

In the later stages of pregnancy, at the point the fetus becomes viable and is able to live independently from the mother, the state has a strong interest in protecting potential human life. States may, if they choose, regulate and even prohibit abortion except where necessary to preserve the life or health of the woman.

In 1992, in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, the Supreme Court specifically reaffirmed Roe's standard for evaluating restrictions on abortion after viability but eliminated Roe's trimester framework by explicitly extending the state's interest in protecting potential life and maternal health to apply throughout the pregnancy.

Thus, under *Casey*, regulations that affect a woman's abortion decision that further these state interests are valid unless they have the "purpose or effect" of "imposing a substantial obstacle" in the woman's path.

However, the bottom line is that in *Casey* the Court retained the "central holding" of *Roe v. Wade*. As a result, women in all 50 States still enjoy the constitutional right to choose.

The challenge for American men and women who support a pro-choice agenda will be to continue to make their voices heard in an environment that appears focused on nullifying all reproductive rights and trying to overturn *Roe* after 30 years.

*Roe v. Wade* secured an important constitutional right—a right I strongly support.

I am deeply concerned about passing a late-term birth abortion bill that doesn't include language recognizing the importance of *Roe*. That is why I believe that we should disagree with the House message accompanying S. 3.

I urge my colleagues to vote to support the language in the Senate-passed version of S. 3 regarding the importance of *Roe v. Wade*. We cannot—we must not—go back to a time without choice.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2754

AMENDMENT NO. 1723

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the passage of H.R. 2754, the energy and water appropriations bill, it be in order to consider and agree to the amendment that is at the desk. I have cleared this with the Republican manager of the bill, Senator DOMENICI.

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

The amendment (No. 1723) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 16, end of line 12, before the "." insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That \$65,000,000 is provided to be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to repair, restore, and clean up projects and facilities of the Corps of Engineers and dredge navigation channels, restore and clean out area streams, provide emergency stream bank protection, restore other crucial public infrastructure (including water and sewer facilities), document flood impacts, and undertake other flood recovery efforts considered necessary by the Chief of Engineers

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

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2691, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2691) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1724

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I call up a substitute amendment which is at the desk. This amendment is the text of S. 1391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] proposes an amendment numbered 1724.

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

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004. In dollar terms, this is a modest bill compared to many of the appropriations bills we tackle in this body. It totals about \$19.6 billion in discretionary budget authority. But in terms of its direct impact on the lives and livelihoods of the people and communities throughout this country, it is a critical bill, and it is of particular importance to the Western States, such as my State of Montana, where the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service either own or manage in trust vast acres of land.

These are lands where my constituents live. This is where they graze livestock, where they mine, where they hike, hunt, fish, and timber. What we do in this bill affects all of those activities.

It is not just a public lands bill. It is also a bill that provides education, health care, and other core services for the Native Americans of America.

It supports energy research and development that fosters economic growth, strengthens our national security posture, and improves the quality of our environment. And it supports the treasured cultural institutions, such as the Smithsonian and the National Endowment for the Humanities—institutions that help tell the story of America and that remind us who we are as a people.

As I suspect is the case with many of my colleagues who have chaired appropriations subcommittees, the more I learn about the agencies funded in this bill, the harder it gets to make tough choices that have to be made, particularly in the current fiscal climate.

The President's fiscal year 2004 budget request for the Interior bill was \$19.56 billion in discretionary budget authority, a modest increase over the comparable level for fiscal year 2003.

While the budget request included increases for several activities that have considerable merit, it also proposed severe reductions in a number of critical programs that have broad support within the Senate. With an allocation that is effectively the same as the President's request, we had to make some tough choices.

That said, with the help of Senator DORGAN, my good friend and neighbor from North Dakota, we have been able to fashion a responsible bill that does a number of very positive things.

The bill provides increases for the core operating programs of the land management agencies, including \$72 million for our National Park System and \$31 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service. The funds provided for the park system include \$20 million over the budget request to increase the base operating budgets of individual parks.

The bill also increases funding for Bureau of Land Management operations by \$27 million and adds \$34 million to the President's request for Forest Service activities.

From the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the bill appropriates \$511 million. This includes \$222 million for Federal land acquisition, an increase of \$35 million over the budget request and more than double the House total of \$100 million. As is always the case, there was great interest in increasing funding for the land, water, and conservation programs, but I think the amount provided is reasonable given the constraints of the subcommittee allocation and the many other demands on this bill.

The Interior bill also supports several grant programs. I won't go through all the numbers, but among

the highlights is a \$30 million increase over the budget request for payments in lieu of taxes; a \$15 million increase for State wildlife grants; and an increase of \$9 million for the Historic Preservation Fund. The bill also restores a proposed \$16 million cut in the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Fund.

Let me explain PILT, payment in lieu of taxes. This is the money that goes directly to the counties to support their activities where a large amount of Federal land is found—BLM land, anyway.

As I mentioned previously, the Interior bill is a vitally important bill for Native American communities. It increases funding for the Indian Health Service by \$88 million over the enacted level, for a total of \$2.9 billion.

It includes \$574 million for Indian education programs which fully funds the budget request for Indian school replacement. It also provides an increase of \$6 million for tribal community colleges. This is a subject that is of particular interest to both Senator DORGAN and me and one we may discuss further as we progress with this legislation.

The bill also provides \$243 million for the Office of Special Trustee to continue the administration efforts to improve the management of Indian trust assets. This is an increase of \$95 million over the enacted level.

While I strongly believe Congress must support trust reform, let there be no mistake that reform is coming at a very significant cost in terms of money, personnel, and management focus. Vital concerns in Indian country are being shortchanged because trust reform and related litigation are draining both funds and morale.

We would all like there to be a simple solution, but there just isn't one. Settling the case may ultimately be the answer, but at this stage, the plaintiffs and the administration do not appear ready to have productive negotiations. Even if we settle on any past damages, the question remains as to how we manage Indian trust assets in the future. This bill continues to support the Department's reform efforts to the greatest extent possible.

I will continue to work closely with the Department, with the authorizing committees, and with Indian country to advance the reform effort so we can get ourselves out from under this immense cloud.

The Interior bill also supports an important piece of our Nation's energy portfolio, including research on fossil energy and energy efficiency, the operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. This bill provides \$1.67 billion for Department of Energy programs, including \$862 million for energy conservation and \$594 million for fossil energy research and development.

Among the cultural programs supported by this bill, the Smithsonian will receive an additional \$10 million to prepare for the opening of two new mu-

seums, the Air and Space Museum extension near Dulles Airport, and the National Museum of the American Indian on The Mall. The National Endowment of the Arts will get \$117 million and the National Endowment for the Humanities will get \$142 million. This is an increase of \$15 million for the NEH, for an American history initiative.

This has been something the new Member of this body, Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee, has worked on very hard ever since his arrival in the Senate and something he and I have discussed many times. I know Senator ALEXANDER and his staff have been meeting with administration officials and the authorizing committees to discuss ways of aligning the administration's American history proposal with his own.

It is my understanding those discussions are going well.

Certainly we should all be pulling in the same direction on an issue such as this. I am excited about this initiative, and I want to applaud our good friend from Tennessee for his hard work.

Finally, I want to talk about funding of wildland fire management. This is a subject we find ourselves discussing again and again. The reason is this: The current system we have for the fire suppression budgeting is broken. Again and again we find ourselves in a situation where both the Forest Service and the Department of Interior are forced to borrow massive amounts of money from other budget accounts to fight the fires. Those accounts are inside their own agencies.

This is a reasonable mechanism when the amounts being borrowed are relatively modest, when the borrowing occurs only during particularly bad fire years, and when sufficient surplus carryover funds are readily available. But the borrowing has become routine and the amounts involved are massive. We no longer have large carryover amounts in other accounts. This carryover has disappeared in many accounts with the decline of the timber program and the revenues it produced.

Last year, we borrowed heavily from a number of Forest Service and Interior accounts, causing both agencies to stop conducting certain activities until those amounts were repaid or replaced. In the end, however, we only repaid about 60 cents of every dollar borrowed, which is the amount proposed by the administration in its supplemental request.

As a result of this shortfall, a large number of congressionally approved projects have either been cancelled or reduced in scope. This year we find ourselves in the same situation. Prior to the recess, my colleagues may recall I was very upset that the House sent us a supplemental appropriations bill that did not include the fire funds requested by the administration. Those funds were desperately needed in August when my State of Montana was suffering from dozens of significant fires.

The presence of smoke was almost constant during the time I spent in Montana over the recess. In fact, two airports had to be closed for a period of time because of smoke.

In a way, I am glad we did not act then. I say this because the \$289 million that is under discussion in the legislative branch appropriations bill is totally inadequate. I would not want anybody to believe that this amount begins to take care of our problem. The Department of Interior has already borrowed \$130 million from other accounts to fight fires this summer. It expects to borrow \$30 million more before the end of the fiscal year. The Forest Service has already borrowed—and get this figure—\$595 million and is contemplating another \$100 million transferred to get us through this fiscal year. Roughly speaking, we will borrow \$850 million from other accounts before the end of the fiscal year.

Simply providing the \$289 million in the pending administration request does not do the trick. These funds, for the most part, have already been spent.

There are not options at this point. We need to repay those accounts soon and we need to repay them in full. Sixty cents on the dollar this time around would be devastating to a wide variety of programs. They range from endangered species monitoring to facilities construction, from acquisition to processing even the simplest forms of grazing permits. It would amount to a de facto rescission of funds that this Congress voted to appropriate when it approved the 2003 bill.

My colleagues will hear more from me later on this issue, and I will likely have an amendment to offer at some point, but for now I want to use this opportunity to tell my colleagues this is not just a problem for those States where there has been fire. It is a problem for every State in this country, because the funds are effectively borrowed from every State, including the projects and programs that were funded at a specific request of Members in this body. So I call on the administration to send up another supplemental request, one that fully reflects the amounts that will be spent on fire suppression this fiscal year.

I thank my friend, Senator DORGAN, and his staff. They have been great to work with. Of course, we come from almost the same part of the country—in fact, we are neighbors—so it was very easy for neighbors to get together and to roll up our sleeves and put this bill together. His input has been very valuable. We have tried to fashion a bill that reflects the priorities of the Senate as a whole. I think this bill does just that.

So I urge my colleagues who have amendments to get them to me or to my staff as quickly as possible so we can deal with them and get this bill to conference. I caution, however, that we have allocated the entire amount of the subcommittee's allocation. Any amendment that provides additional

funds will have to be fully offset, and I think I can speak for Senator DORGAN in saying we will take a dim view of amendments that propose to use across-the-board reductions or unspecified administrative savings as offsets.

I ask the support of this Senate for this bill. I would hope we can have this bill done by tomorrow, and move on and get this bill into conference. I urge my colleagues to support it.

If I can get the attention of my good friend from North Dakota, I look forward to working with him on this issue and I appreciate his good help and his input on this bill.

I yield the floor to my good friend from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator BURNS. Senator BURNS is the chairman of this appropriations subcommittee. I have been very pleased to work with him. I think his leadership and his work on this subcommittee is exemplary.

This is my first year on this subcommittee. I moved to this position from another subcommittee and so it is the first year I have had the opportunity to work with Senator BURNS, but we have had an excellent working relationship.

This is a very large appropriations subcommittee bill, and I shall not repeat that which Senator BURNS has already described in any great detail, but I do want to make some points. I will go through a couple of the items.

Senator BURNS mentioned this bill deals with the BLM, Bureau of Land Management, and the funding for their programs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, the National Park Service, and a number of smaller agencies as well. There is the Office of Surface Mining, Minerals Management Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Indian Affairs—I am going to speak a little bit about that in a couple of minutes—and then the larger departmental offices down at the Interior Department that includes the Forest Service, which is a very large agency, the Department of Energy—a portion of the Department of Energy funding is in this—the Indian Health Service, Smithsonian, National Gallery of Art, Kennedy Center, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, and more.

As you can see, these are very important public functions for which we provide funding. I think we have done as good a job as is possible to do, given the restraint on financing many of these functions. I think Senator BURNS would probably agree there are a number of issues that are presented in this appropriations bill for which we would like to provide additional funding but could not. But that is the process these days, trying to find ways to stretch limited resources over unlimited wants that are expressed to the committee.

Let me mention a couple of issues specifically. First of all, payment in

lieu of taxes. My colleague, Senator BURNS, mentioned that. For those who do not understand this issue, it is called P-I-L-T. Payment in lieu of taxes is a payment the Federal Government makes on land it owns that otherwise would have borne a property tax but, because it is in Federal hands, does not pay a property tax. So payment in lieu of taxes is the payment the Federal Government makes to these counties that makes up what they should have collected in property taxes had that land been in private hands.

As you know, in most cases property around this country has to bear a responsibility to help raise the funds for our school systems. Yet if you have a substantial amount of Federal land, it doesn't pay property taxes and therefore you don't have the revenue coming off that land to support the school system and other governmental functions. That is what the payment in lieu of taxes is about.

I am pleased Senator BURNS and I were able to increase that amount this year. It is very important. The administration had suggested that it be decreased a bit. We have actually appropriated, in this bill, \$30 million above that which the administration requested. I think that is something important to highlight.

I want to spend a couple of minutes talking about Indian issues because, while that is not the largest part of this bill, it is a very important set of issues. I want to talk a bit about it and then I want to talk about grazing permits and a couple of other smaller items.

Let me talk about the Indian issues for a very specific reason. We have trust responsibility in this Government for Indian education, among other things. That trust responsibility is not something we have been able to shed. That is a responsibility we have. It is a responsibility we must meet. I believe we have, on Indian reservations in this country, bona fide crises in health care, education, and housing. This bill deals with two of those—education and health care.

Let me talk about how it deals with education first of all. The administration request on Indian education suggested that we zero out funding for the United Tribes Technical College in North Dakota and also the Crown Point Technical College in New Mexico. Both of them are vocational/technical schools that are wonderful opportunities for Indian men and women, children, to learn and to get a college education. I am pleased that Senator BURNS and I were able to restore funding to both of those important institutions.

In addition to that, we are restoring some funding that is much needed for the 28 tribally controlled community colleges in our country. These are tribal colleges that have been remarkably successful. Once again, there was a requested cut. We are actually increasing

funding over last year. Senator BURNS and I have talked about trying to do more. We hope to be able to do that as we work through this process on the floor of the Senate.

I thought it would be useful, instead of speaking in the abstract, to read a letter from someone because I have visited many tribal colleges. I said there is a bona fide crisis in education, health care, and housing on our reservations. If one doesn't believe that, I encourage you to visit and then ask yourself whether that is what we want to confine Indian children to, or the adults who live on those reservations, with respect to access to health care, access to good education, and more.

Let me read a letter from a woman who wrote to me some while ago describing the value of tribal colleges in her life. I think it is an instructive letter. As I said, I have visited many tribal colleges and this letter says it very well. She says:

I grew up poor and considered backward by non-Indians. My home was a two-room log house in a place called the "bush" on North Dakota's Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation. I stuttered. I was painfully shy. My clothes were hand-me-downs. I was like thousands of other Indian kids growing up on reservations across America.

When I went to elementary school I felt so alone and different. I couldn't speak up for myself. My teachers had no appreciation for Indian culture. I'll never forget that it was the lighter-skinned children who were treated better. They were usually from families that were better off than mine. My teachers called me savage. Even as a young child I wondered . . . What does it take to be noticed and looked upon the way these other children are?

By the time I reached 7th grade I realized that if my life was going to change for the better, I was going to have to do it. Nobody else could do it for me. That's when the dream began. I thought of ways to change things for the better—not only for myself but for my people. I dreamed of growing up to be a teacher in a school where every child was treated as sacred and viewed positively, even if they were poor and dirty. I didn't want any child to be made to feel like I did. But I didn't know how hard it would be to reach the realization of my dream. I almost didn't make it.

By the time I was 17 I had dropped out of school, moved to California, and had a child. I thought my life was over. But when I moved back to the reservation I made a discovery that literally put my life back together. My sisters were attending Turtle Mountain College, which had just been started on my reservation. I thought that was something I could do, too, so I enrolled. In those days, we didn't even have a campus. There was no building. Some classes met at a local alcohol rehabilitation center in an old hospital building that had been condemned. But to me, it didn't matter. I was just amazed I could go to college. It was life-changing.

My college friends and professors were like family. For the first time in my life I learned about the language, history and culture of my people in a formal education setting. I felt honor and pride begin to well up inside me. This was so unlike my prior school experience where I was told my language and culture were shameful and that Indians weren't equal to others. Attending a tribal college caused me to reach into my inner self to become what I was meant to be—to fight for

my rights and not remain a victim of circumstance or of anybody. In fact, I loved college so much that I couldn't stop! I had a dream to fulfill . . . or perhaps some would call it an obsession. This pushed me on to complete my studies at Turtle Mountain College and to ultimately earn a Doctorate in Education Administration from the University of North Dakota.

I've worked in education ever since, from Head Start teacher's aide to college professor. Now I'm realizing my dream of helping Indian children succeed. I am the Office of Indian Education Programs' superintendent working with nine schools, three reservations, and I oversee two educational contracts with two tribal colleges. My life would not have turned out this way were it not for the tribal college on my reservation.

My situation is not unique and others feel this way as well. Since 1974, when Turtle Mountain College was chartered by the Turtle Mountain tribe, around 300 students have gone on to earn higher degrees. We now have educators, attorneys, doctors and others who have returned to the reservation. They—I should say, we—are giving back to the community. Instead of asking people to have pity on us because of what happened in our past, we are taking our future into our own hands. Instead of looking for someone else to solve our problems, we are doing it.

There's only one thing tribal colleges need. With more funding, the colleges can do ever more than they've already achieved. We will take people off the welfare rolls and end the economic depression on reservations. Tribal colleges have already been successful with much less than any other institutions of higher education have received. That is why I hope you will continue to support the American Indian College Fund.

I'm an old timer. The College Fund didn't exist when I was a student. I remember seeing ads for the United Negro College Fund and wishing that such a fund existed for Indian people. We now have our own Fund that is spreading the message about tribal colleges and providing scholarships. I'm so pleased. I believe the Creator meant for this to be. But so much more must be done. There still isn't enough scholarship money available to carry students full time. That is my new dream . . . to see the day when Indian students can receive four-year scholarships so they don't have to go through the extremely difficult struggle many now experience to get their education.

I hope you'll keep giving, keep supporting the College Fund, so that some day this dream becomes reality. I know it can happen because if my dream for my future came true, anything is possible. Thank you.

Let me describe to you the signature. The signature is: "Loretta De Long, Ed.D."

This is a woman from North Dakota who has done wonderful things in the field of education. She describes the circumstance that allowed her to get this education, the presence of a tribal college that gave her hope and opportunity. We need to fund them and we are not funding them adequately. The per-pupil burden that exists on tribal colleges and the reimbursement we provide to meet that burden is not equal at all to that which we do for public community colleges. In fact, it is somewhere very close to half. I have the numbers here. The support per student for public community colleges is \$8,900 and the public support for tribal colleges is just under \$4,000.

One final point. I know this is not a major part of this bill, but I have spent

a lot of time working on tribal college issues. I just want to tell you one other story about going to a tribal college graduation. When I spoke at the graduation, I asked who was the oldest graduate. And they said: That's her over there. And I went over to say hello.

This was a woman who was in her early forties. Here is her story.

I asked her: "What is your story?" "She was a janitor. She was cleaning the hallways and the toilets of the community college. She had four children, her husband had left her, and she was working at low wages cleaning the hallways and the bathrooms of the community college. She thought to herself: I would like to be a graduate of this college. Somehow, by the grace of God, through Pell grants, or through all of the support we offer to give people opportunity, the day I was there this woman was not cleaning the hallways or cleaning the bathrooms of this college, she was graduating, wearing a cap and gown, and wearing a smile—something no one will ever take from her because she did it herself with the help of what we put together to provide opportunity to people.

But, once again, it enriches people's lives. Education is the way up the steps, up out of poverty.

I spoke about tribal colleges just because I care a lot about them. These in many instances are places in our country that look like Third World parts of the globe. Yet they exist in this country with people terribly disadvantaged. It is the route of progress. Education provides the opportunity for these people who want opportunity, those who live on Indian reservations. This woman is an example of that, and there are so many others. I have a whole list of them here which I could talk about today.

My hope is that in the time we are on the floor of the Senate, Senator BURNS and I can continue to work on this issue, and we intend to do that.

I will speak just for a moment about Indian health care. The fact is, if you visit Indian reservations and take a look at the amount of money spent on Indian health care, you will decide that there is something fundamentally wrong. This is about young children and others who do not have adequate health care. Go and find a reservation with 5,000 people living on it with one dentist working out of a trailer house and ask yourself: What kind of care for those people exists with respect to dentistry? Go to a reservation, for example, and take a look at the funding through the Indian Health Service and through the BIA, especially with respect to protecting Indian children against sexual abuse.

I had a hearing on that in Bismarck, ND. A woman came to the hearing to testify. On this Indian reservation, she was in charge of the social services and trying to protect these children. She said to me: I have a stack of files on my floor a foot and a half high. These

are files of allegations of child sexual abuse and abuse of children. They have not even been investigated. Why? Because there is no money to investigate them. She said: Even when I just have to find a way for somebody to come and take a child to the biggest town 10 miles away, to the hospital off the reservation, I have to beg to try to borrow a car, to put a young kid in a car to take them to the hospital or the clinic.

At that point, she broke down and began weeping, at a public hearing. She just couldn't continue. She said it is just too sad. The fact is we are not doing what we should do to protect these children.

I have this story about some years ago learning of a young lady named Tamera Damirez. She was a 3-year-old. She was on an Indian reservation. She was a child from a very difficult set of circumstances. She was put into foster care by a woman who was handling 150 cases. You get a social worker handling 150 cases, and do you think that social worker is going to inspect the home where she assigns that child to foster care? She didn't. This young girl was sent to foster care at age 3. There was a drunken party at that foster care residence. Her nose was broken, her arm was broken, her hair was pulled out by the roots—at age 3. Why? Because there was not enough money to fund enough social workers to inspect the house where you were going to send a 3-year-old child.

I fixed that problem. There is more money there now. There are more social workers there. They are inspecting where they are sending children. But this should not happen, and it is happening today across this country because we are not adequately funding Indian education and Indian health care by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Part of it is the bureaucracy of BIA, I might also say. I don't want to suggest that the BIA is an agency that functions very well in many circumstances. I have a lot of grievances with the BIA as well.

My point is that we have spent a lot of money on a lot of aspects of this Government. None is quite so important to me as protecting children. I visit places in this country where I just shake my head and wonder why it is that these children are not a priority for this country. This bill is one bill where we have a responsibility to do more, and we need to keep working and fighting and funding ways to do more.

Let me mention just a couple of other items as we proceed.

Before I finish that piece of my discussion, I know I am taking one piece out of this large bill and talking about it some. It is because I feel so strongly about it. I know my colleague, Senator BURNS, does as well. The dilemma and the disappointment is that we have limited amounts of money. We need more. We need more to address these issues with children, particularly on reservations, and address the issues of education and health care.

Let me talk just for a moment about an issue in the Forest Service dealing with grazing permits for ranchers. We have a requirement as a result of a previous Federal law that says those who graze on public lands and have grazing permits with which to graze cattle on public lands, in order to get a renewal of the grazing permit when the permit reaches its end, have to have a NEPA—the National Environmental Policy Act—evaluation of that permit.

It was easy enough, I suppose, for the previous administration and the previous Congress to say this should be done. But it has proven much more difficult for it to be done.

The Forest Service has done precious little in moving forward on the NEPA evaluations of the grazing permits. Ranchers out there who are trying to make a living grazing cattle on public lands don't have the foggiest idea of whether at the end of this year they will get an extension of their existing grazing permit because the NEPA evaluation has not been done. That is not their fault. That is the Forest Service's fault. The Congress hasn't funded it. The Forest Service hasn't done it. As a result, the rancher is wondering whether they will get an extension of their permit.

In recent years, we have extended it a year. This bill extends it a year. But at end of each year we are in the same situation.

I believe we ought to do a couple of things: No. 1, we ought to say to the Forest Service: Do this. No. 2, we ought to fund it to get them to do it, and we ought to stop holding ranchers hostage on the completion of these duties.

Until we decide to do that, it isn't going to be done this year because adequate funding does not exist to do what the law would require with respect to NEPA evaluations on grazing permits. I think we ought to do more than extensions of 1 year. We don't know exactly what it should be. We ought to be talking about that during the discussion of this bill.

Frankly, we should not say to those ranch families out there who have cattle grazing on public lands: By the way, at end of each year you are going to be threatened with the loss of the permit. The law says the NEPA evaluation must be done, but we know it is not being done.

Let us decide either it gets done and provide the resources to do that or at least have reasonable extensions so ranchers aren't held hostage at the end of each year by actions of an appropriations committee each year. Let us find a way to do that if we can. I hope we can talk about that as we move along.

I will mention one other concern. I have not talked to my colleague from Montana about this. He talked about the We The People Project. I am a strong supporter of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts. I think both enrich our country. Both are programs that are excellent. Visit

Europe and see what remains from the 15th century. It is not some fossilized, arthritic, calcified human being. It is their art. It is this wonderful art that enriches Europe and tells us something about the 12th century and the 15th century. So, too, are the arts important to our culture. I think these are very important—arts and humanities.

But I must say that doing a new start of We The People—no one, in my judgment, would say that We The People—whatever that acronym attaches to; in this case, it attaches to the study of history—no one would say that is unimportant. It is very important. But we have added money previously to the Department of Education for this. To the extent we are going to do something new, I really would prefer that it be in the Department of Education, or some other device, rather than starting a new program in the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I think history is critically important. The issue of how we are going to enhance the learning and the teaching of history is really a function of doing so in the classroom.

I will not object to it being here this year, but the problem with all these things, once they stick, it is kind of like Velcro. It gets stuck in here and next year it will be here and it becomes a permanent program. I think this program belongs somewhere in an education piece of legislation. I understand \$100 million was added in an amendment by Senator BYRD for that purpose and I prefer we do that.

Those who are pushing for the enrichment of the education of history in our school system, absolutely, I fully support it. We have spent a lot of time talking about the maths and sciences, which I think is important. It is very appropriate to say we want kids coming out of our schools to have a great sense of the history of this wonderful country of ours. But I don't believe the place to do that in terms of nurturing that is in the National Endowment for the Humanities. I believe, as Senator BYRD has appropriately pushed, the right place to do it is over in the education legislation. I know we have colleagues who feel very strongly about that. I hope they can perhaps work with Senator BYRD and with us so next year we do not have to have this as another continuing and building program in the National Endowment for Humanities.

Having said that, I know there are some who think, boy, this is a terrific expansion of National Endowment for the Humanities. I am someone who supports the National Endowment for the Humanities. I think it is important. But I also believe this particular piece that is now added to it is more appropriate with the Department of Education, if we are going to do this, and I believe we should do this initiative to enhance and stimulate the education of the history of this wonderful country in our school system.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, our staff and the staff of Senator ALEXANDER and the Department of Education and the administration did get together. They are moving to an agreement. I agree maybe the Department of Education is where it should be and those funds be allocated to be used there.

But what the Senator from Tennessee was trying to do was highlight something of national interest that is happening in North Dakota and Montana now. As I said, the Dakota territory and Montana was the heart and soul of the book that was written, "Undaunted Courage." Now that we are approaching the 200th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase and the trek of Lewis and Clark, there is a lot of interest in our part of the country. What was started in the humanities, the interest of Lewis and Clark, the interest of the Louisiana Purchase and the impact it had on this country, has been very positive for all of us out there and all of America.

Some of the original 13 States got the idea that maybe this country is big enough right where it is. If you read another book, "A Wilderness So Immense," you get an idea—this was before our Constitution was ratified—some of the events that went on in the history of the Louisiana Purchase. It is very interesting.

That is why we are very supportive of history initiatives. We have young people coming out of our schools who do not have a sense of history. They do not know who they are, why they are, or how they got here. This initiative is very important.

In regard to the Forest Service permit, it is fire suppression money that was taken from the accounts that would enable them to issue the permits and to complete the NEPA studies. We have to understand that and how important these funds are to be replaced in the accounts of the BLM and the Forest Service so this work can be completed. The Senator from North Dakota is exactly right. These do not have to be done on a yearly basis. There should be a longer term with monitoring. I like the 10-year lease. That is the way it used to be. We find now everywhere we had grazing we did not have fires, which is something we should take a look at as far as fire prevention and fire suppression and the use of the land.

The other day, I will even tell my good friend from North Dakota, I saw a truckload of sheep being unloaded in Missoula County, Montana. They were paying the sheep man to run his sheep on public lands for weed control, spotted nap weed, and of course earlier in the spring, we had the spurge problem. But I thought, what a novel idea. I wished I had thought of it.

We will let that program go to the benefit of the land and also to the people who graze the land and make their living and are in the business of feeding and clothing.

Those are the challenges we have ahead of us. This bill impacts a lot.

I have a few clarifications of items in the committee report that I would like to have printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent those corrections be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### CLARIFICATIONS OF COMMITTEE REPORT

On page 28 of the Committee report, the table includes \$3 million for "Independence Square site rehabilitation". The \$1.25 million provided in addition to the budget request is for landscaping improvements to Independence Mall.

On page 40 of the Committee report under "Other Recurring Programs", the reference to the "Dry Prairie Rural Water System" should have been to the "Assiniboine and Sioux Rural Water System."

On page 52 of the Committee report, the amount provided for Forest Health Management is \$82,073,000, as displayed in the table on that page.

Mr. BURNS. I remind Senators to get their amendments down here. We want to complete this bill by noon tomorrow so we can watch the rain. Those folks are worried about forest fires. I don't think anyone on the East Coast has to worry about that.

Mr. DORGAN. I am tempted to talk about the intelligence of sheep and enjoying munching on leafy spurge, but I will not do that.

My colleague describes the real serious problem with spurge and nap. We have known in North Dakota when you put sheep on the land, baby spurge and leafy spurge is gone and the sheep seem happy.

Having said that, I go back to make a point on this issue of, we, the people. We have Lewis and Clark money to celebrate the bicentennial in a number of different places in legislation in several different appropriations bills. It was a wonderful expedition, perhaps the greatest expedition certainly in the history of this country, perhaps ever. The greater the education and the bigger the celebration of that, the better for our country and the better for our children to understand the richness of that history, as well.

My only point is, as we think through this in the longer term, this money is in the bill and I would like to see if we can find a way with the administration to put it where I think it really belongs, and that is education.

The other point I would make in terms of priorities, if we have \$15, \$20, \$25 million here and there, we have urgent priorities, especially dealing with Indian health, that we need to find some additional resources for.

I did not mention in my opening statement something my colleague from Montana mentioned, and that is the forest fire issue. Fire suppression money has been borrowed from every account. It is the wrong way to do business. What we should do—and we talked about this in the spring when we received the budget request; we traditionally get a budget request that does not ask for the money that all of us know will be necessary and then

when the need comes for fire suppression money, they take it from virtually every corner and come back with a request for emergency funding.

We ought to understand that forest fires are events that cause a lot of television cameras to record them, and cause a lot of angst for people who are in the way, but they happen every year. This isn't like some big typhoon some place that happens every 10 or 15 years. We know we are going to have forest fires every year. We know about what it is going to cost us if we have a moderate season of forest fires, or more forest fires than a moderate season, and we just as well ought to begin to plan for it. Both the administration and the Congress should; frankly, neither have.

I fully support the comments made by my colleague from Montana. We need to find a way to come at this up front, in the spring of the year each year, to put in sufficient money. In some cases, it may not be enough, if we have an extraordinary season of massive forest fires, but in most cases we could put money in to cover the kind of year that we would have in most situations in this country. So I hope we can do that.

Let me also say, we have some folks on this side of the aisle who will have amendments. As my colleague has indicated, I would prefer if they would just bring them over and offer them. And let's deal with them quickly. We do have a little rain coming to the east coast. It would be nice to be able to finish this bill. The bill is going to be open for amendment, and I would ask colleagues to come over and work with us, offer the amendments, and let's work through them today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1724, the pending substitute amendment, be agreed to and considered original text for the purpose of further amendment, provided that no points of order be waived by virtue of this agreement.

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

The amendment (No. 1724) was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I again say to my colleagues, we are going to try to finish this bill before this storm hits tonight. We are working now on a managers' package of known amendments, and if there are some unknown amendments, I suggest Senators come to the floor, submit their amendments, and let us deal with them. If not, we are going to move right along in completing this legislation.

We understand the House is not going to be in tomorrow. So we do not want to be caught in that pickle. We want to complete action on this appropriations bill if we possibly can. I suggest my colleagues bring their amendments to the floor.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we now go into a period of morning business with Senators being allowed to speak for 5 minutes therein until the hour of 2 p.m. this afternoon, at which we will return to the business of Interior appropriations.

Mr. DODD. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent request is for a period of morning business so Members can speak for up to 5 minutes on a topic of their choosing.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

#### IRAQ

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues a few thoughts on the subject of Iraq, if I may. I begin by thanking the President for speaking to the Nation on September 7. President Bush, my colleagues will recall, addressed the American people about the subject of Iraq. He happens to be one of the very few members of his own administration to begin to tell the American people the facts of life about our involvement in Iraq: That it is going to be very difficult for our troops and civilian personnel to be successful in standing up a democratic government out of the ashes of a crushed and totally discredited dictatorship, and it is going to be very expensive as well, the President pointed out—very expensive. In the President's own words, this undertaking is going to be "difficult and costly."

President Bush also explained in simple terms U.S. policy objectives. He said in that speech that our objectives are to destroy terrorists, enlist the support of other nations for a free Iraq, and help Iraqis assume responsibility.

He was far less clear on how he intends to achieve those objectives or to mitigate the cost to the American public—the cost in dollar terms and also in terms of human lives.

Our military has, I think all of us would agree, done an exemplary job in