and restoration efforts in our State. I appreciate their fully funding the administration's request for \$597,000 in the Fish and Wildlife Management Account as well as their willingness to make \$1.1 million available to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to carry out a competitively awarded grant program to fund on-the-ground recovery efforts for Maine's Atlantic salmon.

Ms. SNOWE. I also want to thank my colleagues for their support for Atlantic salmon recovery. As the Senators know, the fiscal year 2001 Interior appropriations bill provided the funding to establish the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation's Atlantic salmon grant program. The program, which has leveraged an even greater amount of non-federal money, has been extremely successful at identifying and supporting innovative projects that will help with the recovery effort.

Mr. BYRD. I appreciate the comments of my colleagues from Maine and commend them for the hard work they have done to secure resources to help with the Atlantic salmon recovery efforts in their State.

Ms. COLLINS. In reporting its bill, the subcommittee originally provided \$500,000 for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation's Atlantic salmon grant program. It is my understanding that, in increasing funding for the program to \$1.1 million, the subcommittee continues to meet the administration's request for \$597,000 in funding for Atlantic salmon recovery efforts through the Fish and Wildlife Management Account.

Mr. BURNS. The Senator from Maine is correct. The subcommittee recommended an increase of \$7,380,000 for Fish and Wildlife Management above the administration's request for this account. Of the \$7,380,000, \$600,000 has been reallocated as part of the manager's amendment to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's General Administration Account for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation's Atlantic salmon grant program, bringing the total provided by the bill for this program to \$1.1 million.

Ms. SNOWE. The money that was provided last year has been utilized to engage a wide range of stakeholders, including local community groups as well as aquaculture, agriculture, and forestry companies in cooperative restoration efforts. They have worked hard to aid the rebuilding process. It is a reflection of the strong commitment of everyone in Maine that we have far more projects being proposed than funding to accommodate them all. I

can assure you that the money you are providing today will make a significant impact. I thank the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member for their courtesy and continued support.

Ms. COLLINS. I also thank the Senators from West Virginia and Montana, and I look forward to continuing to work with them and the senior Senator from Maine to ensure that resources are available to assist in Atlantic salmon recovery efforts.

#### FUNDING FOR THE URBAN PARKS AND RECREATION RECOVERY FUND

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify that it is the intent to seek additional funding for the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Fund, UPARR, when the Senate Interior appropriations bill goes to conference.

UPARR plays a vital role in supporting the last remaining green spaces in some of our most congested urban areas. This program takes a relatively small amount of federal funds and leverages them to make a substantial contribution to the development and improvement of our nation's urban parks, playgrounds, and recreational areas. For many of my constituents, these small pockets of open space are a vital part of their community. They serve as playgrounds for children, meeting places for adults, and areas for fun, recreation, and respite from the daily hustle and bustle of our Nation's most economically and socially stressed neighborhoods.

I was pleased to see that the House included \$30 million for this important program in its fiscal year 2002 Interior appropriations bill. This amount includes a slight increase over last year's funding levels and is consistent with the commitment made to this program last year in title VIII of the Interior appropriations bill.

I was disappointed, however, that the Senate bill did not match this funding level. I realize that this lower level of funding for UPARR is related to the lower overall level of funding in the Senate bill. When the bill gets to conference with the House, I hope we can accept the House level. Is that the chairman's intent?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with my distinguished colleague from California that UPARR is a worthy program. If additional funds become available in conference, I shall be glad to consider a higher level of funding for UPARR.

#### SEWALL-BELMONT HOUSE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise today to ask my colleagues Senator BYRD and Senator BURNS to work with me in conference on the Interior appropriations bill to ensure that the Interior Department provides funding for an important Capitol Hill landmark, the Sewall-Belmont House.

The Sewall-Belmont House has been a center of political life in Washington for more than 200 years. It was the home of Treasury Secretary Albert Gallatin from 1801 to 1813 and the only site in Washington to offer armed resistance when British troops invaded

the city in August 1814. The building later became a beacon of liberty for American women in the 20th century as the headquarters of the historic National Woman's Party and home of the suffragist leader, Alice Paul.

Congress provided \$500,000 last year to begin much needed site preservation work at the Sewall-Belmont House. Funds will be needed this year to continue construction and ensure that this home remains a national treasure.

Recognition of the Sewall-Belmont House as a nationally significant heritage site has dramatically increased as a result of this preservation effort. Visitorship is steadily increasing, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation recently called the Sewall-Belmont House "the most significant unrestored women's history site in the country." Again, I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure funding for the continued preservation of Sewall-Belmont House.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank my colleague and share her commitment to preserving Sewall-Belmont House. As my distinguished colleague from Texas is undoubtedly aware, it will be difficult to address the funding needs of all the worthy requests before us. Nevertheless, I look forward to working with her in conference to address the funding needs of this unique historic site.

**AUXILIARY POWER UNITS AND PORTABLE POWER IN THE DOE TRANSPORTATION FUEL CELL PROGRAM**

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, fuel cells, a family of technologies that produce energy electrochemically, without combustion, are being developed for a exciting variety of applications. Some of these applications were not contemplated in 1992 when Congress authorized the Office of Transportation Technologies to support development in a variety of product areas. To its credit, the department has attempted to keep pace and to provide the most meaningful support possible to the research, development and demonstration of fuel cells.

My purpose today is to clarify the Senate's interest in two applications, auxiliary power units for motor vehicles and portable power. Auxiliary power units promise a substantial improvement in energy efficiency of vehicles of all types and may reach commercial readiness before complete fuel cell engine systems for vehicles. APU's might also encourage the development of fuel infrastructure and encourage consumer acceptance, readying the marketplace for fuel cell vehicles.

Successful development of fuel cell portable power units will also accelerate consumer understanding and market acceptance. The manufacture of portable power units would yield important experience in manufacturing technology and the increased production volumes would have a direct benefit in reducing the cost of fuel cell engines and systems for vehicles.

Is it the understanding of the distinguished chairman that these applica-

tions fall within the jurisdiction of the Office of Transportation Technology?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. The committee recognizes that vehicle auxiliary power units and portable power systems may be early commercial uses of fuel cells that would also develop infrastructure and experience needed for fuel cell vehicles, and considers these applications to be within the scope of the Office of Transportation Technologies fuel cell program.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator.

**OHIO WATER PROJECTS**

Mr. DEWINE. Madam President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with Appropriations Chairman BYRD and the ranking member of Interior Appropriations, Senator BURNS. I want to briefly discuss with my honorable colleagues an important conservation and recreation project that is of great interest to me and request their favorable consideration of \$5 million for this project in the fiscal year 2002 Interior appropriations bill.

Madam President, a few miles west of Ohio's State capital of Columbus flow two outstanding waterways: the Big and Little Darby Creeks. These two creeks are recognized as State and National Scenic Rivers for their crystal clear water, their abundance of wildlife, and their importance to many Ohioans as a source of high quality outdoor recreation. The Nature Conservancy has even listed these watersheds as one of the "Last Great Places" in the Western Hemisphere. On more than one occasion, I have had the pleasure of visiting these two creeks. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I spent a wonderful day canoeing on the Big Darby Creek earlier this week with two of my children.

Since 1959, the Franklin County Metro Parks have been purchasing land from willing sellers along these two creeks as part of their Battelle-Darby Creek Metro Park. The Park currently offers several recreational opportunities including a Streamside Classroom Education Program, a 1.6 mile walking trail, and several canoe access sites. In addition to welcoming the thousands of visitors the park receives each year, the park's dedicated and highly trained staff are conducting important wetland and prairie restoration programs in the area. At this time, there are several potential purchases that could substantially expand the park and ensure the protection of the creek and increase public access opportunities. I have urged my colleagues on the Interior Appropriations Committee to provide funding for these purchases.

I have discussed my interest in providing financial support for further expansion of the park with Senators BYRD and BURNS and I appreciate their willingness to enter into this colloquy. I also appreciate their interest in exploring funding opportunities for this project through the fiscal year 2002 Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I have had the opportunity to discuss this

project with Senator DEWINE, and I rise today to assure him that I appreciate and understand his interest in this important project and will give it serious consideration during further consideration of the fiscal year 1902 Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I too have had the opportunity to discuss this project with my friend from Ohio. I share Senator BYRD's interest in examining potential funding opportunities to support this project.

**WOLF RECOVERY PROGRAM**

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I rise to commend Mr. BYRD and Mr. BURNS on their leadership and hard work on this bill. The subcommittee has had to make hard decisions about scarce resources and has labored to do so fairly. They have made real efforts to make sure the taxpayer's dollar is spent effectively and efficiently. I have seen first-hand, and appreciate, their dedication to the integrity of this process.

Would the distinguished gentlemen from West Virginia and Montana engage in a colloquy with me concerning the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Program for the nonexperimental population of gray wolves?

Mr. BYRD. I would be pleased to engage in such a colloquy.

Mr. BURNS. As this program also affects my State, I too would be pleased to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. CRAIG. While I wish gray wolves did not reside in my State, they do, and they are not going away. Thus, I believe the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must be pro-active and aggressive in addressing issues related to the monitoring of the wolf population and working with the affected States of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming to delist the population. The wolf population in Central Idaho is growing by leaps and bounds. As a result, permittees are faced with growing livestock-wolf conflicts. In addition, private property rights are infringed as these conflicts occur on private property. Yet the permittee must have a Federal permit to address conflict issues on their own land. Last, as the population grows, management efforts have not increased at the same rate. I feel that these individuals should not be punished because the wolves were re-introduced into central Idaho.

The subcommittee has worked to secure an additional \$200,000 for the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Program. I feel this additional money should be used to increase monitoring efforts and increase communication with potentially affected permittees, as well as, to focus efforts on defining and meeting criteria for delisting the wolves in central Idaho. I believe these funds should work to provide Idaho with flexibility in managing the wolf population to meet the needs of those most affected by the wolves.

Mr. BYRD. I will work with Mr. CRAIG to see that these funds are used for monitoring of the central Idaho wolf population.

## JACOB RIIS PARK

Mr. BURNS. I agree with the gentleman from Idaho, these funds should be used to provide flexibility in managing the wolf population of central Idaho.

## JUDICIAL TRAINING IN THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I would like to discuss with my distinguished colleagues, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the ranking member on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the need for judicial training in the Pacific Islands.

I have been working over the past year with the judges of the ninth circuit, the circuit charged with overseeing the judiciary in the Pacific Islands, to help them secure the funds to conduct a needs assessment for the training of judges in the United States territories and Freely Associated States in the Pacific. That assessment has been completed, and has identified the need for more training programs for nonlawyer and legally trained judges.

The judges of the ninth circuit have worked with the National Judicial College to design two separate one-year training programs for judges in the Pacific Islands. One is aimed at nonlawyer judges, and would be conducted in Pohnpei, the capital of the Federated States of Micronesia, in order to be the most cost effective. The second program would be conducted in the United States, and would be geared toward chief justices or presiding judges.

These training programs are necessary to help Pacific Islands facing burgeoning populations and judicial systems that are not fully developed. The need for further training of these judges has long been recognized by the ninth circuit. This program has the full support of the judiciaries in American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia.

If we are to expect these areas to be able fully and effectively enforce applicable laws, including traditional laws, then we must ensure that the persons who serve in the local judiciaries are fully trained. Of all the technical assistance programs that we provide to improve the operations of government, this particular program has the greatest potential for improving society and the quality of life in these islands.

The cost of this 1-year program would only be approximately \$100,000. I ask my colleagues' support in encouraging the Secretary of the Interior to support this effort.

Mr. BYRD. I support the training of these judges and would be pleased to encourage the Secretary to support this effort as well.

Mr. BURNS. I, too, support such an allocation by the Secretary.

## DON EDWARDS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to join the chairman and ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee

to discuss an issue important to the State of California. That is the continuing funding for the acquisition of San Francisco baylands adjacent to the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge.

Since the early 1900s, more than 90 percent of California's interior wetlands have been lost to development and other land use changes. The property for purchase constitutes more than 13,000 acres of salt ponds at the edge of San Francisco Bay, which itself provides important habitat for more than 1 million birds per year. This purchase will increase the bay's wetland area by 50 percent.

Mr. BYRD. I am familiar with this project. As I understand it, the owner of the land is asking for \$300 million in Federal and State funds for the 13,000 acres. While, this may be a worthwhile endeavor, I question whether it will be possible to allocate such a large sum.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I understand the chairman's concern about the level of funding required to complete this purchase. I share his concern. I am personally working with all parties involved in the agreement in an effort to substantially reduce the federal share of the purchase price.

I am concerned, however, that by providing no funding in the fiscal year 2002 Interior appropriations bill, the seller will be forced to seek other buyers. This would be a lost opportunity of historic proportions. It would be my intention to secure a small amount of funding in the Senate bill to keep the project alive as we move forward in appropriations process with the goal of increasing the project's appropriation should a more realistic price be negotiated.

Mr. BURNS. As the Senator from California knows, funding for the Fish and Wildlife Land acquisition account has already reached its cap and any new funding would have to be offset from within the account.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am aware of the problem raised by the ranking member. To this end, I am willing to reduce funding for two California land acquisition projects—the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge and the San Joaquin National Wildlife Refuge—by \$250,000 each. I want to be very clear—I fully support these projects. In fact, they were included in the bill at my request. I intend to see that they are fully funded by the end of this process. However, due to the procedural necessity of providing an offset, the only way to ensure that all three equally important projects go forward is to make this reduction. Should the interested parties fail to come to an acceptable agreement over the San Francisco baylands, the funding could return to the San Diego and San Joaquin projects.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from California for this statement. With these assurances, I will support the reduction of funds at the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge and the San Joaquin National Wildlife Refuge, and the increase of funds at the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to take a moment to thank Senators BYRD and BURNS for their stewardship of the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. Their work on this bill will secure millions of dollars in funding to help preserve our Nation's precious natural resources, and I support their efforts wholeheartedly.

My colleague from New York, Senator CLINTON, and I would like to take a moment to engage our colleague in a colloquy.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my colleague for his kind words and will be happy to engage in a colloquy with the Senators from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. In 1905, New York City's officials entered into an informal agreement with the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, an organization co-founded by journalist Jacob Riis, to build a recreational facility for the relief of New York tenement dwellers. The resulting Riis Park, opened to the public in 1936, provided opportunities for diversion to millions of city residents. The facility became part of the National Park Service's Gateway National Recreation Area in 1974, and nearly 30,000 people continue to visit this historic site every weekend.

Over the past few years, I have worked with colleagues from both sides of the aisle, in both the Senate and the House, to try to secure funding toward the construction of a natatorium complex at Jacob Riis Park. This project is supported by the New York Landmarks Conservancy, the Historic Districts Council, and the Queensboro Preservation League, as well as the thousands of constituents who turn to this park as a resource for recreation opportunities every spring, summer, and fall.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, Riis Park serves an ethnically diverse population including hundreds of inner-city families, adhering to the ideas envisioned by Jacob Riis and carried on by City Parks Commissioner Robert Moses. By investing in this urban park, our government can ensure that it remains a viable resource for years to come. I stand in full support of funding for the Riis Park Natatorium Complex.

Mr. SCHUMER. My colleague and I have an inquiry to make of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from West Virginia. Both the House and Senate reports to the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 have included \$4.13 million in National Park Service construction funding for rehabilitation of Jacob Riis Park. Would the chairman support the use of these funds for construction on the Riis Park Natatorium Complex?

Mr. BYRD. I appreciate the remarks of the Senators from New York, and would support the use of these funds for such construction.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I thank the Chair.

Mrs. CLINTON. I thank the Chair.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, UNITED STATES  
FOREST SERVICE

Mr. CLELAND. Madam President, I first thank my distinguished colleagues for their leadership and superb management of this bill. I want to take a moment to express my support for a matter of great importance to the people of my State, specifically obtaining funding for land acquisition in the Chattahoochee National Forest. I understand that the \$2,320,000 included in the Appropriations Interior Subcommittee report for that purpose will be used to purchase available tracts of land in, or bordering, the Chattahoochee National Forest in Georgia. I inquire of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and chairman of the committee, am I correct in understanding that \$1,300,000 of that total is intended to purchase property at Mount Yonah near Helen, GA, with the remainder being used to purchase property at Jack's River near the Cohutta Wilderness and the Etowah River near Dahlonega, GA?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia is correct regarding the committee's intent.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the Senator for his inclusion of these worthwhile projects in the Interior appropriations bill.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW RIVER  
GORGE NATIONAL RIVER PARKWAY

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I want to take a moment to ask the ranking member for his agreement to continue a program of importance to the State of West Virginia. The New River Gorge National River is a scenic whitewater river that flows through deep canyons and rugged terrain. The Congress has provided \$125,000 annually for technical support and maintenance on the New River Gorge National River Parkway. Would the ranking member agree that funding for this purpose be continued within the National Park Service appropriation in fiscal year 2002?

Mr. BURNS. I agree with the distinguished chairman that this funding should be continued in fiscal year 2002.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION  
ACT AND CADDO LAKE INSTITUTE WETLANDS  
PROJECT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise today to thank my colleagues Senator BYRD and Senator REID for agreeing to work with me in conference on the Interior appropriations bill to ensure that the Interior Department funds the Caddo Lake Institute's wetlands project in east Texas through the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

Caddo Lake and its associated wetlands provide habitat for over 150 species of fish and wildlife. It is one of only 17 wetlands in the U.S. that has earned the distinction of being designated a Ramsar wetland of international importance pursuant to the international wetlands convention signed in Ramsar, Iran in 1971. Caddo Lake earned this distinction, in part, because the local community sur-

rounding Caddo Lake spearheaded a long effort to convert the area from an army ammunition plant to a refuge for fish and wildlife. With that accomplished, the next stage of the effort is to secure North American Wetlands Conservation Act funding through the Interior bill for the Caddo Lake Institute so that it may advance the planned restoration and wetlands education work at the lake. The Institute has been the local voice and enduring champion for Caddo Lake.

Mr. REID. I would like to be associated with the remarks of my colleague from Texas. I was fortunate to learn about Caddo Lake and the Institute's wetlands work at an April 10, 2001 Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works Committee hearing on wildlife conservation efforts. The premise of that hearing was that national and international conservation goals stand a better chance of accomplishment if they are driven by the local community.

Caddo Lake is a perfect illustration of that idea. At the lake, the local community organized the Caddo Lake Institute and then worked with the State of Texas and the federal government to further the conservation and educational wetland resources there. This not only implements important wetland conservation goals in the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and the Clean Water Act, but also the charge of the Ramsar Convention; that is, it implements both national and international conservation goals. Congressman MAX SANDLIN from the region testified eloquently about the beauty and value of the lake at my April 10 hearing, and I am happy to work with my colleagues to advance the important conservation and education work at Caddo Lake.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my colleagues for their work on this issue, and will work in conference to encourage the Interior Department to continue the work my colleagues have begun by funding a Ramsar-based wetland science, site management and education program through the Caddo Lake Institute working in partnership with the Division of International Conservation and the National Wetlands Research Center.

## HTIRC

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I appreciate the previous support the subcommittee has granted to the Fine Hardwoods Tree Improvement and Regeneration Center at Purdue University. The HTIRC is engaged in research problems and technology transfer related to the regeneration of fine hardwoods. It is a regional center emphasizing not only genetic improvements and silvicultural goals, but addressing wildlife and riparian buffer issues and providing information and outreach to forest landowners.

In establishing the center, I worked with Dr. Robert Lewis of the Forest Service. The project has widespread support and is financially supported

not only by the Forest Service and Purdue University, but by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources and by a very wide variety of forest landowner, industry groups and foundations. It is designed to improve the quality of hardwood tree seedlings and to address the annual shortage of hardwood tree seedlings in the midwest.

The Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture view the center as an excellent example of cooperation between government, academia, and industry in addressing important issues concerning the regeneration of hardwoods. The proposed new forest biology building and laboratory complex will soon house eighteen Forest Service employees and would provide office space and high tech laboratories for these Forest Service employees rent-free and without any charges for maintenance or services over the lifetime of the facility.

The total cost of the forestry complex is \$27 million. Purdue has committed \$20 million to this effort. The remaining \$7 million would be derived from the Forest Service as its share of the cost to house its employees, who would receive office space rent-free and maintenance-free over the lifetime of the facility. Based on a life cycle analysis, the Forest Service has concluded that this degree of cost sharing is fully justified and is in fact extremely favorable to the Forest Service.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including a provision in this bill that releases \$300,000 in previously appropriated funds for the design and construction of this facility. Construction of the facility is planned to begin during fiscal year 2002 and the Forest Service share of that fiscal year's funding needs is estimated at \$2 million.

Mr. BURNS. I understand the need for the project, and I appreciate the Senator's leadership and strong desire to bring this into fruition.

Mr. BYRD. Senator BURNS and I will work with the Senator from Indiana to see if we can find sufficient resources through the conference process to support the Forest Service's share of this worthy effort.

## CANE RIVER NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I express my sincere appreciation to the distinguished floor manager and chairman of the Appropriations Committee for support of my request to provide funds for the Cane River Creole National Historical Park and Heritage Area. This park, one of America's most unique historical parks, is in Natchitoches Parish, LA, the seat of Louisiana's oldest settlement and home to one of the most interesting and unique cultures in the United States. It is my understanding that the committee report recommends \$650,000 for the Cane River National Heritage Area.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. We were pleased to be able to recommend funding for this high priority of the Senator.

Ms. LANDRIEU. With the Senator's forbearance, I want to clarify the purposes for which these funds are allocated. My request to the committee, and I assume the committee's recommendation, will continue funding for the Cane River Heritage Area at last year's rate of \$400,000 for salaries, expenses and grants and will make available to the Creole Center at Northwestern State University \$250,000 to support important research and documentation of Creole culture in Louisiana. Is this the committee's intent?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. In developing this recommendation the committee assumed funding for both these activities in the amounts the Senator described.

#### MINNESOTA FOREST FUNDING

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask consent to engage in a colloquy with my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and of its Subcommittee on Interior. The purpose is to discuss two items in the bill which relate to the management and vitality of national forests in my state of Minnesota—specifically, the Superior and Chippewa National Forests. The chairman and the subcommittee have done a very commendable job in the bill of providing needed funding for the continued multiple uses of our national forests. I would like to draw his attention to two provisions important to Minnesota.

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

The "blowdown" of trees created extreme risk of catastrophic fire due to the amount of downed and dead timber. Yet while the storm has changed affected portions of the forests for years to come and has created new risks and experiences for visitors and residents, officials from 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. Key to that recovery is help provided last year in this bill. The Senate last year provided \$14 million for efforts that continue today. I was pleased to work with the chairman, and I still appreciate his support at that time.

At the same time, there remains a dangerous fire threat in Superior and Chippewa, and the Forest Service plans to continue their recovery work there through fuel reduction, reforestation and general rehabilitation. The bill before us contains increased general funding for such management, recovery and rehabilitation, and I would seek

my colleague's assurance that it is his understanding that an adequate portion of that funding will allow the Superior and Chippewa National Forests to continue their crucial efforts.

Mr. BYRD. I am aware of the devastating storm that affected my colleague's state in 1999, and I was pleased to assist the Senator from Minnesota at that time. The recovery efforts begun with that funding should certainly continued as needed, and I believe the subcommittee intends that this bill will provide adequate resources to complete scheduled work in the Superior and Chippewa National Forests.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague. The second item I would like to mention is that both the Superior and Chippewa National Forests are currently working to complete their forest management plans. The existing plans for these two forests, last revised in 1986, guide the forests' multiple use missions and lay out goals for habitat protection, resource production, soil protection and other aims. The National Forest Management Act requires an update of forest plans every 10-15 years. The Chippewa and Superior National Forests are now jointly revising their plans. This process allows efficient public participation rather than two parallel processes. It also provides greater consistency in resource management between the forests. Substantial public involvement has already helped develop the purpose and need for revising the plans, defining the issues and building a preliminary set of alternatives. The forests have ongoing consultation with four Minnesota Bands of Ojibwe, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, seven adjacent counties, as well as various interested stakeholders. The current forest planning work includes incorporating a required species viability evaluation initiated during 2000. While the 1986 forest plans continue to provide direction during the revision process, with ongoing public involvement, a final environmental impact statement and revised forest plans are expected in next year.

Again, I am seeking my colleague's reassurances that sufficient land management planning funds in this bill should be available to the Superior and Chippewa National Forests to allow for full revision of their forest plans?

Mr. BYRD. I appreciate the Senator's attention to this issue. He is correct to point out the commendable work underway in the Minnesota forests. The Senator is aware that the President requested \$70,358,000 for land management planning in fiscal year 2002, while this Appropriations Committee has provided \$70,718,000, an increase of \$360,000. For that reason, I agree, and I believe the subcommittee would agree, that this legislation should provide adequate resources to the Superior and Chippewa National Forests to complete their forest management plans.

#### "CRITICAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS"

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senators BINGAMAN, BOXER, and DORGAN, to state our strong support for critical energy efficiency programs within the Department of Energy. My colleagues and I have been working with the chairman and ranking member over the last few days to restore and fully fund these important programs. We believe that the proven efficacy of these programs merit allocation of additional funds.

The Federal Energy Management Program, or FEMP, uses alternative financing vehicles, technical assistance, and outreach campaigns to make our federal agencies more energy efficient. Although this program uses only a small amount of federal funding, its energy reduction strategies save the U.S. government, and thus American taxpayers, hundreds of millions of dollars a year. This program has proven to be a great investment. The Federal government is the largest user of energy in the United States and FEMP has helped reduce energy use per square foot of floor area in federal buildings by 19 percent since 1985, resulting in cumulative savings of \$6 billion since 1985. FEMP has also trained over 13,000 federal energy managers, assisted with the design of over 200 energy saving projects, and helped federal agencies make use of market-based energy saving performance contracts.

These are the type of programs we must support, programs that provide a great return for our Federal dollars and keep returning those benefits year after year. These programs also lessen the environmental impact of the federal government, reduce our government's dependence on foreign oil, and leverage private sector resources.

I also suggest expanding several successful, community-based building technology assistance programs. These programs provide technical assistance, demonstrations, training, and education to communities to accelerate the use of innovative and cost-effective energy technologies, strategies, and methods. One particularly successful example is the Energy Smart Schools campaign that provides a comprehensive portfolio of energy efficiency technologies, and works directly with national, state, and local organizations that influence school construction and modernization.

Let me share with you how Seattle Public Schools used this program to reap the extensive rewards of energy-saving retrofits. Through a collaborative effort involving Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Puget Sound Energy, and the Bonneville Power Administration, dozens of Seattle public schools received lighting retrofits, water conservation measures, upgraded energy management systems, and education on how to use energy more efficiently. Combined, these efforts reduced the school system's annual energy bills by a third, saving 15.5

million kilowatts of energy. I urge the Department to commit these additional funds in the Western states that have been severely impacted by the electricity crisis.

Because the budget allocation in the Senate is significantly less than the House, the Weatherization Program also has received less funding in the Senate than in the House bill. It is an effective program—for every one dollar spent, three are saved.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I appreciate the budgetary constraints that we must operate within for the Interior and related agency appropriations bill. We appreciate the chairman's assistance in increasing funding levels for these programs.

Could the chairman of the Appropriations Committee inform me as to his intention with regard to increasing the funding levels of these key energy conservation programs?

Mr. BYRD. I agree that these energy conservation programs are very important. If additional funds are available during conference, I would consider increases in these programs.

Ms. CANTWELL. Thank you for your support.

RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE  
ARLINGTON HOUSE

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with Chairman BYRD and Ranking Member BURNS concerning the renovation and restoration needs of the National Park Service property, the Arlington House, across the Potomac River in Arlington National Cemetery.

Arlington House is uniquely associated with the historic Virginia families of Washington, Custis and Lee. It was built by George Washington Park Custis and was the home of Robert E. Lee until the Civil War. Over the years, Arlington House has become an integral part of the core monument area here in the Nation's Capital. Not only is it located at the center of the Arlington National Cemetery, but it is emblematic of the post-Civil War bond between North and South. Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee are symbolically united by the Memorial Bridge which connects the Lincoln Memorial to Arlington House.

In recent years, the National Park Service has been unable to properly maintain the physical structure of Arlington House to safeguard its artifacts and collections, thereby causing many of the rooms in this historic house to be closed to the public.

The National Park Service has identified the total funding requirements to restore Arlington House. It is my understanding that a minimum of \$2.5 million is needed in fiscal 2002 to preserve this facility.

I am aware that the chairman and ranking member were faced with many significant funding demands in this bill. They have done an admirable job to provide the maximum amount of funding available to preserve our nation's historic resources. I bring to

their attention the significant needs of Arlington House and respectfully request that in conference with the House that this matter be given their attention.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, for his interest in the historic Arlington House. I am aware that funding for the restoration needs for the Arlington House was requested in the President's budget and I can assure the Senator from Virginia that the committee will carefully consider this important project as we continue to assess the maintenance and restoration needs of National Park Service properties.

Mr. BURNS. I concur with Chairman BYRD and can assure the Senator from Virginia that the restoration of the Arlington House will receive our attention during the conference with the House of Representatives. We will make every effort to address the needs of this historic home.

THE FOREST SERVICE AND WILD FIRES

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President there is a serious crisis in my home State of Alaska on the Kenai Peninsula, where literally millions of trees have been killed due to insect infestation. This is causing a major fire danger situation. Many homes and communities are at risk. I was very disturbed to learn recently that the Forest Service had initiated a prescribed burn near Seward that got away from them when the wind shifted. While fortunately the fire was contained before it damaged private property, this incident causes me to be concerned about the level of oversight the agency uses when burning in these very high risk areas.

Mr. BYRD. I recall that my friend from Alaska mentioning this during the committee markup of this bill. I assure you now, as I did then, that I am ready to help in any way possible to be sure the Forest Service applies adequate oversight to its hazard reduction activities.

Mr. STEVENS. I appreciate the chairman's remarks. I just recently met with Chief Dale Bosworth of the Forest Service and expressed my concern. I asked the chief to promptly provide me with a report that addresses how communities that are at risk can be assured when the agency plans a prescribed burn, that all potential factors are taken into account, and the decision to initiate a prescribed burn has been adequately reviewed. I also asked the chief to insure that local elected officials concerns are accounted for before a burn is ignited and to look at naming a Forest Service official in each region who would be in charge of approving any burn plans. I have also provided an amendment that I understand is in the managers package that addresses the specific situation with the prescribed burn I just noted on the Kenai and other areas of high fire risk across the country. This amendment provides the Forest Service with the authority to use \$15,000,000 of Wildland Fire Management funds on

adjacent non-federal lands, using all authorities available to the agency under its State and Private Forestry Appropriation. These funds will be available for reducing fire hazard on adjacent non-federal lands and protecting communities when hazard reduction activities planned on adjacent national forest lands. The Forest Service assures me that portions of these funds will be used to protect communities on the Kenai Peninsula. I expect the Forest Service to strongly consider areas of the Kenai as candidates for the stewardship end results contracting, as specified in Section 347 of public law 105-277, and which the committee has amended to provide for up to 28 additional contracts.

Mr. BYRD. I am pleased to include this amendment in the managers package and feel it will be extremely helpful in protecting communities from the threat of wild fire.

SMITHSONIAN CENTER FOR MATERIALS  
RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Mr. SARBANES. Would the distinguished chairman yield for the purpose of a colloquy regarding language contained in the bill concerning the Smithsonian Center for Materials Research and Education.

Mr. BYRD. I would be happy to yield to my friend, the senior Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I remain deeply concerned with the Secretary of the Smithsonian's decision to close a number of the Institution's scientific and research facilities, including the Smithsonian Center for Materials Research and Education (SCMRE) located in Prince George's County, MD. It is my understanding that language contained in the bill would preclude any funds to be utilized for the purpose of closing SCMRE and the other relevant facilities without the approval by the Board of Regents of recommendations made in this regard by the Secretary's proposed Science Commission.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. It is also my understanding that the bill provides sufficient funding to ensure that SCMRE's programs can continue at last year's level.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is again correct.

Mr. SARBANES. For nearly 40 years, researchers and scientists at SCMRE have been leaders in the field of preservation research and analysis. They have contributed greatly to the conservation efforts of museums and institutions throughout the nation and around the world by offering training programs and technical assistance. I would like to quote from an editorial that appeared on May 8 in the New York Times that captures the importance of preserving this facility:

... [Claring for artworks, which can often be done in museum labs, is far different from scientifically studying how to care for them. Over the years, the Materials Research Center has created an extensive store of archaeological data based on its work on collections from around the world. It makes no

sense for the Smithsonian—the most remarkable accumulation of objects on earth—to close a national laboratory whose very purpose is to analyze the material basis of its collections.

I thank the chairman for his time and commend him for his leadership and assistance in this matter.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise to thank the managers of the fiscal year 2002 Interior appropriations bill for working with me to provide Forest Legacy funding for an important conservation project in the western mountain region of Maine.

In drafting the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002, the managers have demonstrated, once again, their commitment to promoting conservation. I am particularly pleased that the bill funds Forest Legacy at \$65 million—the most that has ever been allocated for this important and growing program—and I am grateful for the support Chairman BYRD and Senator BURNS have given to projects in my State this year and in years past.

Neither the Interior appropriations bill that passed in the house nor the Senate bill voted out of committee included funding for the Tumbledown/Mt. Blue conservation project in the western mountain region of Maine. Because of the importance of this project to my State, I proposed an amendment to the bill to dedicate Forest Legacy fund to the Tumbledown/Mt. Blue initiative. Chairman BYRD and Ranking Member BURNS have graciously agreed to accept a modified version of my amendment, which will earmark \$1 million for the project.

The western mountain region of my State is a beautiful area that has long been valued for recreation, natural resources, scenic values and productive forest lands that fuel Maine's forest product industries. These traditional uses, which would be protected in perpetuity by this conservation project, are of tremendous value to the local communities and the region's economy.

Recent changes in land ownership and land use has led to local concern that the character of the Tumbledown/Mt. Blue area will be permanently altered. This has prompted the State, local businesses, and conservation groups to promote a long-term conservation vision for the region that will prevent this forested landscape from being converted as a result of development pressures. Making this conservation vision a reality entails the acquisition of 31,240 acres around Mt. Blue State Park and along Tumbledown Mountain through fee and easement purchases.

Funding the Tumbledown/Mt. Blue Conservation project will enable the State to protect critical properties adjacent to the park and some of Maine's most scenic areas—including Tumbledown Mountain, Jackson Mountain, Blueberry Mountain, and trailheads leading to these peaks. I would also proudly point out to my colleagues

that Mt. Blue State Park is one of Maine's most popular recreation spots and was recently voted by Outdoor magazine as one of the ten best family vacation areas in the country. The area contains rugged summits, alpine ridges, and wetlands, as well as habitat for the federally listed bald eagle and one of Maine's only successful peregrine falcon nesting territories.

I am pleased to say that several landowners within the project area are ready now to put their resource lands into a conservation plan that will permanently protect and allow public access to recreation lands, scenic areas, and trailheads leading up Tumbledown, while providing for sustainable harvesting on the more productive and less environmentally sensitive forested areas. This is a locally driven win-win approach to resolving the various concerns that arise out of changes in the region. I applaud the many individuals and groups that have invested time in bringing this project about. It is heartening to know how deeply they care about their community, and I appreciate having this opportunity to determine my support for their efforts.

Last year, because of the generous funding level the Interior Subcommittee was able to provide the Forest Legacy Program, \$1.17 million was allocated to the Mt. Blue/Tumbledown Mountain project for the first phase of acquisition. This year, to complete the project another \$4 million is needed. I am concerned that unless we make funding progress in fiscal year 2002 with the willing sellers now in place, Maine will lose a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to protect a truly wonderful resource.

I want to thank very much the Senators from West Virginia and Montana for their willingness to work with me and Senator SNOWE on this critical important project.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend an agreement that was reached with regards to the Landrieu-Smith amendment to the Interior appropriations bill. Simply put, the purpose of the amendment was to fix what is essentially a technical concern with the bill and improve the way that States received their portions of the \$100 million. This would be done by utilizing an already established wildlife conservation fund and its formula parameters instead of creating a new program with a new formula.

I do want to make it clear that I am extremely supportive of the funding that is provided in this Interior appropriations bill for the State Wildlife Grant Fund. I believe that these dollars will be of great benefit to State efforts to protect wildlife populations. I am especially pleased that the bill allows the States to determine the manner in which to utilize these resources.

The Landrieu-Smith amendment would seek to use the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program, under the popular and successful Pitt-

man-Robertson Program, that was established in the fiscal year 2001 Commerce-Justice-State appropriation law. The law also provided \$50 million under formula apportionment to the States for high priority wildlife conservation, education and recreation projects. That language was included at my request because of my concern for equitable distribution of valuable conservation funds. In fact, I have recently introduced a bill—the American Wildlife Enhancement Act of 2001, S.990—that would extend the authorization of that program through 2006. The Landrieu-Smith amendment would allocate the \$100 million set-aside for the State Wildlife Grants Fund to the already established Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program.

Adoption of our amendment would improve, and make more equitable, the way that these dollars are allocated to the States. Our amendment would allow for the allocation of funds under the formula established last year in the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program. Funding in that program is based two-thirds on the population of the State and one-third on the land area. It also guarantees that a single State would receive no less than one percent and no more than five percent of the available funds. This formula was supported by all 50 State fish and wildlife agencies as being the most equitable distribution to address conservation needs throughout the country.

The Interior appropriations bill that was reported by the Appropriations Committee would have changed that formula. This would result in a considerable gain of funds for only 2 States, but a loss for 37 other States. To change the already established formula would compromise the ability of the majority of our states to effectively address their wildlife conservation needs.

I am seeking to change back to what was established last year because I believe that is what is most fair to all States and already has their strong support. Regardless of whether or not our amendment was agreed to, New Hampshire's funding will not be impacted—to me it is an issue of fairness.

It also makes much more sense to appropriate the \$100 million to an already existing account with set allocation parameters that has demonstrated success than to create a new bureaucratic process. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and State fish and wildlife are agencies already familiar with the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program and could administer the program efficiently. Why impose a new set of criteria for allocation of the fiscal year 02 funds when the previously established criteria works so well?

Through excellent cooperation between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the State fish and wildlife agencies, all 50 States have already qualified to receive their apportionment of the \$50 million made available by last

year's Commerce-Justice-State appropriations law and are in the process of submitting their project agreements. Adopting this amendment would have allowed this process to continue smoothly into the next fiscal year.

I am pleased to support what I believe is a fair compromise to this amendment. The Interior appropriations bill that passed the Senate this evening reflects the changes in the formula that our amendment intended to make, without sending the funds through the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program. Even though the previously established account is not being used to distribute the funds, I am pleased that the funds will be allocated using a formula that all 50 State fish and wildlife agencies have agreed to as fair and equitable.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, I rise in favor of the Landrieu amendment to the Interior appropriations bill regarding the distribution of \$100 million in state wildlife grants for priority wildlife conservation, education, and restoration projects. As currently written, the Interior appropriations bill changes the way these grants are allocated to the States. The change would negatively affect the amount of grant money most states would receive.

Last year, Congress established the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account as part of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Fund. It was Congress' intent that funds from the account be distributed to the states through a formula based on one-third of the land area of a state and two-thirds population. Congress also said that no state will receive less than one percent or more than five percent of the total funding.

The Landrieu amendment would distribute the funds under the same formula allocation that was enacted last year by directing them through the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account.

All 50 State fish and wildlife agencies agree that the formula Congress enacted last year is the most equitable distribution of these funds. If we agree to the formula proposed in the Interior appropriations bill, 37 States will receive less money. Ohio would receive over \$100,000 less than under the already established formula. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources supports the Landrieu amendment.

With so many States facing such large reductions in the amount of grant money they would receive, it makes sense to distribute these funds based on the equitable formula that Congress agreed to last year. Support of the Landrieu amendment will ensure that the \$100 million appropriated for State wildlife grants is distributed fairly and provides all states with the funds they need for their most critical wildlife and conservation projects.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, in the managers' package is contained an amendment which provides for the repeal of section 819 of the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act.

In my view, this is a matter that is more appropriately addressed in the authorizing committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Accordingly, I intend to work with my colleagues to see that this proposed repeal of a section of authorizing legislation is removed from the Interior appropriations bill and addressed in the appropriate forum.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, this bill is the first appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 the Senate is considering. I am pleased to be a member of the subcommittee that has the responsibility for writing this bill each year.

I have enjoyed working on the issues and programs that must be addressed each year during our hearings and the development of this legislation.

The Department of the Interior and the U.S. Forest Service have a major presence in my state. The levels of funding for their activities and responsibilities in Mississippi have a significant impact on our interest in protecting our natural resources and historic attractions.

I'm glad the Committee's bill provides an increase in the funding for operation and maintenance of the Natchez Trace Parkway. The beauty and living history facilities of this parkway attract tourists and local visitors alike, and its completion has been one of my highest personal priorities.

The Vicksburg National Military Park will be enhanced by the acquisition of the house used by General Pemberton as his headquarters during the siege of Vicksburg. Along with funding for a needed stabilization project, this commitment will enable the Park to continue to attract more than one million visitors each year.

There are also funds in this bill to help pay the cost of acquisition, as part of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, of Cat Island, which is located in the Gulf of Mexico off the Coast of Mississippi.

Other provisions of this bill allow the continued construction of the Franklin County Lake in the Homochitto National Forest which will be a very important recreational resource for the people of southwest Mississippi.

An increase in funding is also provided in the bill as payments in lieu of taxes to counties that contain federal lands. This will help offset the losses that have occurred in many of these counties by changes in forest management policies of the U.S. Forest Service.

The bill also includes \$6.3 million for research programs that will be performed by the University of Mississippi and Mississippi State University.

The National Park Service is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Natchez National Historical Park which contains some of the most interesting properties that reflect the lifestyles and cultural diversity of the early settlers in the oldest continuously inhabited town on the Mississippi

River. The City of Natchez is also the southern terminus of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

This bill contains funds for continued enhancement of the historical park which will enrich the experience of visitors to this unique educational resource in my state.

Another interesting destination for visitors is the Corinth Battlefield in northeast Mississippi which was included in a list of the top ten most important Civil War battlefields by former Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan. It is located near the Shiloh National Military Park and will be the site of a new Civil War Interpretive Center. This building will be constructed with funds that are included in this bill at the request of our state's delegation in Congress.

My colleague, TRENT LOTT, has taken the lead in making this new addition to our state's list of federally supported projects a reality. Congressman ROGER WICKER has also been a key influence in the appropriations process on this project as well as the Brice's Crossroads site.

Taken as a whole, the provisions of this Interior Appropriations bill will contribute to the economy of our state and at the same time help protect valuable natural resources, historic attractions and our environment.

I appreciate the cooperation and assistance of the managers of the bill and my staff member, Ginger Wallace, who worked hard to help develop the provisions of the bill that were of specific interest in our State of Mississippi.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I rise to support the Education and Training Center for the Power Generation Industry at Bismarck State College. Although funding for this program is not explicitly mentioned in the Interior Appropriations bill, I would like to see the relationship between Bismarck State College (BSC) and the Department of Energy grow during the next fiscal year as BSC builds on its Partnership to Improve Energy Technology Training and Education. Last year, BSC's Energy Technology Program received \$50,000 in competitive Federal funding to develop a new curriculum based on conventional and advanced power technologies. Given that the Chairman has been kind enough to increase the budget request for fossil fuel research and development, I would hope that the DoE will provide the funds to expand this program next year, especially given the challenges that the power industry will face in the coming years.

I applaud those at Bismarck State College who have been working on this project, and it is my hope that the Committee could provide some funding for this program as we move this bill to conference so that the College could further develop the curriculum plan and provide nationwide online courses in power generation management.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I rise today to discuss an amendment I have

offered to section 107 of the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. The amendment is intended to clarify that under that section preleasing activities are prohibited, just as they are in other sections of the bill that restrict oil and gas development in other waters.

Section 107 now reads as follows: “no funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the President’s moratorium statement of June 12, 1998.” This includes the areas of northern, central, and southern California, the North Atlantic, Washington, Oregon, and the eastern Gulf of Mexico south of 26 degrees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude.

I want to stress that it is my belief that section 107 prohibits preleasing activities because preleasing activities are, by their very nature, related activities. However, sections 108, 109 and 110 create moratoria on offshore leasing for the Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, North Aleutian Basin and portions of the Gulf of Mexico, and these sections restrict preleasing, leasing, and related activities. I am concerned that the discrepancy between Section 107 and these other sections creates the potential for legal ambiguity that may put the areas listed in Section 107 at risk. Specifically, it may be argued that a set of activities exists preleasing activities that are prohibited under Sections 108, 109 and 110 but not prohibited under Section 107.

The simple, straightforward amendment I have proposed adds preleasing to the list of prohibited activities in Section 107. It would clarify Congressional intent and serve as a preventative step against any challenge to the meaning of the prohibition. It would do no more than clarify that California, the North Atlantic, Washington, Oregon and portions of the eastern Gulf of Mexico have the same protections now provided to the Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic and other areas in Sections 108, 109 and 110.

In closing I want to briefly discuss one reason why this amendment and the clarification it would provide is important to Massachusetts and New England. That reason is Georges Bank a natural wonder critically important to our state’s economy and environment. Georges Bank supports Atlantic cod, scallops, haddock, yellowtail flounder and other valuable commercial species. Endangered species including the right whale, humpback whale and sei whale rely on Georges Bank and the surrounding area for feeding and as a migratory pathway. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the federal agency charged with protecting marine resources, has warned that oil and gas exploration in Georges Bank threatens these commercial and endangered species. NOAA and others have pointed out that despite advances in drilling

technology, exploration carries inherent risks from spills, other accidental releases, drilling muds, seepage and other sources. I strongly believe petroleum exploration in the unique and extremely valuable habitat of Georges Bank poses unnecessary economic and environmental risk.

I want to thank Chairman BYRD and Ranking Member BURNS for working with me to secure the passage of this important amendment.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, Senator KERRY of Massachusetts and I have introduced the Kerry-Snowe Georges Bank amendment to the fiscal year 2002 Interior Appropriations bill today to make absolutely certain that language in the fiscal year 2002 Interior Appropriations bill before us is modified to ensure that there will be no preleasing activities on Georges Bank. Language in the bill does prohibit the expenditure of funds by the Department of Interior for activities related to offshore leasing in the North Atlantic area, but I wanted the guarantee that pre-leasing activities would be out of bounds as well.

Currently, both the United States and Canada have moratoria on oil and gas exploration until 2012 for the ecologically sensitive Georges Bank. What the Kerry-Snowe amendment does is include language in the Senate bill to prohibit any pre-leasing activities for the Georges Bank area, such as is included for the Mid- and South Atlantic. We are adding this language for the North Atlantic as well because of indications over the past few months that the administration could be considering legal and administrative groundwork for accessing Georges Bank.

Report recommendations to the Secretary of Interior by the Subcommittee on Natural Gas on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf included a recommendation that the Mineral Management Service, in consultation with industry and affected States, identify the five top geologic places for natural gas reserves in the moratoria areas, where industry would most likely explore, and where seismic data could be collected. Georges Bank is reported to be one of these prospects.

Our added pre-leasing language for the North Atlantic area makes Section 107 of the bill consistent with Section 110 of the bill that does not allow Interior Department funding to conduct oil and natural gas pre-leasing, leasing and related activities in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.

As I recently wrote the President, I strongly believe that the moratoria should not be lifted on this 185-mile-long bank that stretches from Nova Scotia to Cape Cod—five-sixths of which is owned by the U.S. This broad, shallow fishing ground is one of the world’s most productive, and current available natural gas reserves in the U.S. dwarf those which are projected to be available on the Georges Bank.

I want to sincerely thank the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee

Chairs BYRD and BURNS for accepting the Kerry-Snowe amendment as part of the Managers amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I rise to support the Trails and Rails Program, a national partnership between Amtrak and the National Park Service. This program provides onboard educational programs to rail travelers. It has played a valuable role in educating Americans about the historic landmark sites in this country. This is an excellent outreach program that allows the National Park Service to reach non-traditional visitors and introduce them to our national parks, trails and historic sites.

I am particularly excited about this program as we begin to celebrate the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Last May, the famous footsteps of the Lewis and Clark along the trail in North Dakota and Montana came alive as their historic journey was retraced by guests aboard Amtrak’s Empire Builder train. This program has been laying the foundation for the National Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration, which will officially begin in 2003. Train passengers have already been able to explore historic areas along the Lewis and Clark trail such as the Union Trading Post National Historic Site in Williston, ND. It is my hope that the National Park Service could continue its partnership so that Amtrak passengers can explore other historic sites in the Lewis and Clark expedition.

Although fiscal year 2002 funding has not yet been identified for this program, I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting this important National Park Service partnership. I trust that some funding will be included for this partnership in the final version of the Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the provisions in this bill that enhance the Steel Loan Guarantee program. The changes adopted today will provide invaluable assistance to our nation’s steel companies as they strive to stay afloat in the face of overwhelming surges of finished and semi-finished steel imports.

As you know, our domestic steel industry finds itself reeling from record import surges. Numerous companies are either in bankruptcy, have filed for bankruptcy, or are on the verge of doing so. On the Iron Range in my home state of Minnesota, for example, citing poor economic conditions, LTV Steel Mining Company halted production at the Hoyt Lakes mine, leaving 1400 workers out of work and affecting another 5000 additional workers as well. These are hard working people who want desperately to work the trades they were trained for and have been doing for generation upon generation.

The changes we are making today in the Steel Loan Guarantee program will make it easier for companies to access much needed capital. In particular, we are increasing the loan coverage for a

portion of the loans under this program from 85 percent to 95 percent and extending the duration of financing from 5 to 15 years. These changes represent one component of S. 957, the comprehensive Steel Revitalization Act of 2001 that I, along with Senator Byrd, Senator Dayton and others introduced earlier this year.

I am pleased that we are taking the opportunity today to move a portion of this comprehensive measure. And I will continue to press this passage of the remaining elements of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I wish to comment on the Interior appropriations bill which the Senate has passed by voice vote. I am satisfied, that unlike in years past, this bill is relatively free from anti-environmental riders. I commend the chairman (Mr. BYRD) and the ranking member (Mr. STEVENS) for producing a bill that is largely free from riders which many of my constituents view as an undemocratic way to address environmental issues. I have been pleased by the progress on this bill, and by the manager's efforts to allow important environmental issues the benefit of an up or down vote on the floor.

Though the bill this year has been considered by the Senate with an improved process, I do have some concerns about a few of the bill's provisions. First, I understand that the Senate fiscal year 2002 Interior bill includes \$65 million for the Forest Legacy Program of the U.S. Forest Service, a program I strongly support. I further understand that, of the \$65 million provided for the Forest Legacy program, \$35.26 million has been allocated by the Senate Interior appropriations Subcommittee in the committee report to fund specific projects. I hope that this allocation leaves approximately \$29.8 million available to be distributed by the Forest Service to other priority projects, such as the Tomahawk Northwoods project in Northern Wisconsin. The Tomahawk project was specifically enumerated to receive funds by in the House report on the 2002 Interior appropriations bill, and it is my hope that the Senate's bill leaves flexibility so that this project can indeed be funded by the Forest Service.

I also want to share my concern regarding section 330 of the fiscal year 2002 Interior appropriations bill. Section 330 extends for 50 years a special use permit for a cabin located in the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness Area in Montana. I hope that the conferees on this legislation will give serious consideration to removing this provision and referring the matters to the Senate Energy Committee for their review. My concern, as a Senator who is concerned about federal wilderness management, is that allowing the cabin to remain, without the benefit of review by the appropriate authorizing committee, could set a precedent that is contrary to the Wilderness Act, Forest Service policy and the Custer Na-

tional Forest Management plan. It would be my hope that review by the Energy Committee would clarify whether the Montana State University-Billings indeed has the ability to apply for an extension of the special use permit that had been held by the cabin's previous owner.

Finally, I understand that the managers' amendment contains language concerning the management of cruise ships in Glacier Bay National Park. Though I understand that this language represents a compromise worked out over the last few hours, I feel that an important policy matter such as this one would be better left to the authorizing committee. I believe legislative language which seeks to addresses serious legal issues over the reduction of cruise ship traffic required by Federal courts deserves full and fair consideration through proper hearings and review. I hope that the conference committee will give serious consideration to removing this provision.

I am pleased to support this year's bill, and I hope so see a bill free from environmental riders emerge from conference.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have been fortunate to be in this Chamber during the entire time the Interior bill has been debated. I would like to take a few minutes to commend the President pro tempore of the Senate, who is also the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, for the tremendous leadership he has shown not only on the Interior bill but on the supplemental appropriations bill we passed. It shows his experience and his dedication to the Senate. He has taken the helm of the Appropriations Committee firmly and has confidently steered this bill in the right direction. There have been very difficult decisions to make in crafting this bill.

I also want to take a minute to express my public appreciation to Ranking Member Burns for the work they have done. If there were ever a bipartisan bill—and I hope it remains that way in the remaining hours of this bill, and I am confident it will—this is it.

These two legislators have worked to come up with an appropriate package that has the best they could do with the tools they had, the limited amount of money they had, to satisfy hundreds and hundreds of requests from Members and from different entities making up our Federal Government. It has been a very difficult time. From a personal perspective, I think they have done exemplary work.

About 4 years ago I asked President Clinton to convene a summit in Lake Tahoe. I did that out of desperation. I was at the lake and had, for 15 years, worked to try to do something to improve the quality of a place that has been called by Mark Twain the fairest place in all the Earth. It is a beautiful lake. It is a part of nature that you can only appreciate by being there; it is so absolutely fantastic.

We had a show over here, and there is a display now in the rotunda of the

Russell Building that has great photographs of Lake Tahoe. I spoke briefly there last night. A man by the name of Dr. Goldman, who is the leading expert on the ecology of that lake, spoke. He said he has been all over the world. He has been to Lake Baikal in Siberia in the Soviet Union. Lake Baikal has 20 percent of all the fresh water in the world, in one lake. It is well over a mile deep. It is a beautiful lake. I am fortunate; I have been there. But Dr. Goldman said he has been to most all the major lakes in the world, and, by far, Lake Tahoe is the most beautiful.

So I asked the President to convene a summit because I had not been able to accomplish what I needed. Out of desperation, I said to the press that I thought the only thing that would work is to convene a summit and have the world understand what a calamity is about to occur.

I confided in the President that I had done this and asked if he would support me in this effort. He said: Yes, I will come to Lake Tahoe. And he did. It was not a photo opportunity. And that would have been more than I could ask, if the President of the United States would come to Lake Tahoe for a photo opportunity, but he did more than that. We had six Cabinet officers who held townhall meetings in the months prior to the President coming. Over 1,000 people participated in those townhall meetings when the summit was convened, with the President and Vice President there at Lake Tahoe, and the groups concerned about the lake—the environmentalists, the people who had wanted to build homes there, contractors, small businessmen, big businessmen, people who were against gambling, people who were for gambling. They were all there speaking from the same page.

They agreed that something had to be done. So the summit—rather than being a boisterous affair where people were pointing fingers at each other—was a lovefest. As a result of that, we have been able to get a lot of help for Lake Tahoe. Part of that help is in this bill.

This bill increased, by over 100 percent, the amount of money going to Lake Tahoe. Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER—and now Senator ENSIGN—we have worked together. We have made progress. But it all started as a result of that summit.

I appreciate very much the attention of Senators BURNS and BYRD, recognizing that Lake Tahoe really may be the fairest place in all the Earth.

They have increased funding this year by over 100 percent. This commitment will help make the Federal Government a full partner in the ongoing effort to conserve this exquisite jewel of the American environment. California has done its share. Nevada has done its share by floating bond issues. Now the Federal Government is coming through.

Chairman BYRD and ranking member BURNS also helped improve the prospects for county governments throughout the entire West by allocating \$220 million for PILT—Payment in Lieu of Taxes—Programs.

I thank Senators BYRD and BURNS for making an effort to breathe life back into the budget of the United States Geological Survey, which was treated very badly by this administration. The Bush administration did everything it could to kill the Geological Survey, this great institution of government. John Wesley Powell was the first leader of the U.S. Geological Survey, a man whose arm was cut off. The nerves were exposed and whenever he would bump it, it would hurt more than a person can imagine. With that bad arm, he led the first group to float the mighty Colorado. He was the father of the Geological Survey. Senators BYRD and BURNS have breathed life back into this wonderful institution that is so important to our country.

This agency has had a tremendously positive impact all over the United States. For example, the Presiding Officer traveled with me to Fallon, NV, to find out why we have children dying. Since we were there, one child has died. They have discovered two or three other cases of childhood leukemia. We went there seeking evidence as to why these children are sick and dying.

One of the things being done about this is being done by the U.S. Geological Survey. They are testing water wells in Fallon as I speak so people in Nevada know whether the water they are drinking is safe. The U.S. Geological Survey is our preeminent scientific agency, some say the greatest scientific agency we have in Government. That is debatable, but they do great work.

I appreciate the leaders of the subcommittee who recognized this by restoring the budget. The public land agencies funded by the Interior appropriations bill are of great importance to the State of Nevada: the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation. They do tremendous things for our country. I am grateful that Chairman BYRD and ranking member BURNS have done their best to fund these agencies.

I am confident we can finish this bill today. I hope we can. The managers have worked during the night, and staff members are still working to come up with a proposal to end this legislation quickly. There may be a few disputed matters to be resolved this afternoon. I wanted to spend a minute recognizing the great work done by the two managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 2217), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists

on its amendment and requests a conference with the House of Representatives and the Chair appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. REID, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. CAMPBELL, conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF J. STEVEN GRILES OF VIRGINIA TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of J. Steven Griles to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Steven Griles of Virginia to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise tonight to discuss my opposition to the nomination of J. Steven Griles as Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior. In my view, Mr. Griles' past record and recent statements, both public and private, indicate he is lacking the single most important quality needed for this key position; that is, the ability to bring people together despite very disparate and differing views on natural resources issues.

We have learned in the West—and I see my good friend Senator CRAIG from Idaho. He and I, again and again, sat in hearings in the forestry subcommittee, and we have seen how difficult these natural resources issues are. I am proud we have come together on issues such as the county payments bill which the Forest Service said was the most important law in the last 30 years, and Senator CRAIG and I teamed up to get that law passed because we recognized how important it was to bring people together.

What has troubled me about Mr. Griles' past record—and I will discuss that—and his recent statements, both public and private, is that record indicates he really isn't much interested in the kind of work that Senator CRAIG and I have spent many years pursuing.

One of the things that struck me earlier this year was that Mr. Griles told the Washington Post, in effect, that he had changed. He said he had matured, he had learned from his past experience. When I read about these statements, I was very encouraged. I don't oppose people on philosophical grounds; I don't think that is right. I read these statements and I got the distinct impression that Mr. Griles was going to work to be more inclusive, collaborative, and more creative in looking at the difficult natural resources issues.

He said he was going to be a problem solver who would try to listen to all the parties involved and try to take a balanced approach to any and all issues.

Again, I was encouraged by these comments. Mr. Griles came to my office. I told him about my concerns about his past record, and given his statements I was hoping he had, in fact, changed, and if he would give me some examples. He really didn't have any that day. I said: I will ask you about this when you come for your confirmation hearing.

When he came for his confirmation hearing, he was not any more forthcoming. I said after the hearing my door would still be open to him and that I hoped he would give me some examples in areas such as the Endangered Species Act that require so much cooperation, that he would come forward with some specific ideas. He has not. He has not been willing on three separate occasions to show some evidence that he would take a more collaborative, inclusive approach, and that he would be more balanced in his approach to natural resources issues.

My concern is that as of now the record indicates the J. Steven Griles of the past is going to be back in action after the Senate confirms him.

I will talk for a few minutes about that Jay Steven Griles' track record over 20 years. Over 20 years, again and again, he has placed the interests of powerful special interests above the public. This includes the support for environmentally unsound drilling for oil off the coast of California and looking the other way when powerful corporations were fined for breaking the environmental laws.

It is one thing to try to figure out ways to ensure compliance with the environmental laws; however, it is another thing to not follow through when these powerful interests have actually been fined for violating the law.

I was troubled about those past positions. I told Mr. Griles about that. It is certainly his right to hold those views. I have not made it a habit of opposing candidates with whom I differ on substantive issues. Given those past positions, given his public statements and his private statements to me that, in fact, he was going to change, it is troubling we have not seen any evidence of it.

His record is important. I will give a few examples of that record.

During his service with the Reagan administration, Mr. Griles is reported to have single-mindedly pushed for an oil lease sale off the coast of California, despite objections from his own Fish and Wildlife Service biologists. In 1988, he wrote a memo to the Assistant Secretary advising him to change the tone and conclusions of a Fish and Wildlife Service report citing the specific environmental damage that could be caused by a proposed northern California offshore oil lease. Mr. Griles concluded that memo by stating: