



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 20, 2000

No. 95

## Senate

### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3457, 3933 TO 3457, 3965, 3966, 3967, 3968, 3969, 3970, 3971, 3972, 3973, 3974, 3975, AND 3976, EN BLOC

Mr. COCHRAN. I further ask consent that the Harkin amendment No. 3964 and the other emergency designation amendments now pending at the desk be considered en bloc and agreed to en bloc and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 3964) was agreed to.

The amendments, en bloc, were agreed to as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3457

(Purpose: To provide market and quality loss assistance for certain commodities)

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 7. APPLE MARKET LOSS ASSISTANCE AND QUALITY LOSS PAYMENTS FOR APPLES AND POTATOES.—(a) APPLE MARKET LOSS ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to provide relief for loss of markets for apples, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use \$100,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payments to apple producers.

(2) PAYMENT QUANTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the payment quantity of apples for which the producers on a farm are eligible for payments under this subsection shall be equal to the average quantity of the 1994 through 1999 crops of apples produced by the producers on the farm.

(B) MAXIMUM QUANTITY.—The payment quantity of apples for which the producers on a farm are eligible for payments under this subsection shall not exceed 1,600,000 pounds of apples produced on the farm.

(b) QUALITY LOSS PAYMENTS FOR APPLES AND POTATOES.—In addition to the assistance provided under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use \$15,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payments to apple producers, and potato producers, that suffered quality losses to the

1999 crop of potatoes and apples, respectively, due to, or related to, a 1999 hurricane or other weather-related disaster.

(c) NONDUPLICATION OF PAYMENTS.—A producer shall be ineligible for payments under this section with respect to a market or quality loss for apples or potatoes to the extent that the producer is eligible for compensation or assistance for the loss under any other Federal program, other than the Federal crop insurance program established under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(d) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment which would assist apple growers who suffered losses from fire blight and other weather related and economic damage. The amendment is cosponsored by Senators COLLINS, SCHUMER, GORTON, MURRAY, SNOWE, LEAHY, JEFFORDS, MOYNIHAN, DURBIN, ROCKEFELLER, ROBB, ABRAHAM, and LIEBERMAN. This spring, apple growers in Michigan suffered huge crop losses and damage due to several hail storms which caused thousands of acres of apple trees to be infected with fire blight. Fire blight is a bacterium that has destroyed thousands of acres of fruit trees in Michigan. Experts at Michigan State University anticipate that ¼ of all MI apple farmers have trees that are afflicted by fire blight. As a result of this weather related disaster, many of Michigan's best apple producers face diminished production this fall, and decreased revenues for many years to come. My amendment provides essential assistance for apple

and potato producers that have suffered quantity losses due to fire blight or other weather related disasters. These hardships could not come at a worse time for our nation's apple farmers who, according to USDA, have lost nearly \$1 billion over the past three years due to a variety of factors including diseases, such as fire blight. This legislation also includes assistance for apple and potato farmers who have incurred quality losses due to weather-related disasters.

The Agricultural Risk Protection Act, which President Clinton signed into law, included some emergency assistance for our nation's farmers. However, much remains to be done to address the myriad of problems facing out nation's apple farmers. That is why with 13 cosponsors I have introduced amendment No. 3457 that would provide \$100 million in assistance this year for quantitative losses of our nation's apple farmers. A second degree amendment that would provide \$60 million for qualitative losses, suffered by apple and potato farmers, was attached to my amendment by Senators ABRAHAM and SCHUMER. Articles from a number of Michigan papers show the plight of apple farmers, and mentions the need for direct assistance, in the form of this amendment, to our apple farmers. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Herald-Palladium, June 22, 2000]

BAD APPLES: FIRE BLIGHT IS TAKING BITE  
OUT OF AREA CROPS

FARMERS SEEK FEDERAL FINANCIAL  
ASSISTANCE FOR ACRES OF DYING TREES

(By Michael Eliasohn)

WATERVLIIET—The name of Rodney Winkel's farm is Grandview Orchards, but the view these days is far from grand.

A building on Winkel's Bainbridge Township farm Wednesday morning was the location for a meeting of about 80 Southwest Michigan farmers who have the same view—brown dead leaves on dying apple trees.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7351

The cause is fire blight, a bacterial infection that shrivels the apples and can kill the trees. Alan Jones, Michigan State University's fire blight expert, said it's the worst outbreak ever in Michigan.

John Sarno, U.S. Farm Service Agency Southwest Michigan regional director, said his office has received preliminary reports of fire blight damage in Berrien, Van Buren, Cass and Kalamazoo counties. He expects to receive a similar report soon from Allegan County and believes there may be damage in Ottawa and Kent counties.

Prior to the meeting, Michigan Farm Bureau (MFB) conducted a tour of four fire blighted orchards in Van Buren County for aides to several Michigan members of Congress, plus staff from the MSU College of Agriculture, the Farm Service Agency, Michigan Department of Agriculture and others.

Winkel described the problem facing the farmers. He and his son-in-law Mark Epple grow about 300 acres of apples. "I conservatively estimate we'll take out 60 to 70 acres of trees," he said. "These are huge dollars we're talking about and the cookie jar is dry."

"A number of years ago, agriculture could handle a disaster like this," but not any more, said MFB President Jack Laurie, who chaired the meeting. "The (profit) margin has been reduced, so farmers can't stand a big loss."

Unlike a spring freeze that wipes out that year's crop, the fire blight damage goes far beyond one year.

Coloma area grower Jerry Jollay said during the meeting he and his son, Jay, expect to lose about half of their 55 acres of apple trees.

He later told The Herald-Palladium if trees are removed and new trees planted, it takes 5-6 years until they start producing a good crop and it isn't until the eighth year they get a full crop.

He estimated it costs from \$4,000 to \$10,000 per acre to replant trees and to maintain them until they start producing, depending on the number planted per acre. The figure does not include the value of lost production.

Growers may be able to remove diseased limbs and save some trees, according to Jones of MSU, but that could mean 2-3 years of reduced crops until it gets back to full production.

"But if you don't get it all," said Mike Hildebrand, "it will flare up next year or the year after." Hildebrand and his father, Ernie, grow about 70 acres of apples near Berrien Springs.

Jones said if an infected limb is missed, the fire blight will spread to the roots and kill the tree.

And if one tree is infected, the fire blight can spread to the rest of the trees in the orchard.

Sarno told the growers there is no existing program to compensate them for fire blight damages, that Congress has to approve one and the funds for it. "We have to start over," he said. "We have to look at what we have today (in damage) and that's what we're doing today."

Sarno later told The Herald-Palladium there are three potential programs Congress could approve, one involving low-interest loans to partially compensate them for their production losses and tree losses.

The other two programs would give them grants, either to help cover production losses or pay for removing diseased trees and planting new ones.

Farmers with crop insurance may be covered for lost crops this year.

Sarno said county agricultural emergency boards must first compile loss data, which they forward to the state emergency board.

If the state board decided the loss is significant enough, it asks Gov. John Engler to

ask U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman to declare the affected counties agricultural disaster areas, thus qualifying growers for aid, if Congress OKs it.

Sarno said the last time there was such an emergency, in Kent County in 1998 when winds blew down trees and spread fire blight, it took about a year before growers received their government checks. "We hope to expedite this (for fire blight damage)," he said.

Winkel said he could lose 30,000-35,000 bushels of apples this year, and for the next several years, until replacement trees start producing apples, his loss could be 50,000 bushels a year.

The value of apples varies widely, depending on the variety, when they are sold and their use, but at \$6 per bushel—the 1999 average from two area packing houses for Jonathans—Winkel's annual loss would be \$300,000 a year.

He said Idared, Jonathon, Rome, Gala, Paulared and Golden Delicious are the varieties being affected most by fire blight.

For some growers, fire blight isn't their only problem. Jollay said spring frosts and freezes reduced his tart cherry crop by probably half, apples by 20 percent and peaches by 50 percent.

Then hail on May 18 caused more damage, followed by the fire blight. He guessed he will have only about a fourth of his normal crop of apples.

In his 35 years in agriculture, Jollay said, he has suffered losses from freezes, hail and fire blight, but not all in one year. "This is absolutely the worst I've ever seen." He said he and his son hope to get through this year with income from pumpkins, their other significant crop, and their pick-your-own "family fun" operations in the fall.

As for possible federal aid, he said: "Hopefully this will help alleviate part of the problem."

Coloma area grower Paul Friday, whose 140 acres of peaches suffered major hail damage on May 18, asked that hail-caused damage to fruit and young trees not yet bearing fruit be included in any assistance program.

[From the Kalamazoo Gazette, June 22, 2000]

APPLE GROWERS GETTING BURNED—EPIDEMIC OF FIRE BLIGHT DEVASTATES LOCAL CROP

(By Ed Finnerty)

HARTFORD—The Golden Delicious apple trees on Kevin Winkel's family farm are anything but golden or delicious.

Their leaves are more brown than green. Their fruit resembles rotting grapes more than edible apples.

To Winkel and scores of besieged farmers in the apple country of Van Buren and Berrien counties, a killer epidemic of fire blight that has overtaken their orchards and threatens their livelihoods is a disaster by any reasonable standard.

"It got my entire crop," lamented Winkel, a second-generation grower working the land he took over from his father 16 years ago.

"There will be zero income from this year's crop and at least half of the expenses are already in it," said Winkel, a married father of two who isn't sure the business will survive the loss.

Apple farmers in Van Buren and Berrien counties in southwestern Michigan are hoping to persuade the Federal Government to declare their farms disaster areas, entitling them to aid farm officials say may be a last lifeline for some growers.

"The problem here is devastating," said Al Almy, Michigan Farm Bureau's director of public policy and commodities. "It could put some of the very best growers right out of business."

Fire blight is a bacterial disease affecting primarily apple and pear trees that is spread

by insects and often enters blooms or leaves damaged by wind or hail. It destroys tissue it infects, killing blossoms and shoots, sometimes progressing into the tree and its roots. Badly infected trees look like they have been burned.

Strains of fire blight that have become resistant to antibiotic sprays have slowly spread in area orchards, but a May 18 storm that produced hail and high winds is blamed with sparking the huge outbreak.

Mark Longstroth, district horticulture and marketing agent with the MSU Extension, estimates some 300 to 400 growers and 27,000 acres of apples will be affected by the blight. The major damage is in Van Buren and Berrien counties, but fire blight has appeared in Allegan, Cass and Kalamazoo counties too, officials say.

Officials are still evaluating losses but say they may reach about \$10 million in the two counties. This year's losses will be multiplied in future years with the loss of production from trees that are killed.

"This is one of the worst epidemics we have ever seen," said Alan Jones, a professor of plant pathology at Michigan State University. Jones, a fire blight expert with MSU for 30 years, said this outbreak dwarfs the worst epidemic he had seen previously, in 1991.

The Michigan Farm Bureau on Wednesday invited media and representatives from the area's congressional delegation to tour orchards from Lawrence in Van Buren County to Watervliet in Berrien County. The caravan stopped at some orchards to inspect the damages, but in most cases a drive by acre after acre of brown orchards was all that was needed to see the devastation.

At an orchard near Watervliet, dozens of apple growers waited to meet with representatives from the Farm Bureau, USDA, Michigan Department of Agriculture, MSU Extension and other agencies. It was partly a show for the invited media, including crews from several newspapers and television stations, and a show of force to representatives of the Congressional delegations.

Staffers for U.S. Sen. Carl Levin and Reps. Fred Upton, Nick Smith, Vernon Ehlers, and Peter Hoekstra were on hand Wednesday, and Michigan Farm Bureau President Jack Laurie urged growers to push them for disaster assistance.

"Levin's office is the one we've got to lean on, this guy here," one grower said to others, as they waited for another farmer to finish bending the ear of Levin's staffer.

If a disaster is declared, farmers will be eligible for low-interest loans to cover losses and replace trees. Federal assistance to replace weather-damaged trees doesn't cover fire blight, but officials from the Farm Bureau and other assembled agencies said political pressure should be applied to get that coverage.

A state emergency board will be convened to evaluate losses in the affected counties, then ask Gov. John Engler to request federal disaster relief from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

"I think we have seen enough to know this is very widespread, this is very dramatic," said John Sarno, district director for USDA Farm Services Agency, who took his camera along on Wednesday's tour. "There are going to be great losses."

Any help would be welcomed by Winkel, who says he may have to find a second job and whose wife may have to go from working as a part-time nurse to working full time. His 100 acres of trees, which last year produced about 73,000 bushels of apples and \$300,000 in revenue, will yield nothing this year.

"The whole future of the southwest Michigan fruit industry is at stake here," said Tom Butler, head of the Michigan Processing

Apple Growers. "A lot of growers are not going to be able to stay in business until some serious help comes along."

The fire blight will have no discernible impact on consumers because of a strong supply of apples nationwide, Butler said

Mr. LEVIN. I am particularly grateful to Senator SUSAN COLLINS whose support has been essential. I am also pleased with the many bipartisan co-sponsors who have supported this legislation.

This amendment is similar to legislation which recently passed the other body as part of the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my good friend Senator LEVIN in offering an amendment to provide much needed relief for apple and potato producers across America. Senator LEVIN and I share a deep concern for these farmers, who have endured such unexpected hardship over the past year. I am grateful for having the opportunity to work with my friend from Michigan on this critical matter.

Over the past three years, America's apple growers have lost more than \$760 million according to U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics. Market conditions, beyond the control of our farmers, and unfair trade practices have contributed significantly to these losses. There has been a reduction in demand for U.S. apples in much of the world because of poor economic conditions in foreign markets. The domestic demand for apples has been affected by conditions abroad as well. With diminished demand overseas, we have seen an increase in the foreign supply of apples in our domestic markets. The U.S. Department of Commerce and the International Trade Commission recently found that our producers have been victimized by unfairly priced imports of Chinese apple juice concentrate.

Unusual weather also has hurt our potato and apple producers. The Maine Pomological Society, a group that primarily represents apple producers in my State, reports that a summer-long drought, coupled with the heavy winds and rains of Hurricane Floyd in the fall, had a disastrous impact on the quality of apples produced in Maine last year. On average, only 49% of Maine's 1999 apple crop could be sold at the "fancy grade" quality. To provide my colleagues with a sense of what this means, I would note that in 1998, 78% of the apples produced in Maine were labeled as fancy grade.

Maine potato farmers also found themselves victims of weather-related disasters in 1999. In Maine, some potato farmers found their fields covered in as much as 15 inches of water following the drenching that accompanied Hurricane Floyd last fall. Because many of Maine's farmers leave their crop in storage over the winter, we did not realize the full extent of the damage caused by Floyd's rains until this spring. Mr. President, potato farmers

pour their hearts and souls into their fields. It is profoundly disheartening to hear from a farmer who has lost an entire crop that took many months of hard work to cultivate.

The amendment Senator LEVIN and I offer today provides much-needed assistance to both potato and apple producers. Under our proposal, the Secretary of Agriculture would allocate \$100 million in market loss assistance payments to our nation's apple producers. The market loss payments authorized by our amendment will help thousands of apple growers from Washington State to Michigan to Maine survive the losses they have endured due to conditions beyond their control. This amendment directs a modest amount of funds to producers who have received very little of the nearly \$15 billion in emergency agriculture spending that we have passed this fiscal year.

Our amendment also directs the Secretary of Agriculture to provide \$15 million in quality loss payments to apple and potato producers who suffered losses as a result of a hurricane or other weather-related disaster. This assistance will be important to those farmers who were unable to produce their finest product because of adverse weather conditions.

Mr. President, the provisions of our amendment are similar to language in the House-passed version of the FY 2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill. The provisions recognize that potato and apple producers, like other farmers across the country, are subject to the vagaries of international markets and the weather. I ask my colleagues to join us in providing assistance to our apple and potato producers in their time of need.

If anyone questions the emergency nature of this request, I would refer them to a news story that ran on the evening news in Maine this past Tuesday. The segment focused on a long-time apple grower from Alfred, Maine. The grower, with much regret, has come to the conclusion that after thirty-five years this will have to be his family's last crop. The dwindling profits are not enough incentive for the next generation of the family to contend with the government regulations and uncertainty that comes with running an apple orchard. I encourage my colleagues who missed this broadcast from Maine to read the story in Tuesday's New York Times about the hardships being endured by apple growers in New York who watched hail storms this spring wipe out much of their crops. This amendment and the aid it represents is certainly an emergency to these producers.

Mr. President, the federal government must be a partner in our farmer's efforts to feed America and much of the world. The Levin-Collins amendment ensures that our apple and potato producers get the help they need to overcome the difficulties of the past year and continue to produce a quality

product. I urge my colleagues to support our amendment, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3933

(Purpose: To provide relief for apple growers whose crops have suffered extensive crop damage as a result of fireblight)

On page 2, lines 16 through 23, strike all after "(b)" and insert,

"QUALITY LOSS PAYMENTS FOR APPLES AND POTATOES.—In addition to the assistance provided under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use \$60,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payments to apple producers, and potato producers, that suffered quality losses to the 1999 and 2000 crop of potatoes and apples, respectively, due to, or related to, a 1999 or 2000 hurricane, fireblight or other weather related disaster.

AMENDMENT NO. 3965

(Purpose: To ensure that nursery stock producers receive emergency financial assistance for nursery stock losses caused by Hurricane Irene)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_.—In using amounts made available under section 801(a) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note; Public Law 106-78), or under the matter under the heading "CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE" under the heading "COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND" of H.R. 3425 of the 106th Congress, as enacted by section 1001(a)(5) of Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1536, 1501A-289), to provide emergency financial assistance to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 1999 crop due to a disaster, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider nursery stock losses caused by Hurricane Irene on October 16 and 17, 1999, to be losses to the 1999 crop of nursery stock: *Provided*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, Senator MACK and I offer this amendment that will correct an injustice being done to nursery growers in south Florida impacted by Hurricane Irene in October of 1999.

On October 15, Florida was hit with Hurricane Irene.

Following closely on the heels of Hurricane Floyd, a storm that caused a disaster declaration in 13 states, Hurricane Irene dropped over nine inches of rainfall on average across Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade Counties.

Three-day rainfall totals at specific measuring sites throughout this area ranged between 10.88 and 17.47 inches.

Nineteen Florida counties received a major disaster declaration.

At the height of the storm, more than 1 million people lost power.

Agriculture losses from Hurricane Irene totaled over \$438 million.

In total, seven deaths were attributed to Irene's visit to the Florida coastline.

Last year, Congress specifically provided \$186 million in "additional resources for damage caused by hurricanes and other natural disasters in Florida and other states" under Title I—Emergency Supplemental Appropriations of the FY 2000 Omnibus Appropriations Act.

This crop loss assistance was provided in addition to the \$1.2 billion previously allocated under the Crop Disaster Program to respond to farmers who suffered losses due to "adverse weather and related conditions."

In executing this program, the Farm Service Agency (FSA) has made the determination that nursery, unlike other Florida crops damaged by Hurricane Irene, will not be eligible for Crop Disaster Program assistance.

FSA indicates that nursery is ineligible because the program is limited to losses in the 1999 crop year, and the hurricane damage occurred after the FSA-set 2000 crop year had begun.

The hurricane damage occurred on October 16–17, 1999, and the 2000 nursery crop year, according to FSA, began on October 1, 1999.

By all accounts, the FSA's crop year determination was made on an arbitrary basis as nursery does not have a traditional crop year and crops are grown on a year-round basis.

By contrast, the Risk Management Agency had a similar problem and made a special dispensation for the nursery crop year to provide eligibility for hurricane losses under the federal crop insurance program.

The Florida delegation has made a concerted attempt to work closely with the Department since the hurricane damage occurred.

On December 9, 1999 FSA representatives briefed the Florida delegation on disaster assistance available to Florida farmers, and we were informed that Crop Disaster Program assistance would be available to respond to hurricane-related farm losses in Florida.

Today, it is still not available.

The amendment we offer today will ensure that nursery stock losses due to Hurricane Irene will be eligible for relief under the Crop Disaster Program.

Mr. President, the intent of Congress was clear—that losses in Florida due to natural disasters should be covered by the Crop Disaster Program.

I hope that my colleagues will support our amendment that will provide clear direction to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and ensure that its actions meet the intent of Congress.

I urge its adoption.

AMENDMENT NO. 3966

(Purpose: To permit the enrollment of an additional 100,000 acres in the wetlands reserve program)

On page 85, after line 8, of Division B, as modified, add the following:

SEC. . Notwithstanding section 1237(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837(b)(1)), the Secretary of Agriculture may permit the enrollment of not to exceed 1,075,000 acres in the wetlands reserve program: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation

Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i), such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, shall provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 2000 for technical assistance activities performed by any agency of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out this section. *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3967

On page 85, after line 8 of Division B, as modified, add:

SEC. . In addition to other compensation paid by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary shall compensate or otherwise seek to make whole from funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, not to exceed \$4,000,000, the owners of all sheep destroyed from flocks under the Secretary's declarations of July 14, 2000 for lost income, or other business interruption losses, due to actions of the Secretary with respect to such sheep: *Provided*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3968

(Purpose: To provide emergency funding for the Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration for completion of a biotechnology reference facility)

On page 76, after lines 18, of Division B, as modified, insert the following:

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, \$600,000 for completion of a biotechnology reference facility: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$600,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3969

(Purpose: To ensure that growers who experienced crop losses due to citrus canker receive appropriate compensation)

On page 83, line 5, strike the following: "and (e) compensate commercial producers for losses due to citrus canker".

On page 85, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the Federal Grants and Cooperative Agreements Act) the Secretary of agriculture shall use not more than

\$40,000,000 of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for a cooperative program with the state of Florida to replace commercial trees removed to control citrus canker and to compensate for lost production: *Provided*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, members of the Senate, I rise before you today with my colleague, Senator MACK, to offer an amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill on behalf of the Florida citrus industry.

Mr. President, if ever there was an industry in crisis, this is it.

Since last year, the Florida citrus industry has been besieged by the ravages of citrus canker.

Citrus canker is a disease that spreads rapidly through the air to infect grove after grove after grove.

There is no cure.

Once a tree becomes infected, it must be burned to the ground to prevent further spreading.

As part of an ongoing effort to eradicate citrus canker, the Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service (APHIS) issued a regulation requiring the destruction of all trees within a 1,900 foot radius of an infected tree.

The result is that hundreds of healthy trees are burned to the ground.

This government regulation is critical to eradication of citrus canker, but it increases the number of trees that are destroyed.

To date, over 1,500 acres of limes and oranges, have been burned.

In response, both the Governor and the Secretary of Agriculture declared a state of emergency in Florida due to the citrus canker outbreak.

Once destroyed, it takes between three and four years for a citrus tree to reach maturity and produce its maximum capacity of fruit.

The growers whose healthy trees are destroyed by the federal government are robbed of income today and income for the next three to four years.

I believe that the destruction of the healthy trees in accordance with federal regulation is in effect, a "federal taking" of private property for which Florida citrus producers should be compensated.

The Appropriations bill we are considering today provides the Secretary with authority to spend funds on compensation for growers who experience losses due to citrus canker.

Our amendment would mirror language in the House-passed Agriculture Appropriations bill which provides up to \$40 million for compensation of growers for citrus canker losses.

Our amendment ensures that Florida citrus growers whose trees are destroyed as a result of federal regulation are able to receive appropriate compensation.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in providing much needed assistance to an industry besieged by disease and severely impacted by a federal regulation which, while well-intentioned and important to the eradication of this disease, robs citrus growers of income from healthy trees for a three to four year period.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3970

On page 76, strike lines 6 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof:

"For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$59,400,000 to be available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That this amount shall be used for the Boll weevil eradication program for cost share purposes or for debt retirement for active eradication zones: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent on official budget request for \$59,400,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, during year 2000, the National Boll Weevil Eradication Program (BWEP) will have approximately 6.8 million acres under active eradication and treatments will be initiated on an additional 832,000 acres, bringing the total acreage in active eradication to 7.65 million acres. The states participating in treatments currently are: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

By 2001 another 2 million acres will begin eradication, and at the same time, eradication will be completed on about 1 million acres. Thus the total acreage in active eradication in 2001 will increase to 8.8 million acres. The peak year for the high costs to the participants of the eradication program will be in 2001.

Initially the BWEP operated on a 70/30 cost-share basis with the growers providing 70 percent through a pre-acre self-assessment approved by referendum and 30 percent provided through annual federal appropriations. Programs in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Arizona and portions of Alabama and Florida were completed with a 70/30 cost-share. As participating acreage rapidly expanded across the cotton belt, the federal cost-share declined from 30 percent to about 4 percent in fiscal year 2000.

With the problems American agriculture is still facing with low commodity prices, droughts, and flooding, the burden of this program at a cost-share rate of 96/4 is jeopardizing the participation in the Boll Weevil Eradication Program nationwide.

This amendment, which I am offering today to the Fiscal Year 2001 Agricultural Appropriations bill, increases the

Animal, Plant and Health Inspection Service's salaries and expenses by \$59,400,000. This amendment includes an emergency declaration which requires the President to request the full amount before the monies are appropriated.

This additional appropriation will enable APHIS to increase federal funding for is to increase the Boll Weevil Eradication Program by \$59,400,000 for 2000. This amount is needed to provide a thirty percent cost-share to farmers participating in the program. With this appropriation, farmers will be able to fully participate in the eradication program without putting another financial strain on their farm income.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3971

(Purpose: To provide financial assistance to the State of South Carolina in capitalizing the South Carolina Grain Dealers Guaranty Fund)

At the appropriate place in chapter 1 of title I of Division B, insert the following:

For an additional amount for the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance to the State of South Carolina in capitalizing the South Carolina Grain Dealers Guaranty Fund, \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That, these funds shall only be available if the State of South Carolina provides an equal amount to the South Carolina Grain Dealers Guaranty Fund: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3972

(Purpose: To restrict the use of funds to provide certain conservation assistance and authorize a transfer of funds for the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program)

On page 85, after line 8, of Division B, as modified, add the following:

SEC. (a). None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to carry out section 211 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 3830 note; Public Law 106-224) unless—

(1) the Secretary permits funds made available under section 211(b) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 to be used to provide financial or technical assistance to farmers and ranchers for the purposes described in section 211(b) of that Act; and

(2) notwithstanding section 387(c) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 3836a(c)), the Secretary permits funds made available under section 211 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 3830 note; Public Law 106-224) to be used to provide additional funding for the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program established under that section 387 in such sums as the Secretary considers necessary to carry out that Program.

(b) The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the

Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided*, That the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3973

(Purpose: To provide for assistance for emergency haying and feed operations in the State of Alabama)

In section 1107, after the first proviso insert "*Provided further*, That of the \$450,000,000 amount, the Secretary shall use not less than \$5,000,000 to provide assistance for emergency haying and feed operations in the State of Alabama:".

## AMENDMENT NO. 3974

(Purpose: To provide emergency funding to the Department of Agriculture's Rural Community Facilities program)

On page 40, line 17, after the period, insert the following:

"For an additional amount for the rural community advancement program under subtitle E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009 et seq.), \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide loans under the community facility direct and guaranteed loans program and grants under the community facilities grant program under paragraphs (1) and (19), respectively, of section 306(a) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)) with respect to areas in the State of North Carolina subject to a declaration of a major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) as a result of Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: *Provided*, That the \$50,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) *Provided further*, That the \$50,000,000 is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251 (b)(2)(A) of the Balance Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A))."

## AMENDMENT NO. 3975

(Purpose: To make emergency financial assistance available to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 2000 crop due to a disaster and to producers of specialty crops that incurred losses during the 1999 crop year due to a disaster)

At the end of chapter 1 of title I of division B, add the following:

SEC. 1108. CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use such sums as are necessary of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation (not to exceed \$450,000,000) to make emergency financial assistance available to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 2000 crop due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall make assistance available under this section in the same manner as provided under section 1102 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note; Public Law 105-277), including using the same loss thresholds as were used in administering that section.

(c) **QUALIFYING LOSSES.**—Assistance under this section may be made available for losses due to damaging weather or related condition (including losses due to scab, sclerotinia, aflatoxin, and other crop diseases) associated with crops that are, as determined by the Secretary—

(1) quantity losses (including quantity losses as a result of quality losses);

(2) quality losses; or

(3) severe economic losses.

(d) **CROPS COVERED.**—Assistance under this section shall be applicable to losses for all crops, as determined by the Secretary, due to disasters.

(e) **CROP INSURANCE.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall not discriminate against or penalize producers on a farm that have purchased crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(f) **LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PAYMENTS.**—The Secretary may use such sums as are necessary of funds made available under this section to make livestock indemnity payments to producers on a farm that have incurred losses during calendar year 2000 for livestock losses due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(g) **HAY LOSSES.**—The Secretary may use such sums as are necessary of funds made available under this section to make payments to producers on a farm that have incurred losses of hay stock during calendar year 2000 due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(h) **EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

**SEC. 1109. SPECIALTY CROPS.**—(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use such sums as are necessary of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make emergency financial assistance available to producers of fruits, vegetables, and other specialty crops, as determined by the Secretary, that incurred losses during the 1999 crop year due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) **QUALIFYING LOSSES.**—Assistance under this section may be made available for losses due to a disaster associated with specialty crops that are, as determined by the Secretary—

(1) quantity losses;

(2) quality losses; or

(3) severe economic losses.

(c) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Assistance under this section shall be applicable to losses for all specialty crops, as determined by the Secretary, due to disasters.

(d) **CROP INSURANCE.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall not discriminate against or penalize producers on a farm that have purchased crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(e) **EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency

Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3976

On page 85 after line 8 of Division B, as modified, insert:

**SEC. .** Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a payment in the amount of \$7,200,000 to the State of Hawaii from the Commodity Credit Corporation for assistance to agricultural transportation cooperative in Hawaii, the members of which are eligible to participate in the Farm Service Agency administered Commodity Loan Program and have suffered extraordinary market losses due to unprecedented low prices.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments, (Nos. 3457, 3933, 3965, 3966, 3967, 3968, 3969, 3970, 3971, 3972, 3973, 3974, 3975, and 3976), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. **COCHRAN.** I further ask consent that it not be in order in the Senate, for the remainder of the 106th Congress, to consider any bill or amendment that raises the level of emergency spending for agriculture above the level contained in this Agriculture appropriations bill as of the adoption of the above described amendments.

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

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. **GRAMM.** Mr. President, I thank Senator **STEVENS** for agreeing to this amendment. I realize that there are legitimate emergencies, but I remind my colleagues that in the last 2 years we have had \$16.6 billion of agricultural emergencies. This amendment does not guarantee that we are not going to have more. But it certainly strengthens the ability of those who want to draw the line and say that enough is enough.

So I support this agreement. I thank Senator **STEVENS** and Senator **COCHRAN.**

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. **CONRAD.** Mr. President, I thank Senator **STEVENS** as well. I thank Senator **COCHRAN** and others who helped craft this agreement—Senator **KOHL.** Because the fact is, there are real disasters and real emergencies. In my State where, on June 12, 20 inches of rain fell in 36 hours, 1 week later 8 inches of rain fell in 6 hours. It gave us this headline in the biggest paper in our State: “Swamped.” It says it all. A disaster of stunning proportions costing hundreds of millions of dollars in the major city of our State—1.7 million acres of land, of cropland, devastated. This is an emergency. It is a disaster. It must be addressed.

Through this amendment we will begin the process of healing. I thank all those who participated in this agreement.

I do want to answer the Senator from Texas when he says we have had \$14 billion of emergencies in the last 2 years. The underlying reason is a failure—

Mr. **BYRD.** Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will suspend.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. **CONRAD.** I thank the Chair, and I thank very much my colleague from West Virginia.

The reason we have had to have substantial emergency spending is because of the failure of the last farm bill. The last farm bill represents unilateral disarmament. While our major competitors, the Europeans, are spending \$50 billion a year to support their producers, we, on average, were spending \$10 billion under the previous farm bill. We cut it in half on the notion that the Europeans would follow our good example.

What a foolish tactic. We would never do that in a military confrontation, engage in unilateral disarmament. But it is precisely what we did with respect to a trade confrontation.

Agriculture has been in deep trouble and we have responded. Congress, the administration, and we thank our colleagues, for that response. But now we have been hit by unprecedented natural disasters.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will suspend. I want to get the Senate back to order.

I ask colleagues take conversations off the floor and take them to the Cloakroom. Please take your conversations to the Cloakroom.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. **CONRAD.** Again, I thank the courtesy of the Chair.

We have been hit by unprecedented natural disasters. This body has been generous in responding, whether it was in North Dakota or New Mexico. I just hope we do not ever lose that generosity of spirit in this country because none of us can predict who might be hit next.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. **DOMENICI.** Mr. President, I thank Senator **GRAMM** for working on this with me and the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee and all those who helped put an agreement together, including **TED STEVENS**, Senator **STEVENS**, and those who helped him. I really believe the discussion tonight was a very good one. Whether or not it means anything in the weeks and months to come, who knows? But, frankly, I am fully aware in that list there are some items that are really natural disasters, or disasters of one sort or another that we would compensate for. I just believe that at some point or another in the field of agriculture, and on the agricultural bill, at some point in time adding

emergencies has to kind of end. I submit there would be more than this if it would be 2 weeks from now when the agricultural bill came up.

That is my point. I really have a lot of faith and confidence in THAD COCHRAN and his minority ranking member. But I frankly believe sooner or later we ought to just face up and add to the budget and not continue to add emergencies when they are not emergencies. And certainly many of them were. I did not have a chance to look at it thoroughly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I regret to tell my friend from Texas—I have told him informally, but I will tell him formally now—we have a staggering disaster going on in Alaska right now. It is the total collapse of the fish runs in the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers that sustain a substantial number of our native villages. If this is not in this bill now, it might come in in conference, but it is going to come up sometime before this year is out. I just want to put the Senate on notice. I was talking here about the agriculture items that are in this bill now. But I do not feel bound not to represent my State later, in terms of trying to protect these people who live in rural Alaska.

I talked today to James Lee Witt who is the Federal Emergency Management Agency Director. He told me the President had asked him to work with all existing agencies to try to find out what could be done under existing law and with existing funds to deal with a disaster that is taking place as we speak. We will not know, probably, until we come back in September, what will be required. But we do expect to have some substantial problems with this disaster within the coming 5 or 6 weeks.

I hope my friend understands what I am saying to him. In this agreement we just made, that, to me, does not include the fisheries disaster that is going on now in Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I want to thank Senators COCHRAN and KOHL for staying with this issue for those of us who represent States with true disasters, true emergencies, that were not represented in the bill as it came to the Senate. We have had the worst outbreak of fire blight in our apple industry in the history of the State of Michigan. Our Governor has requested that Secretary of Agriculture Glickman grant a disaster designation for seven counties in Michigan that have been afflicted by fire blight.

I ask unanimous consent that this request be printed in the RECORD along with two newspaper articles.

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

STATE OF MICHIGAN,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Lansing, MI, June 30, 2000.

GOVERNOR REQUESTS DISASTER DESIGNATION FOR FRUIT GROWERS IN SOUTH AND SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN

Governor John Engler announced today that he has requested a United States Department of Agriculture Disaster Designation for fruit growers in South and Southeast Michigan.

Fruit trees in that region suffered from a very severe storm that brought hail, high winds and heavy rain on May 18.

That severe weather caused small wounds and scars on the leaves, limbs, and fruit of apple, cherry, apricot, plum, pear and peach trees. In the case of apples and pears, these wounds allowed the bacteria known as fire blight to enter the tree. This bacteria quickly infects the limbs, killing the leaves and fruit, eventually making its way into the roots, killing the entire tree.

It is estimated that over 2,000 acres of apple trees in the counties of Allegan, Berrien, Branch, Cass, Hillsdale, Kalamazoo and Van Buren are dead or dying, with another 5,400 acres showing severe symptoms of this insidious disease. This is the area to be covered by Governor Engler's disaster designation request.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Lansing, MI, June 29, 2000.

Hon. DAN GLICKMAN,  
Secretary of Agriculture, Administration Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GLICKMAN: A natural disaster has occurred in Michigan that will result in production and physical losses in fruit crops and fruit trees for the year 2000. Consistent with USDA policy, I am hereby alerting you within the required 90 day time period that such a condition exists.

The month of May was wet and humid throughout Southwest Michigan. More than five inches of rain fell in May alone and 15 days in May saw relative humidity above 80%. On top of this weather, a severe thunderstorm hit the area on May 18, 2000, bringing high winds very heavy rain, and hail. This storm caused severe damage to fruit trees and the fruit crop in the region. This damage was exacerbated when a bacterium, fire blight, took hold in apple and pear trees. This fire blight infection was directly related to the May 18, 2000, storm inasmuch as the hard rain and hail scarred and wounded the leaves, limbs and fruit of apple and pear trees, creating an avenue for the fire blight disease to enter the trees.

The following counties were affected: Allegan, Berrien, Branch, Cass, Hillsdale, Kalamazoo, Van Buren.

This disaster affected apples, sweet and tart cherries, apricots, plums, pears and peaches. Only apples and pears were affected by the resulting fire blight.

Damage assessment information will be forwarded to your office by the Michigan Farm Service Agency as soon as it is available. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN ENGLER,  
Governor.

Mr. LEVIN. We are always the No. 2 or No. 3 state in terms of apple production. Every year we vie with New York for who comes in second after the State of Washington. But our apple industry has suffered major devastation in southwestern Michigan. We have had the largest problem with fire blight in the history of our State. It is a true disaster. It seems to me some people

just look at the whole and ignore the parts. They also have a responsibility of looking at the parts. Our part was a disaster which we addressed in the form of an amendment providing relief on June 19. Senator COLLINS and 12 bipartisan cosponsors joined this amendment. I thank them very much for their assistance. We cover potatoes as well as apples because there has been an honest to goodness disaster emergency amongst potato growers as well.

I once again, thank the managers of this bill. I know how difficult this is. Those of us who represent States that had emergencies that were not reflected in the bill, as it came to the Senate, counted on the managers and our colleagues to do justice for our emergencies in the same way this bill, as it came to the Senate, addressed emergencies in other States.

We are deeply grateful to the managers. We thank Senator STEVENS and others who were able to work out this agreement so our true disaster could be taken care of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Wisconsin, and others, including the Senator from Alaska and my colleagues who have agreed to a compromise.

The history of disaster aid in this Congress is well over a century old. This is not a new issue. For well over a century, Congress has dealt with the issue of disasters that have occurred in some parts of this country.

I am proud of supporting disaster aid for areas of this country that suffer earthquakes, hurricanes, fires, floods, and tornadoes. In the case of the fires that recently ravaged and injured so many people and their property in New Mexico, I am proud to say that I wanted us to help them, and we did. I am proud to say I helped the folks in Los Angeles who were flattened by earthquakes, and the folks in Texas who have been injured by drought.

It is one of those areas of public spending where I say it is the best this country has to offer. When a region of this country, when its people are flat on their backs from causes that they could not control, this Congress extends its hand and says to them: You are not alone. We want to help you. We have a long tradition of doing that, and I am proud of that tradition.

In North Dakota, as my colleague indicated, late one night in June, several thunderstorms converged together and then did not move. In a State that gets 17 inches of rainfall in a year, in one spot they received 18 to 20 inches in 36 hours. Think of that. About a week and a half later, the Red River Valley, land that is dead flat, flat as a table top, received 8 inches of rain in 6 hours. They were flooded. Up to 1.7 million acres of farmland that people planted in the spring with the sweat of their brow and risked their money to plant were either destroyed or severely damaged.

We ask Congress to recognize that this, too, is a natural disaster for those producers and people who live in those areas. That is what this is about. None of us in this Chamber should ever be bashful about saying there are people in need in this country, and when that need exists because of causes they did not control or could not control—fires, hurricanes, earthquakes, floods—then we should respond.

It represents the very best impulse, in my judgment, of this body. That is what this debate is about. From our standpoint, it is especially about family farmers. As I said earlier today, they are some of the best in this country. They risk their money. They hope for a good crop. So many things are beyond their control. Then they discover that late one night a hailstorm comes through, and the crops are devastated; or a flood inundates their crops; or a drought dries them up; or the insects come and eat them out; or disease comes and their crop is gone. That is what this is about.

Mr. President, those tonight who worked for a solution to add some emergency funding to this piece of legislation have done those in need in this country a service. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are getting to a point where we are winding down on this bill. We have several more amendments, probably less than five. Some of those will be disposed of with the managers' good work. I think we should take a few minutes to see where we are. Therefore, 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. 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.

The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 3980

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. HARKIN, proposes an amendment numbered 3980.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of this amendment, which is not on the unanimous consent—

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I know a lot of Senators on both sides are wondering about the proceedings at this time. I understand there are at least a couple of amendments that may take a few minutes. And then, of course, we are not sure at this point whether they would require a recorded vote or not, and then final passage.

We still hope to get an agreement that would allow us to go to the mar-

riage penalty tonight, and have an hour of debate on that, and then continue on that tomorrow. And beyond that, we will have to get an agreement worked out.

I urge my colleagues to, if they will, agree to time limits and cooperate with the managers as much as they can. We need to finish this bill in the next 30 minutes, if we can, and get an agreement on how we proceed for the rest of tonight, tomorrow, and Monday.

So I withdraw my reservation. And I thank Senator DURBIN for allowing me to do that at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is in order.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify the effect of the provision prohibiting amendment of part 3809 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations)

In section 3102, after the first sentence insert the following: "This section does not limit the authority of the Secretary to promulgate final rules, or to revise or amend subpart 3809 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to require full financial assurance of reclamation of mining sites to protect the taxpayers from the actions of hardrock mining operations that cause damage to or destruction of public land; to prevent environmental destruction that unduly threatens fish or wildlife habitat; and to prevent pollution that threatens public health or the environment."

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, section 3102 of the Agriculture appropriations bill does not address the production of food and fiber in America. It does not address any jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. It is a provision which has been added to this bill which relates directly to hard rock mining in the United States, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

I might say, parenthetically, I found it very interesting listening to this debate on the Ag appropriations bill, and considering some of the comments that have been made on the Senate floor in the past year about limiting the subject matter of amendments and the substance of legislation.

If we can consider an Amtrak amendment on the Ag appropriations bill, and if we can consider an amendment on hard rock mining on the Ag appropriations bill, then those who come before us and say we have to have purity in the amendments we are offering and considering on the bill should remember this particular debate.

I was surprised to find that a point of order on a motion to strike, based on that point of order, would not stand because of what I consider to be a very thin connection to some language in the House appropriations bill. But the Parliamentarian advised me of that. I understand that is going to be the rule of the day around here. I suppose that is what we will play by. I am sure each side will find an advantage and disadvantage associated with that interpretation.

Allow me to address the amendment before us, and to try to do it in a very concise way, knowing that everyone

has waited a long time. I have waited for 8½ hours to offer this amendment.

Let me say at the outset, we are dealing with the hard rock mining industry. An effort is being made, with the language in this Agriculture appropriations bill, to stop the Department of the Interior from issuing new regulations to make sure that this industry follows the best practices to protect the taxpayers of this country and the environment.

To put it in perspective, just this May the Environmental Protection Agency released its Toxics Release Inventory report. It identified the hard rock mining industry in the United States as our Nation's largest toxic polluter.

The mining industry released 3.5 billion pounds of toxic pollution in 1998. I will repeat that. The mining industry released 3.5 billion pounds of toxic pollution in 1998. Almost half of all of the toxic pollution in America comes from this industry, which is being protected by this amendment in the Agriculture appropriations bill.

The U.S. Bureau of Mines has identified 12,000 miles of American streams and 180,000 acres of American lakes polluted by mining. The EPA has listed 27 hard rock mines as Superfund sites. It is time for us to update the 19-year-old regulations that protect public lands managed by the BLM from the environmental impact of hard rock mining.

These regulations, commonly referred to as 3809 regulations, help the BLM comply with Federal land policy. They direct the Secretary of the Interior to "take any action necessary to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation on the federal lands."

Since these regulations were first promulgated in 1981, the whole hard rock mining industry has changed in America. New technologies have allowed the industry to expand tenfold. New exploration techniques have resulted in capabilities unknown 20 years ago. Larger excavation equipment allows ores to be mined from larger and deeper pits and has made open-pit mining feasible in areas where it would not have been feasible before.

Just as the mining industry has modernized, so too should the regulations that protect the environment and the taxpayers. Those who would put this amendment in this bill are stopping the modernization of those regulations designed to protect public lands, the environment, and the taxpayers.

As I explain one aspect of this, you will understand that the provision in this particular section of the Ag bill will result in literally hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars, of liability to the taxpayers of today and tomorrow.

The need to update these regulations has been recognized a long time. The BLM established a task force in 1989 to look them over. President Bush expected it to be done in short order, and it still has not happened.

There has been a steady stream of reports. This is, as best we can tell—this



rider introduced by Senators MURKOWSKI and CRAIG—the fifth attempt in 4 years to block the Department of the Interior from implementing stronger environmental regulations on hard rock mining.

Last year, there was a compromise. The compromise said we are not just going to give this assignment to the Department of Interior. We are going to give it to a group, the National Research Council, that is associated with the National Academy of Sciences and ask them to come up with recommendations for new regulations on this industry to protect the environment. In fact, what this particular rider does, this environmental rider on this Ag bill, is to stop the implementation of most of the recommendations that came forward from the National Research Council.

Let me tell the Senate why we need stronger regulations. First, any group that starts to mine on these public lands usually has to post a bond. It is a financial assurance that their activities on these lands will not in any way destroy the environment, and that ultimately the land will be reclaimed and the stabilization and vegetation of the land will be restored. Sadly, in many instances, these hard rock mining companies will post bonds that are literally worthless, corporate bonds, for example, and when the company goes bankrupt, they are of no value or little value at all. I will give a few examples a little later on of where these bonds have failed us and we have found the taxpayers holding the bag.

Reclamation bonds are meant to ensure that companies do not declare bankruptcy and leave taxpayers responsible for the cleanup bill. The current bonding requirements don't work. In example after example, in Idaho, in Montana, in South Dakota, we find that these companies have gone bankrupt, the bonds don't cover the expenses, and the taxpayers end up holding the bag. The recommendation from the National Research Council, which I hold here, was that we change that assurance, that financial assurance to protect the taxpayers. This environmental rider stops that reform. It makes certain that the taxpayers don't have that protection.

A recent study by the National Wildlife Federation and the Center for Science and Public Participation found that American taxpayers are facing as much as \$1.1 billion in liability for restoring hard rock mines in the Western U.S. because current reclamation bonding regulations are inadequate. In Nevada alone, as of 1999, 13 mines have gone bankrupt. As of May 2000, at least 29 mines are bankrupt. Most of these mines were bonded by corporate guarantees. Just one single mine, the Yerington mine, could cost American taxpayers up to \$40 to \$80 million to clean up. The effort to put real bonding requirements in the law to protect the taxpayers and the environment will be stopped by this environmental rider.

Also, there is a question of environmental performance standards. These standards have to be adjusted to reflect modern mining practices. Let me give an example. One technique that is now being used, heap leaching, is increasingly common. Millions of tons of ore are extracted and piled in heaps on lined pads often hundreds of feet high. This post illustrates what I am discussing. To give Senators an idea of what we are talking about, this is a hard rock mining site. To put it in perspective, we can barely see this tiny dot down here, a large over-the-road truck, to give an idea of the heaps of ore. Under the heap leaching process, a cyanide solution for gold or silver or sulfuric acid for copper is sprayed in open air over the pile so that ultimately it will leach the mineral from the ore. As I said earlier, it is this use of cyanide and sulfuric acid that has led to hard rock mining being the No. 1 toxic polluter in the United States of America.

The mining industry has released 3.5 billion pounds of toxic pollution in 1998. In addition, we have to say that many of these agencies, like BLM and the Forest Service, need to have the right to deny mining in highly sensitive areas, particularly areas that are adjacent to national forests, national parks, and populated areas where they can cause great damage.

Let me tell my colleagues about one particular mine as an example, the Zortman-Landusky mine in Montana. The Zortman-Landusky mine is located in the Little Rocky Mountains of north central Montana. ZL is an open-pit mine, one of the world's first large-scale cyanide heap leach gold mines and the largest gold mine in Montana when operations began in 1979. Lack of standards on pad construction allowed the company to overload its leach pads leading to cyanide releases in the nearby streams and potential health problems for the local communities. The Canadian Pacific company, Pegasus Gold, Incorporated, that owned the mine, went bankrupt in 1998. It left a bond to protect the damage it had created in the amount of \$61.9 million. The actual cleanup cost for this site is estimated at approximately \$70 million, leaving nearly \$8.6 million to be picked up by the taxpayers.

I would like to read for you for a moment a comment not from an environmental group, not from some eastern group of tree huggers, if you will, but from the Daily Missoulian. This is an editorial, Sunday, August 29, 1999, Missoula, MT. Referring to this particular mine, in their editorial entitled "Miners Offer Regulators Some Hard Lessons from Montana"—my friends, the Western States where these mines are located:

Pegasus' bankruptcy has been an eye-opening experience for State regulators. Among the lessons learned:

It's a mistake to assume the companies that develop mines will stay around—or even exist—when it comes time to clean the mines up.

Reclamation plans that presume miners will reclaim their own mines understate the actual cost when miners go out of business or skip out. Everything becomes more expensive when the state has to hire contractors for the work.

The third lesson directly impacts the environmental rider which we are considering on this bill:

Reclamation bonds required to insure cleanup may not be worth as much as expected. At least some of the insurance companies that issue reclamation bonds would rather fight than pay, forcing the state to rack up legal expenses or accept lesser settlements.

It goes on to say:

Look hard around the state [of Montana], and you won't find a single example of a large-scale hard-rock mine successfully reclaimed.

Taxpayers and the environment aren't the only losers when the reclamation plants go awry. Miners haven't done their industry any favors, either. Mining is controversial enough, even when people focus on jobs and profits. Leaving citizens in the State with big messes and big bills to pay after the mines play out is a good way to wear out your welcome.

Incidentally, in this same Missoula, MT, editorial, they go on to praise the coal mining in the State which has modernized its practices and is considered more responsible by these editorial writers.

Because the hour is late, I will not go through the five or six examples that I have of mines in Idaho, in South Dakota, which have literally been abandoned because of bankruptcy, leaving the taxpayers holding the bag for millions, almost \$1 billion in liability.

This environmental rider stops the Department from coming up with meaningful bonds. Quite honestly, it means that those who exploit public lands and leave an environmental mess behind and threats to the public health frankly make a fool out of Uncle Sam and American taxpayers. That is what this environmental rider does.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate, as I close, what I am offering in this amendment is as follows: We should give the Bureau of Land Management and the Department of the Interior the authority to promulgate rules which will require full financial assurance of reclamation of mining sites. I state specifically the goals that we are seeking: To protect the taxpayers from the actions of hard rock mining operations that cause damage to or destruction of public lands, to prevent environmental destruction that unduly threatens fish or wildlife habitat, and to prevent toxic pollution that threatens public health or the environment.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator respond to a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to respond.

Mr. JOHNSON. I represent a western gold mining State. I have just returned recently from examining the Brohm site in the beautiful Black Hills of South Dakota where the Brohm Mining Company has gone bankrupt with approximately a \$5 million bond. That site has now been declared a Superfund

site. It is now going to cost the Federal taxpayers approximately \$27 million because of the inadequacy of the bond at this site. It is going to cost the taxpayers of the State of South Dakota in perpetuity tens of millions of dollars to monitor the streams and the environment around that bankrupt site.

Is the Senator telling us that without the amendment he is offering here, we will continue to see these inadequate bonds and these costs being shifted to the taxpayers to pick up the cost of mining companies—oftentimes foreign mining companies—that have spoiled our land and then walk on?

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct. I think it is important that a Senator from a State where this mining is taking place has come to share this story. This is not just testimony presented by environmental groups. These are the real-life circumstances of people in Western States, where the mining is taking place, who are left with a mess when the mines go bankrupt.

This environmental rider stops us from revising and reforming the financial assurance language and requiring bonds of companies that literally will protect the communities and the taxpayers and families around these mining sites. That is what it is all about. That is the bottom line.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues in the Senate. I have waited for a long time to offer this. I will not labor it. I hope they will join me in passing this amendment, which will establish standards which I think are reasonable to make sure this industry can continue but only in a responsible way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN to amend Section 3102 of the Agriculture Appropriation bill.

Section 3102 is the latest edition in a series of riders that have prevented the Clinton Administration from reforming hardrock mining on public lands by putting in place sound environmental and fiscal protections. In past debates, proponents of these riders have argued that the hardrock mining industry has reformed its ways. They acknowledge that mining companies have made mistakes in the past. How could they not? The facts are overwhelming: More than 300,000 acres of federal lands have not been reclaimed. There are more than 2,000 abandoned mines in national parks. There are 59 Superfund sites at former mines across the country. The Mineral Policy Center estimates that the cleanup costs for abandoned mines on public and private lands may reach \$72 billion. But after acknowledging this legacy of environmental damage, the proponents of these riders argue it is the result of decisions made 50 or 60 years ago—before we knew better—before we understood that there are limits to what the environment can withstand. They tell us that a new environmental consciousness, sensitivity and awareness have taken root in the

industry, and today's mines are safe because they utilize modern technology and practices.

This is an important point, Mr. President. It deserves a response. I'm not out to punish the mining industry for mistakes of the past. I recognize that the mining industry has made improvements and that not all mining operations result in environmental disaster. The March 2000 National Geographic has an excellent article on the hardrock mining industry. It discusses the history of the mining in the West, its cultural heritage, its economic contribution, and its unfortunate legacy of environmental ruin. It also talks about some of the new efforts underway to lessen mining's impact on the environment. It describes Homestake Mining Company's McLaughlin gold mine near Lower Lake, California as a safe mine. The McLaughlin operation recycles and contains all processed water, the 600-acre tailings pond will eventually be converted into wetlands, and a monitoring system watches for contamination of ground water. Sierra Club and the Mineral Policy Center—two groups sharply and appropriately critical of mining operations—have praised this operation. Homestake's environmental manager at the site told National Geographic that, "When you look at the total environmental cost, it's roughly 2 percent of our capital costs for the whole project. We want to protect the our stockholders' investment. Creating an environmental liability doesn't serve their interests or ours."

I am confident that McLaughlin is not the only operation that is working and caring for the land, but it's just not true to say that the entire industry is reformed. There are bad actors and mistakes happen, and that is why we need tougher standards.

I urge my colleagues to look at the record of the Hecla Mining Company's Grouse Creek Mine in the Salmon-Challis National Forest in Idaho. The Grouse Creek Mine opened in 1994 with great expectations. It was precisely the kind of operation we've heard about on the Senate floor: a new mine operated under a new environmental ethic, and presumably an example of why we don't need tougher protections. In August 1995, Mr. Michael White, the Vice President and General Counsel of the Hecla Mining Company, testified before the Senate that, "The Grouse Creek Mine is a state-of-the-art facility and has been constructed not only to meet, but to exceed, existing environmental requirements." Mr. White continued, "For example, road improvements that included sediment catch basins actually reduced sediment impact to Jordan Creek compared to preexisting conditions." Let me be clear: Mr. White promised us a state-of-the-art facility that would exceed existing environmental requirements, and he went even further to promise that the Grouse Creek Mine would actually improve the environment by reducing the sediment runoff into Jordan Creek.

Hecla's chairman, Arthur Brown, said in 1995 of Grouse Creek that, "Minimizing the environmental impact is a strong focus of Hecla." A Hecla company spokeswoman said in 1995, "We believe that we need to take care of the land we are using; it's just good stewardship." The former Governor of Idaho, Cecil Andrus added his praise, saying "Hecla has met every requirement we've asked of them. I can show you a thousand sins of the past that we need to clean up but modern mining is a plus." And the accolades continued: The Idaho Department of Lands nominated the mine for an award, and Hecla employees were honored by the US Department of Agriculture for their environmental work.

It is now only 6 years later, and Grouse Creek is an environmental disaster. In 1996—only two years after the mine opened—the Environmental Protection Agency fined Hecla \$85,000 for violating its wastewater permit. EPA found cyanide and mercury discharges that exceeded their limits by more than five times the allowed levels for over a year, and the mine was cited for excessive sediment discharge into Jordan Creek. In April 1999, Idaho officials found cyanide leaking into a stream that is habitat for the endangered chinook salmon, steelhead trout and bull trout. The cyanide levels were more than 12 times the concentrations at which chronic exposure harms fish. The environmental legacy of the now-closed mine is a tailings impoundment holding 450 million gallons of cyanide-laced water and 4.3 million tons of heavy metals. Can you imagine? The General Counsel of Hecla, Michael Smith, actually testified before the Senate in 1995 that the mine would actually improve the environmental quality of Jordan Creek. Within less than five years the operation was cited for loading Jordan Creek with excessive sediments and cyanide. The fiscal legacy is just as bad. A May editorial in the Idaho Falls Post Register reports that Hecla may walk away from the environmental mess it has created if the cost of cleanup exceeds \$28 million. Before opening the mine, Hecla was only required to put up a bond of \$7 million, and the company reported \$120 million in losses before closing the mine. Maybe Hecla will reclaim the land, maybe it won't—it's too early to judge that issue—but clearly a system that allows part of a national forest to be turned into a toxic waste site, and leaves us negotiating cleanup, is in need of reform. And, Mr. President, more importantly, this didn't happen 50 years ago or 60 years ago. It happened 6 years ago.

Grouse Creek isn't the only unfortunate example of the "modern" mining industry's environmental troubles. The Phelps Dodge Mining Corporation's Chino copper mine near Santa Rita, New Mexico has dumped more than 180 million gallons of contaminated wastewater into Whitewater Creek since 1987. In 1990, rainwater flushed 324,000

gallons of wastewater out of the Ray Complex mine site and into the Gila River in Arizona. Shortly after opening in 1986 the Summitville gold mine in southern Colorado began leaking cyanide, acid and heavy metals into 17 miles of the Alamosa River. Its owner is now bankrupt, the mine closed and the land has been declared a Superfund site.

We need reform. Today's debate is not about sins of the past or punishing the mining industry. It is about ending a system that sells public land for as little as \$2.50 per acre. A system that has allowed more than \$240 billion worth of minerals to be excavated from public lands and does not collect a cent in royalties. A system that, despite all the excuses and promises, continues to allow the land to be damaged. We should not have to depend on the goodwill of the mining industry to protect public land—the rules should be clear, they should be strong and they should be enforced. American citizens should not carry the burden of fiscal and environmental irresponsibility.

I thank Senator DURBIN for moving to amend the hardrock mining rider. I urge other my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, under rule XVI of the Senate, this is legislation on an appropriations bill. I raise a point of order against it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I raise the defense of germaneness, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The Chair submits to the Senate the question, Is the amendment germane?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 36, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Akaka	Graham	Reed
Bayh	Gregg	Robb
Biden	Harkin	Rockefeller
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Roth
Cleland	Johnson	Sarbanes
Collins	Kohl	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Snowe
Durbin	Lautenberg	Specter
Edwards	Leahy	Torricelli
Feingold	Levin	Voivovich
Feinstein	Lieberman	Wellstone
Fitzgerald	Lincoln	Wyden

NAYS—56

Abraham	Domenici	McCain
Allard	Dorgan	McConnell
Ashcroft	Enzi	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bingaman	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Santorum
Bryan	Helm	Sessions
Burns	Helms	Shelby
Byrd	Hollings	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Conrad	Inhofe	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
Daschle	Lugar	Warner
DeWine	Mack	

NOT VOTING—7

Boxer	Kennedy	Murray
Bunning	Kerrey	
Inouye	Kerry	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 36, the nays are 56. The judgment of the Senate is that the amendment is not germane. The amendment falls.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I have two amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I have two amendments, one of which I am not going to offer.

I have an amendment which establishes the Trade Injury Compensation Act of 2000. This measure is identical to my bill, S. 2709, which enjoys wide bipartisan support by my fellow members of Senate Beef Caucus and has already been referred to the Senate Agriculture Committee.

The Trade Injury Compensation Act establishes a Beef Industry Compensation Trust Fund to help the United States cattle industry withstand the European Union's illegal ban on beef treated with hormones.

Over a year ago, the World Trade Organization endorsed retaliation when the EU refused to open to American beef. Since that time, the EU has continued to stall in its compliance which is frankly, outrageous. For over a decade we've fought the beef battle. Now its time to try something new to help producers who continue to be injured by the ban.

The Trade Injury Compensation Act establishes a mechanism for using the tariffs imposed on the EU to directly aid U.S. beef producers. Normally, the additional tariff revenues received from retaliation go to the Treasury. This bill establishes a trust fund so that the affected industry will receive those revenues as compensation for its injury.

Mr. President, my amendment creates a fund which provides assistance to United States beef producers to improve the quality of beef produced in

the United States; and provides assistance to United States beef producers in market development, consumer education, and promotion of the beef industry in overseas markets.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cease the transfer of funds equivalent to the duties on the beef retaliation list only when the European Union complies with the World Trade Organization ruling allowing United States beef producers access to the European market.

In a perfect world we would not need this amendment because the European Union would abide by its international trade commitments. And it is still my hope that the European Union simply comply with the WTO Dispute Settlement rulings and allow our beef to enter its borders.

Mr. President, the WTO is a critically important institution that sets the foundation and framework to make world trade grow.

We all recognize that it needs improvement, and I, along with many of my colleagues, are working on ways to fix it. We must bring credibility and compliance to the system. The Trade Injury Compensation Act will give some relief to our producers as we strive toward this endeavor.

Mr. President, I realize that we still have work to do in perfecting this amendment. That is why I appreciate my colleague Senator LUGAR's commitment to allow an Agriculture Subcommittee hearing on this bill in September.

In light of that impending hearing, I will not offer the amendment at this time.

Time is of the essence for our producers who have been injured by the European Union. I look forward to this hearing and further expeditious action in this matter.

AMENDMENT NO. 3981

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] proposes an amendment numbered 3981.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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 direct the Secretary of the Army to conduct a restudy of the project for navigation, Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, North Carolina, to evaluate alternatives to the authorized inlet stabilization project at Oregon Inlet)

Strike section 3104 and insert the following:

SEC. 3104. STUDY OF OREGON INLET, NORTH CAROLINA, NAVIGATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army, shall have conducted, and submitted to Congress, a restudy of the project for navigation, Manteo (Shallowbag)

Bay, North Carolina, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1818), to evaluate all reasonable alternatives, including nonstructural alternatives, to the authorized inlet stabilization project at Oregon Inlet.

(b) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army shall—

(1) take into account the views of affected interests; and

(2)(A) take into account objectives in addition to navigation, including—

(i) complying with the policies of the State of North Carolina regarding construction of structural measures along State shores; and

(ii) avoiding or minimizing adverse impacts to, or benefiting, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge; and

(B) develop options that meet those objectives.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment has been agreed to by my good friend, the ever gracious senior Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment strikes the provision in the bill that transfers portions of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge from the Department of the Interior to the Army Corps of Engineers. It also requires the Army Corps to conduct a study within 180 days of alternatives, including nonstructural alternatives, to the currently authorized inlet stabilization project at Oregon Inlet. This study would have to take into account objectives in addition to navigation, such as the policies of the State of North Carolina regarding construction of structural measures along the coast and minimizing adverse impacts to the national seashore and the wildlife refuge. Most importantly, the study would have to develop recommendations to meet those objectives. I hope this study will provide a sound basis on which Congress can resolve this issue.

I believe this amendment will be fair to the people of North Carolina and also to the American taxpayers.

The senior Senator from North Carolina has been very helpful in working out this amendment. I appreciate his efforts.

Mr. President, to reiterate, my amendment would replace section 3104 of the bill, which transfers land from the Interior Department of the Corps of Engineers in order to circumvent environmental rules and promote the construction of a system of jetties at Oregon Inlet in North Carolina.

Some background about the Oregon Inlet project.

At the outset, let me acknowledge the obvious. I'm no expert about Oregon Inlet.

Senator HELMS is. He has been working on this issue for at least 30 years.

I am simply trying to react to an appropriations rider by mustering the facts as well as I can.

Oregon Inlet is on the Outer Banks of North Carolina, near Roanoke Island. It is the only inlet between Cape Henry, Virginia, 45 miles to the north and Cape Hatteras, 85 miles to the south.

Like much of the Outer Banks, the Inlet is a dynamic ecosystem, with high waves, swift currents, and a rapidly shifting sandbar at the mouth of the Inlet.

Make no mistake. It is treacherous water. Between 1965 and 1995, more than 20 ships sank or ran aground, with the loss of 22 lives.

I should not, though, that all but one of the deaths occurred before the early 1980s, when the Corps began a dredging program.

In 1970, at the urging of Senator HELMS, Congress enacted legislation authorizing the Corps of Engineers to construct a jetty system at Oregon Inlet.

Specifically, the Corps was directed to deepen the navigation channel through the Inlet from 14 feet to 20 feet and to maintain that channel with two jetties.

It gets more complicated. And much has changed since 1970.

The jetties would prevent the natural flow of sand from north to south. That flow is what replenishes Pea Island, a national wildlife refuge which otherwise would erode.

To counteract this effect, the system includes a system of pipes and pumps that will transport 2 million cubic feet of sand each year.

All told the project will cost American taxpayers \$108 million to construct and about \$6 million a year to maintain. We all know it will cost more than that.

The project would be built on: the northern part, on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore; and the southern part on the Pea Island Wildlife Refuge.

Therefore, before the Corps can build the project, it must get permits from the Interior Department, confirming that the project will be compatible with the Seashore and the Refuge.

The provision that has been included in the Agriculture appropriations bill, as section 3104, effectively eliminates this permit requirement. It transfers the land from the Interior Department to the Corps, so that permits no longer are necessary.

Those are the basic facts.

Now, some of you listening may be scratching your head, wondering what's going on here. After all, the project was authorized in 1970. Thirty years later, it still hasn't been built. That, you might be thinking, is unacceptable. It's probably because of Government red tape.

Maybe it's high time we cut through all the red tape and move this project along, as the bill would do.

An understandable reaction, if you just look at this on the surface. But, as is often the case, if you dig a little deeper, and get past the surface, it's not that simple.

The principal reason that the project has not been built is that the project is very questionable and very controversial. Many have argued that the project will cause great environmental harm and waste more than one hundred million dollars of taxpayers' money.

Time after time, Interior Secretaries have refused to grant the necessary permits. Including I should note, President Reagan's Interior Secretary, James Watt.

The only exception was when Secretary Lujan granted a permit towards the end of the Bush Administration. Soon after taking office, Secretary Babbitt reversed the decision.

Also time after time, the environmental impact statements developed by the Corps have been found to be inadequate, and the Corps has been sent back to the drawing board.

As we speak, the process continues. The Corps has been asked to revise its latest Environmental Impact Statement, to address what the National Marine Fisheries Service called "significant errors and inadequacies."

As I understand it, the revised EIS will be submitted to Corps headquarters around the end of this month and issued in August.

After that, the Corps can move ahead and again seek permits from the Interior Department. If there is a dispute, it will be resolved by the White House.

Section 3104 of the bill circumvents this process by transferring the land and therefore eliminating the need for any permits.

Mr. President, I am sympathetic to the concerns of Senator HELMS and others who support this project. I know that they're frustrated that this project has drawn on too long.

But I believe that the approach taken in the bill has four main faults.

The first goes to process. The provision in the bill is, simply put, a rider. It is authorizing legislation, properly within the jurisdiction of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

This is a controversial issue; it has been debated, back and forth, for thirty years. It should be resolved on the merits, with input from the committee of jurisdiction. It should not be resolved as a rider on an unrelated appropriations bill.

The second fault is that the bill may cause serious environmental harm.

This is, again, a dynamic ecosystem. Always shifting. Always changing.

As this chart shows, there have been major changes in the geography of Oregon Inlet over the years. The Inlet itself has shifted south by about 80 feet a year, which amounts to more than two miles since the Inlet opened in 1848.

In the middle of this dynamic, shifting system, the project would construct a pair of rock jetties that are a total of more than 3 miles long.

That poses two big risks.

In the first place, we'll be altering the natural system by which the ocean erodes and then replenishes the barrier islands along the coast.

As it now stands, each year, tons of sand shift, mostly from north to south, replenishing Pea Island. The jetties will block most of that sand from shifting naturally. To compensate, the Corps plans to pump about 2 million

cubic feet of sand each year, that will be trapped above the north jetty, through a large pipeline, and unload it below the south jetty.

Maybe it will work. But what if it doesn't?

Consider what happened on Assateague Island. 60 years ago, we constructed a jetty. It blocked the sand from replenishing the southern part of the island. Since then, the coastline has eroded about one-half mile.

Another thing. We'll alter the natural flow of water through what is now a broad, relatively shallow inlet leading to Albermarle and Pamlico Sounds. The Sounds contain important and productive habitats for several species of fish, including Spanish mackerel, Atlantic croaker, and gray trout.

These fish spawn at sea. The larval fish then migrate into the calm waters of the sounds where they grow until they're strong enough to return to the ocean.

It is not at all clear that these fish will be able to make it through the jetties. The fishery biologists just aren't sure.

So we are taking major environmental risks.

The third major fault is that the economics don't add up.

True, the Corps projects an economic benefit, of about \$37 million over a 50 year period.

However, as we all know, the Corps' economic analysis has come under heavy criticism lately.

In any event, many people have questioned the Corps' estimate of the cost and benefits of this project.

I am not talking about environmental groups, which, it might be argued, have their own agenda.

I am talking about Taxpayers for Common Sense, and several distinguished economists who have studied the project.

For example, Professor Richard Seldon, who I understand is a distinguished professor emeritus at the University of Virginia, said this:

My extremely conservative analysis of the Corps' data found that rather than the almost \$37 million of net benefits claimed for the project by the Corps . . . this project will have negative benefits of [more than \$4 million]. In fact, I believe the project is very likely to have a much worse return on investment based on many costs thus far not accounted for by the Corps.

In a letter sent to Senator HELMS a few days ago, Professor Emeritus Seldon said.

I am convinced that these jetties should not be built—not for environmental reasons but simply because the benefits claimed by the Corps are nowhere near as large as the likely cost to taxpayers. This is a bad economic deal, even if we forget about the environment.

The fourth fault is that I believe there's a better way.

Let me say again that I understand the frustration that Senator HELMS and others in North Carolina feel about this project.

They have serious concerns. One is safety. Again, these are treacherous waters.

Another is economic development. As I understand it, this is an area that could use the economic boost that increased fish landings might provide.

I'm not going to stand here and say that environmental concerns should prevail over safety and economic development. Not a all.

I don't buy that, whether we're talking about Montana, North Carolina, or anyplace else. We have to strike a balance.

But here is the rub. There may be a better way.

We may be able to achieve all the benefits that would be achieved by constructing the jetties, and do it much more cheaply and without the environmental risks.

Here is how. By dredging a better channel.

We could direct the Corps to dredge the Inlet deeper and more often.

But there is a problem. In the most recent EIs the Corps has studied only one non-structural alternative. One that would have more than doubled this width of the channel. It's no surprise that the costs outweighed the benefits. So, for at least 30 years, we haven't fully considered whether there's a better alternative to the jetty system.

In addition there are many more factors to consider—environmental, recreational, and so forth—then there were in 1970.

That brings me to my amendment.

It deletes the provision in the bill that transfers the land, thereby circumventing the permitting process.

Instead, the amendment requires that, within 180 days the Corps, must evaluate alternatives to the jetty project, including dredging.

In doing so, the Corps must consider the views of affected interests, must consider how various alternatives accord with North Carolina's shoreline protection laws, and must minimize adverse environmental effects.

Mr. President, pulling this all together, we need to do more to improve safety at Oregon Inlet.

But the jetty system that we authorized in 1970 is an idea whose time has probably gone.

We do not need 3 miles of granite rock jetties. We don't need 2 miles of pipeline, to pump 2 million cubic feet of sand every year.

We do not need huge environmental risks.

We do not need to ask taxpayers to fork over \$108 million.

Instead, we should step back, take stock, and see whether we can solve the problems at Oregon Inlet in a way that avoids big environmental risks and saves taxpayers' money.

Therefore, I urge colleagues to support my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent a statement of administration policy by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget listing the Administration's strong objection to the underlying provision in the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S. 2536—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2001—(SPONSOR: STEVENS (R) AK)

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the FY 2001 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The President's FY 2001 budget is based on a balanced approach that maintains fiscal discipline, eliminates the national debt, extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, provides for an appropriately sized tax cut, establishes a new voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit in the context of broader reforms, expands health care coverage to more families, and funds critical investments for our future. An essential element of this approach is ensuring adequate funding for discretionary programs. To this end, the President has proposed discretionary spending limits at levels that we believe are necessary to serve the American people.

Unfortunately, the FY 2001 congressional budget resolution provides inadequate resources for discretionary investments. We need realistic levels of funding for critical government functions that the American people expect their government to perform well, including education, national security, law enforcement, environmental protection, preservation of our global leadership, air safety, food safety, economic assistance for the less fortunate, research and technology, and the administration of Social Security and Medicare. Based on the inadequate budget resolution, this bill fails to address critical needs of the American people.

The bill includes inadequate funding for food safety, conservation and environmental programs, farm loans, bioterrorism, agricultural research through competitive grants and other important programs. In addition, there are a number of objectionable language provisions in the Committee bill.

It is our understanding that a substitute will be offered to the supplemental title of the bill that will include a number of highly objectionable environmental and other riders, including a provision to facilitate construction of the Oregon Inlet jetties prior to completion of a pending environmental impact statement, restrictions that would attempt to weaken pending hardrock mining regulations, and other objectionable provisions. The Administration opposes the bill in its current form. If such riders are included in the bill, the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

FY 2000 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS BILL

Objectionable Legislative Riders—The Administration opposes the environmental and other authorization provisions contained in the bill, which are inappropriate for inclusion in an appropriations act. Such riders rarely receive the level of congressional and public review required of authorization language, and they often override existing environmental protections or impose unjustified micro-management restrictions on agency activities.

More detailed views will be provided when the text of the substitute is made available. Therefore, the views expressed here are necessarily preliminary.

Oregon Inlet (NC) Jetties.—The Administration strongly opposes the provision to remove lands from the Cape Hatteras National

Seashore and the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, prior to completion of a pending environmental impact statement (EIS) on proposals to maintain navigation through Oregon Inlet, N.C. This rider would undermine the EIS process by selecting one option—the construction of a dual jetty and sand transfer system—before a decision on alternatives can be made. There remain significant questions about the long-term environmental impacts and the economic justifications of the dual jetty option, and those questions need to be answered before considering any legislation to remove land from a national park and a national wildlife refuge.

Restrictions on Hardrock Mining Regulations.—The Administration strongly objects to the bill's attempt to weaken pending final regulations on the management of hardrock mining on public lands. These overdue regulations are needed to address the major changes in technology and mining industry practices since the regulations were last updated in 1980. The proposed rider would also attempt to reopen an agreement reached in negotiations on the FY 2000 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill to allow the final rule to go forward, as long as it was "not inconsistent" with the recommendations of a recent National Research Council (NRC) report. The rider would now attempt to limit the rule to only a specific subset of the NRC report's recommendations. By doing so, the rider could hinder the effective regulation of industry practices (such as large-scale cyanide leaching for gold on public lands) that have become increasingly prevalent over the past 20 years.

Community Builders, Sec. 2602.—The Administration urges deletion of the highly objectionable, micro-management language in Section 2602, which would prohibit the Department of Housing and Urban Development from hiring replacement staff for 350 community builder positions.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. BAUCUS. In addition, I ask that a letter from the organization Taxpayers For Common Sense be printed in the RECORD. It is very much opposed to the underlying provision and in favor of this amendment, as well as a statement by Dr. Seldon, a very respected economist who studied this issue extensively.

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

JULY 20, 2000.

Re Baucus substitute amendment on Oregon Inlet

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BAUCUS: Taxpayers for Common Sense Action thank you for your leadership in opposing the anti-taxpayer Oregon Inlet rider that Senator HELMS added to the Agriculture Appropriations bill. TCS Action strongly supports your substitute amendment to provide for an expedited Corps of Engineers/Interior Department study of cheaper alternatives. In addition, TCS supports commitment of a few million dollars for improved interim dredging. TCS Action will likely score the vote on this Baucus amendment on TCS Action's annual Common Sense Taxpayer Scorecard.

As you know, the Oregon Inlet rider would transfer federally-protected land from the Department of Interior to the Corps of Engineers, thereby removing one of the last remaining obstacles to construction of twin mile-long stone jetties at a cost of \$108 million. Anyone who has ever been to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore on North Caro-

lina's famed Outer Banks understands intuitively that the Oregon Inlet project would be a massive waste of taxpayer money. Moreover, six major newspapers in North Carolina have editorialized against the project. Typically, the Raleigh (NC) News and Observer editorialized May 12:

"Decisions on the jetties properly have to be made on the merits of arguments for and against them, not because lawmakers have been intimidated by a tactic such as the one Helms is attempting. And on those merits, despite supporter' good intentions, the jetties shape up as an extraordinary boondoggle."

The anti-taxpayer rider is strongly opposed by a broad coalition. Meanwhile, a 1999 independent review of the Corps' benefit-cost analysis by Dr. Richard Selden of the University of Virginia on behalf of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service demonstrated the project's benefits do not outweigh the costs. The project will provide a \$500,000 federal subsidy for each of 215 charter or commercial fishing boats that will purportedly benefit. Instead, routine channel dredging has worked for the last 30 years. Surely, it is reasonable to study all alternatives to the Oregon Inlet project before giving the green light to this massive waste of taxpayer money opposed by the last five administrations.

Thank you again for your leadership to propose a reasonable compromise solution on this issue.

Sincerely,

RALPH DEGENNARO,  
President & CEO.

JULY 16, 2000.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,  
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: I write you as a staunch Republican and a conservative economist who got his Ph.D. under Milton Friedman at the University of Chicago. I am definitely not a "tree hugger." I have never belonged to the Sierra Club or any other activist environmental group.

I am writing because I'm concerned about your support for the Corps of Engineers' proposal to build jetties at Oregon Inlet. I know you have declared yourself in favor of this project on many occasions, extending over many years, and I can see the practical difficulty of withdrawing your support at this juncture. Nevertheless, I am convinced that these jetties should not be built—not for environmental reasons but simply because the benefits claimed by the Corps are nowhere near as large as the likely cost to taxpayers. This is a bad economic deal, even if we forget about the environment.

You may wonder whether there is a valid basis for my strong negative opinion of the Corps' proposal. Last summer I did a benefit/cost analysis of the proposal as a private consultant hired by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (You may wonder about the objectivity of a study that was commissioned by an agency that opposes the jetties. All I can say is that I examined a ton of material on the proposal, and I tried to apply accepted economic analysis to all of it, regardless of the source.) My findings were clearcut and unambiguous: there is no way these jetties can pass a standard benefit/cost test.

You may also wonder whether my conclusions would be accepted by most other fair-minded economists. I would be glad to have my work scrutinized by a neutral panel (assuming one could be found!). But I can assure you with complete confidence that the benefit/cost analysis provided by the Corps is full of flaws and would be accepted as valid by few if any professional economists. This simply is not an appropriate basis for com-

mitting over \$100 million of taxpayer money! At the very least the Corps should be required to submit its analysis to some outside panel for a thorough critique before they get a green light on this one.

By US Postal Service I am mailing you a copy of my August 1999 report, and I will welcome reactions from you or your staff.

Sincerely,

RICHARD T. SELDEN, Ph.D.

Mr. BAUCUS. Finally, I underline my appreciation for the hard work of both Senators from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, as well as Mr. EDWARDS. This has been a very contentious issue. But as a consequence of the mutual hard work, this amendment can be accepted by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent it be in order for me to deliver my remarks in a seated position.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am grateful for the willingness of the Senator from Montana to work with us, to make certain the stabilization of Oregon Inlet is once more a priority of Congress and of the U.S. Corps of Engineers—in the next 180 days.

I confess some unease at the prospect of yet another study of the Oregon Inlet, inasmuch as there already have been almost 100 such studies previously. If one more study is what is required to save the livelihoods of the good people of Oregon Inlet who make their livings as commercial fishermen, then so be it. But let there be no mistake. This is the last study that will be conducted before action is taken. That is agreed to by the Senator from Montana and me—to help those good people, because enough, Mr. President, is enough.

I will work in good faith with the Senator from Montana and others to make certain that swift action will follow this latest, and I hope last, study to be undertaken.

Mr. President, for nearly three decades—nearly 28 years, to be exact—I have been urging the enactment of legislation to restore security and safety to the remarkable people who live and work on North Carolinas Outer Banks.

And for those almost three decades, those fine people have been short-circuited by a federal bureaucracy more intent in imposing its own will than following through on a much-needed project authorized by Congress in 1970: That is, to begin the process of creating two hard-rock jetties to stabilize and secure Oregon Inlet, the only deep-sea access along the East Coast for a distance of 220 miles between Cape Henry, Virginia, and Morehead City, N.C.

The purpose of the provision being challenged here tonight is to first, protect the lives of literally thousands of both commercial and recreational fishermen who live and work in the Outer Banks, and second, to protect the livelihoods of those fishermen, their boats

and their cargo, which is so vital to their making a living.

So let's be clear about what's at stake in this debate. We're talking about saving lives and saving a way of life for many of thousands of fine decent people trying to make a living providing fine, fresh seafood.

Wayne Gray, a Coast Guard officer stationed at the base there told me, "Oregon Inlet is a nightmare. In my 32 years in the Coast Guard, it's the most dangerous place I've ever seen."

The Coast Guard station there receives on average a distress call every other day. In this fiscal year alone, the Oregon Inlet Coast Guard has responded to nearly 100 call for help by distressed seamen. There will be many more this summer, I'll promise you: There always are.

Over the years, more than 20 lives have been lost because of the deadly situation in the Inlet. In fact, I recently received a letter from a man named Robbie Maharaj who recounted an incident which happened about 4 years ago.

In November of 1996 a friend and I were fishing on the northern side of the ocean bar at Oregon Inlet. It was a fairly rough day at the bar.

We had caught our limit of striped bass and were pulling in our lines when I heard on the radio that some of my friends had gone down. I immediately finished pulling up my lines and went to help.

As I pulled up to the boat, I was able to get one man aboard. We laid him on the deck. He was so cold from being in the water that he looked pale, and almost dead. As we got him on deck, water began to break over the stern of my boat. I had to leave the scene to avoid going down myself.

All in all, four of the five men in the water made it. I was able to get two in my boat. Other fishermen pulled out the two other survivors. The Coast Guard got the one man that didn't make it.

People ask me all the time whether I would do it again. There's no question that I would try and pull men out of the water if I were faced with the same situation again. It's sort of a buddy system out there. You hear cries for help and you can't leave them there. You've got to try to help. This is especially true when the people yelling for help are friends. Who knows, the next time it could be me yelling to be saved.

Thanks to the events of 1996, I know just how dangerous Oregon Inlet can be. Senator, thank you for trying to get the stabilization effort moving. We really need it.

The provision in question merely transfers the land relevant to the project from the Department of the Interior to the Army Corps of Engineers, so that the wheels of the inlet stabilization project can finally begin. This project is sound. Almost one hundred separate studies have been made on the project; therefore, we can reasonably say that just about every possible issue relevant to the project has been thoroughly considered and resolved.

On an economic scale, the project has a cost/benefit ratio of 1.0/1.6, meaning for every \$1 spent on the project, \$1.60 in benefits are returned.

As for the environmental concerns that have been raised, the Corps has

made numerous compromises and alterations to the jetties in order to alleviate every single negative impact upon the local habitat and wildlife.

How many more lives will be lost before Congress makes good on the commitment made 30 years ago. That time has finally come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce to all Senators we are only 2 or 3 minutes away from getting a managers' package of amendments to wrap up the final consideration of this bill. We also have some colloquies and statements that Senators have presented to us during the final stages of the consideration of the bill we are now reviewing and processing. I expect to be able to present for unanimous consent agreement, for inclusion in the RECORD, these statements and colloquies.

We know of no other amendments that are to be offered.

May I ask the Chair, what is the pending business?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, can we have a vote on the amendment, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Montana has not yet been disposed of.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3981) was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, we have been awaiting word from the minority staff of the subcommittee to clear the managers' package. We have cleared the managers' package on this side of the aisle. We have statements and colloquies relating to the managers' package, and I will momentarily send up all of the amendments and the statements and colloquies related thereto.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will be happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wonder if we can have a voice vote on final passage.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to passing the bill on a voice vote.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3982 THROUGH 4014, EN BLOC

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I now have an indication that the managers' package has been cleared. I send the managers' package of amendments to the desk and ask that they be reported en bloc and considered en bloc.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], for himself and Mr. KOHL, proposes amendments numbered 3982 through 4014, en bloc.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3982

(Purpose: To provide for a Animal and Plant Health Services wildlife services methods development study)

On page 20, line 8, strike the "." and insert in lieu thereof the following:

": *Provided further*, That not less than \$1 million of the funds available under this heading made available for wildlife services methods development, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct pilot projects in no less than four states representative of wildlife predation of livestock in connection with farming operations for direct assistance in the application of non-lethal predation control methods: *Provided further*, That the General Accounting Office shall report to the Committee on Appropriations by November 30, 2001, on the Department's compliance with this provision and on the effectiveness of the non-lethal measures."

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Smith-Boxer amendment on Wildlife Services was accepted to the Agriculture appropriations bill.

Our amendment will create a pilot study in four States that will examine the effectiveness of nonlethal predation control methods under Wildlife Services. Our amendment is reasonable and fair.

Let me briefly talk about the lethal predator control program administered under the Wildlife Service program.

With our scarce tax dollars, Wildlife Services personnel kill more than 80,000 mammalian predators a year, mainly coyotes, but also black bears, mountain lions, foxes, and bobcats.

They conduct this killing by engaging in aerial gunning, poisoning, and trapping.

Since 1993, there have been 18 aerial gunning crashes. In addition, the aerial gunning program has caused the deaths of seven individuals, both Federal and contract employees.

Banned in 89 nations because it is so inhumane, leghold traps catch any animal unlucky enough to trigger the device. Animals caught in traps languish and suffer for days, sometimes resorting to twisting off or chewing off a leg to escape its vice grip.

I am not standing before you today saying that every program that Wildlife Services executes is harmful or a waste of taxpayer money.

There are some valuable programs dealing with property protection, human health and safety, crop protection, natural resources, forest and range protection, and aquaculture which are not affected by this amendment.

However, Wildlife Services spends more than \$10 million a year on lethal predator control programs.

But does the lethal predator control program really work? It does not seem to be controlling the coyote population, it has tripled in number and increased in range because the surviving coyotes will breed more often and produce larger litters.

In fact, according to a recent article in the Washington Times, coyotes have now spread to Virginia and Maryland.

In addition, this program has been under scrutiny for decades. Several presidential commissions, including commissions in the Kennedy, Johnson, and Carter administrations have criticized the program's needless reliance on lethal predator control.

In 1995, the General Accounting Office came to the same conclusion, stating the Animal Damage Control had failed to opt for non-lethal programs.

I am well aware that ranchers need to protect their livestock, their investment. During the last 2 decades, there have been a variety of practical and effective nonlethal husbandry techniques developed and put into practical use: The use of guard animals, such as dogs, donkeys, or llamas; the use of electronic sound and light devices; predator exclusion fencing; shed lambing; and night penning, et cetera.

By deploying these techniques, ranchers can minimize the need for lethal responses to predators, which are indiscriminant and cruel to animals.

In closing I would like to read you a quote from the Tulsa World newspaper, which says it all:

Despite steady increases in the Wildlife Services annual budget, and an 8 percent increase in the coyote kill in the past decade, livestock losses to predators have not declined. The statistics show that in every state where predator control was practiced, the agency spent more money on control than the value of livestock lost. It would be cheaper simply to compensate ranchers for their losses.

I will repeat that last sentence: "It would be cheaper simply to compensate ranchers for their losses."

In short, the lethal predator control program doesn't work, it is dangerous for humans, cruel to animals, and a waste of taxpayer dollars.

I thank the managers of the bill for including this pilot study of nonlethal predator control methods in the Agriculture appropriations bill.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the managers for their assistance in adding an amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill that requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services Research Center to design and implement on-the-ground demonstration projects to test the application of non-lethal mammalian predator control techniques.

The purpose of this amendment is to generate data that can be used in determining the effectiveness of non-lethal methods for protecting livestock from predators. These nonlethal methods include: the use of guard animals such as dogs, donkeys, and llamas; the use of predator-proof electric fencing; special light and sound deterrents; and promotion of sound animal husbandry techniques such as carcass removal, night penning, and shed lambing to protect pregnant animals and their newborns when they are most vulnerable.

Lethal predator control measures, such as shooting, poisoning, or trapping, should not be employed in these projects. In order to produce useful outcomes, the pilot projects should involve ranchers whose circumstances are representative of the types of livestock/predator conflicts that other ranchers experience around the country.

The General Accounting Office has been tasked with reporting on these pilot projects and providing an assessment of the effectiveness of these non-lethal mammalian predator control measures. I look forward to working with the Department, along with Senator SMITH and my other colleagues, to ensure that this program gets underway quickly and smoothly to begin demonstrating the value of these non-lethal predator control methods.

AMENDMENT NO. 3983

(Purpose: To amend the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. . Section 2111(a)(3) of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 651(a)(3)) is amended by adding after sulfites, 'except in the production of wine,'."

AMENDMENT NO. 3984

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of appropriated funds to require offices of the Farm Service Agency to discontinue use of FINPACK for financial planning and credit analysis)

On page 75, after line 16 insert the following:

"SEC. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require an office of the Farm Service Agency that is using FINPACK on May 17, 1999, for financial planning and credit analysis, to discontinue use of FINPACK for six months from the date of enactment of this Act."

AMENDMENT NO. 3985

(Purpose: Expands eligibility for Rural Development Community Facilities program)

On page 93 of division B, as modified, after line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Sea Island Health Clinic located on Johns Island, South Carolina, shall remain eligible for assistance and funding from the Rural Development community facilities programs administered by the Department of Agriculture until such time new population data is available from the 2000 Census."

AMENDMENT NO. 3986

(Purpose: To provide funds for a study on flood plain management for the Pocasset River, Rhode Island)

On page 34, line 23, before the period at the end, insert the following: "": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for watershed and flood prevention activities, \$500,000 shall be available for a study to be conducted by the Natural Resources Conservation Service in cooperation with the town of Johnston, Rhode Island, on floodplain management for the Pocasset River, Rhode Island".

AMENDMENT NO. 3987

(Purpose: To allocate funding made available by this Act for loans and grants to federally recognized Indian tribes under the rural community advance program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act)

On page 36, lines 20 through 25, Strike "including grants for drinking and waste disposal systems pursuant to Section 306C of such Act: *Provided further*, That the Federally Recognized Native American Tribes are not eligible for any other rural utilities program set aside under the Rural Community Advancement Program:" and insert "of which (1) \$1,000,000 shall be available for rural business opportunity grants under section 306(a)(11) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11)), (2) \$5,000,000 shall be available for community facilities grants for tribal college improvements under section 306(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)19)), (3) \$15,000,000 shall be available for grants for drinking water and waste disposal systems under section 306C of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926c) to federally recognized Native American Tribes that are not eligible to receive funds under any other rural utilities program set aside under the rural community advancement program, and (4) \$3,000,000 shall be available for rural business enterprise grants under section 310B(c) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(c)):".

AMENDMENT NO. 3988

(Purpose: To provide for a pasture recovery program)

On page 84, line 23, after "section", insert the following: "": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this section, up to \$40,000,000 may be used to carry out the Pasture Recovery Program: *Provided further*, That the payments to a producer made available through the Pasture Recovery Program shall be no less than 65 percent of the average cost of reseeding".

AMENDMENT NO. 3989

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of any funding to recover payments erroneously made to oyster fishermen in the State of Connecticut)

On page 95, after line 22, add the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act or in any other Act may be used to recover part or all of any payment erroneously made to any oyster fisherman in the State of Connecticut for oyster losses under the program established under section 1102(b) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(a) of Division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)), and the regulations issued pursuant to such section 1102(b).



## AMENDMENT NO. 3990

(Purpose: To provide support for creative anti-hunger initiatives in the USDA ranked number one hunger state)

On page 17, line 1 strike “; and” and insert “; and for the Oregon State University Agriculture Extension Service, \$176,000 for the Food Electronically and Effectively Distributed (FEED) website demonstration project; and”; line 8, strike “\$12,107,000” and insert “\$12,283,000” and strike “\$426,505,000” and insert “\$426,680,000”; on line 19, strike “\$43,541,000” and insert “\$43,365,000”; on line 25, strike “6,000,000” and insert “\$5,824,000”.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator COCHRAN and Senator KOHL for accepting this important amendment to S. 2536, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001.

According to the USDA, Oregon ranks first in hunger and seventh in food insecurity in the nation. This amendment will fund, at \$176,000, a demonstration project pairing technology and teamwork: The Food Electronically and Effectively Distributed FEED Website Demonstration Project.

As the only state in the nation with a statewide food bank system in place, the Oregon Food Bank, as well as an organized and active agricultural community, Oregon is prepared to develop and use the FEED website to provide a national model for other states interested in pursuing an organized statewide anti-hunger campaign.

Developed and used in conjunction with Oregon food producers, processors, distributors, transporters, and anti-hunger agents, as well as the UDA and state agriculture extension agents the FEED website will transform the current anti-hunger food distribution network by using the power of Internet technology to support and facilitate real-time communication links between those with food, those who need food and those who can transport food.

The FEED website will also provide a forum for sharing information about innovative anti-hunger efforts, both legislative and organizational, as well as links to other existing government, non-profit, and anti-hunger web sites to increase information sharing between active organizations and people in need.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3991

(Purpose: To increase the Section 502 Guaranteed Rural Housing income limits)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

“SEC. . Hereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider any borrower whose income does not exceed 115 percent of the median family income of the United States as meeting the eligibility requirements for a borrower contained in section 502(h)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472(h)(2)).”

## AMENDMENT NO. 3992

In Division B, strike section 1106 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1106. The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make and administer supplemental payments to dairy producers who received a payment under section 805 of Public Law 106-78 in an amount equal to thirty-five percent of the reduction in market value of milk production in 2000,

as determined by the Secretary, based on price estimates as of the date of enactment of this Act, from the previous five-year average and on the base production of the producer used to make a payment under section 805 of Public Law 106-78: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available until September 30, 2001: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make payments to producers under this section in a manner consistent with and subject to the same limitations on payments and eligible production as, the payments to dairy producers under section 805 of Public Law 106-78: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make provisions for making payments, in addition, to new producers: *Provided further*, That for any producers, including new producers, whose base production was less than twelve months for purposes of section 805 of Public Law 106-78, the producer's base production for the purposes of payments under this section may be, at the producer's option, the production of that producer in the twelve months preceding the enactment of this section or the producer's base production under the program operated under section 805 of Public Law 106-78 subject to such limitations as apply to other producers: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 3993

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide emergency loans to poultry producers to rebuild chicken houses destroyed by disasters)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. .—Section 321(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) LOANS TO POULTRY FARMERS.—

“(A) INABILITY TO OBTAIN INSURANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer did not have hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if the farmer—

“(I) applied for, but was unable, to obtain hazard insurance for the chicken house;

“(II) uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with industry standards in effect on the date the farmer submits an application for the loan (referred to in this paragraph as ‘current industry standards’);

“(III) obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

“(IV) meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle.

“(ii) AMOUNT.—Subject to the limitation contained in §324(a)(2) the amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be an amount that will allow the farmer to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards.

“(B) LOANS TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer had hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if—

“(I) the amount of the hazard insurance is less than the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

“(II) the farmer uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

“(III) the farmer obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

“(IV) the farmer meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle.

“(ii) AMOUNT.—Subject to the limitation contained in §324(a)(2) the amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be the difference between—

“(I) the amount of the hazard insurance obtained by the farmer; and

“(II) the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 3994

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding preference for assistance for victims of domestic violence)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PREFERENCE FOR ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture, in selecting public agencies and nonprofit organizations to provide transitional housing under section 592(c) of subtitle G of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11408a(c)), should consider preferences for agencies and organizations that provide transitional housing for individuals and families who are homeless as a result of domestic violence.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3995

(Purpose: To allocate appropriated funds for early detection and treatment concerning childhood lead poisoning at sites participating in the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children)

On page 50, line 6, before the period, insert the following: “; *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall be made available for sites participating in the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children to—

“(I) determine whether a child eligible to participate in the program has received a blood lead screening test, using a test that is appropriate for age and risk factors, upon the enrollment of the child in the program;

## AMENDMENT NO. 3996

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Office of Generic Drugs in order to accelerate the review of generic drug applications)

On page 56, line 9, strike “\$313,143,000” and insert “\$315,143,000”.

On page 57, line 2, strike “\$78,589,000” and insert “\$76,589,000”.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3997

(Purpose: To provide funds for the cleanup of methamphetamine labs by State and local law enforcement)

On page 96 the modified division B after line 2, insert the following:

**DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION  
(DOMESTIC ENHANCEMENTS)**

**METHAMPHETAMINE LAB CLEANUP ASSISTANCE  
FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT**

For an additional amount for drug enforcement administration, \$5,000,000 for the Drug Enforcement Agency to assist in State and local methamphetamine lab cleanup (including reimbursement for costs incurred by

State and local governments for lab cleanup since March 2000): *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$5,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3998

On page 4, line 12, before the period at the end of the line, insert “: *Provided*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall actively market cross-serving activities of the National Finance Center”.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3999

(Purpose: To fund biomass-based energy research)

On page 13, line 13, strike “\$62,207,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$63,157,000”.

On page 13, line 16, strike “\$121,350,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$120,400,000”.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senators COCHRAN and HARKIN for their assistance in getting this proposal included in the Agriculture Appropriations bill for FY 2001. The biomass program is a collaborative effort between Oklahoma State University and Mississippi State University.

We are now 56 percent dependent on foreign oil. It is projected that by 2020 we will be more than 65 percent dependent on oil from foreign nations. Such dependency is a major threat to our national security. We need to make every effort possible to reduce and curb this dependency. This program will aid us in this effort.

The effort between these two universities will focus on the continued development of a unique gasification-bioconversion process at OSU that utilizes biomass including crop residues, underutilized grasses, and plant byproducts.

Those conducting the research consist of a senior team of nationally recognized experts in biomass production, feedstock harvesting and processing of technologies, environmental impact assessment, and biochemical process.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this unique opportunity for Oklahoma, Mississippi and for the nation.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4000

(Purpose: To provide fiscal year 2000 supplemental contingent emergency funding to the Department of the Treasury for the Customs Service Automated Commercial System)

On page 93 of division B, as modified, after line 21, insert the following:

## “GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

“SEC. . In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in Public Law 106-58 to the Department of the Treasury, Department-wide Systems and Capital Investments Programs, \$123,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, for maintaining and operating the current Customs Service Automated Commercial System: *Provided*, That the funds shall not be obligated until the Customs Service has submitted to the Committees on Appropriations

an expenditure plan which has been approved by the Treasury Investment Review Board, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That none of the funds may be obligated to change the functionality of the Automated Commercial System itself: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$123,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount made available under this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.”.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Chairman and the Committee including \$123,000,000 in emergency funding for the Customs Service Automated Commercial System, or ACS. The current legacy computer system of the Customs Service is in dire need of this emergency funding. This 16 year old system regularly experiences what is called “brownouts” or system-wide outages. When this system goes down, believe it or not, the Customs Service must process all entries by hand. These outages are only becoming more frequent and they are lasting longer and longer. You can imagine the delays at the border that this situation causes. For example, in an outage in March at the Buffalo port, a five-hour delay generated so much paper that the entry documents were piled so high Customs could not see their customers on the other side of the counter. Not only do these outages create long lines at the ports, but after the system is back up and running, Customs employees must then work overtime trying to enter all of the paper entries generated during the outage. Therefore, Mr. President, I am pleased that the Committee has included this funding to address this very serious issue.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4001

(Purpose: To fully fund the Food and Drug Administration's food safety initiative activities)

On page 57, line 2, strike “\$78,589,000” and insert “\$72,589,000”.

On page 57, line 10, insert before the period the following: “: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this heading to the Food and Drug Administration, an additional \$6,000,000 shall be made available of which \$5,000,000 shall be made available for the Centers for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs, and \$1,000,000 shall be made available to the National Center for Toxicological Research”.

Mr. KENNEDY. The American food supply is one of the safest in the world—but it is not safe enough. Over 75 million Americans a year are stricken by disease caused by contaminated food they eat. Each year, 9,000 people—mostly the very young and the very old—die as a result. The costs of medical treatment and losses in productivity for these illnesses are as high as \$37 billion annually.

The emergence of highly virulent strains of bacteria, and the increase in the number of organisms resistant to antibiotics, are compounding these problems and making foodborne illnesses an increasingly serious public health challenge.

Americans deserve to know that the foods they eat are safe, regardless of their source. Yet too many citizens today are at unnecessary risk of foodborne disease. This Congress can make a difference. The FDA requested a budget increase of \$30 million in 2001 for its Food Safety Initiative activities. With these additional funds, the FDA can improve its inspection of high-risk food establishments and strengthen its laboratory capabilities. Without this funding, the agency will conduct 700 fewer inspections next year. The Senate Appropriations Committee recognized the importance of protecting our food supply by granting the FDA the majority of its requested increase for food safety. The amendment I propose will give the FDA the additional \$6 million it needs for these efforts.

In response to improved surveillance and increased sampling and testing, illnesses from the most common bacterial foodborne pathogens decreased by 21% from 1997 to 1999. As a result, 855,000 fewer Americans each year suffer from foodborne diseases. But contaminated food still remains a significant public health problem.

Recently, a new strain of an organism contaminated oysters in Texas, and caused an epidemic of diarrhea. This year, the FDA recalled several smoked fish products manufactured in New York because of outbreaks of disease. In March, 500 college students in Massachusetts became ill with Norwalk-like virus. Each year there are also at least 4700 cases of Salmonella in Massachusetts. We must do more to protect our citizens from foodborne diseases.

Imported foods are a significant part of the problem and often pose especially serious health risks. Americans are consuming foods from other countries at increasing rates. Since 1992, the number of food imports has tripled. At that time, the FDA was able to inspect only 8% of these imports. Since then the rate of FDA inspections of imported food has dropped to less than 1%, because resources did not increase for monitoring these imports.

Other countries have often not implemented food safety protections comparable to those in the United States, and general sanitary conditions are often poor. As a consequence, foods from such countries are more likely to be contaminated with disease-producing organisms. In 1995, 242 people contracted Salmonella from alfalfa sprouts imported from the Netherlands. In 1996, over 1,400 people became ill from contaminated raspberries from Guatemala. Just this year, infected shrimp from Vietnam caused Salmonella and E. coli outbreaks.

In earlier decades, diseases such as tuberculosis and cholera were the focus of food safety concerns. Today diseases caused by dangerous new strains of *E. coli* have become primary causes of foodborne illness. These new organisms necessitate increased investment in research, technology, and surveillance to protect the safety of our food supply.

Food safety are also especially important to protect the growing number of individuals in vulnerable populations, such as young children, the elderly, those with lowered immunity from HIV, and those with inadequate access to health care.

By providing the FDA with the necessary resources to combat foodborne diseases, we can protect tens of millions of our fellow citizens across the country each year. Investment in food safety is an investment in the health of every American. Congress should give the FDA the resources it needs in order to ensure the safety of the food we eat. The amendment I am proposing is a major step to meet this challenge, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4002

On page 71, line 3, strike the comma and insert the following: "prior to July 1, 2001,".

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise to report on an agreement reached today between Senator INOUE and myself regarding the Fort Reno Agriculture Research Station at El Reno, Oklahoma.

Our agreement delays any decision on the ARS until the next Administration. It also preserves the right of Congress to play a role in the future of the ARS. Our agreement ensures that any decision made about the research station will be made based on the merits of the work performed there rather than a decision based on November political considerations.

The agreement should not be read to mean that the research station will be eliminated, nor that the lands at Fort Reno should or will be returned to the Cheyenne-Arapaho tribe of Oklahoma.

I do not want the status of the Agriculture Research Station to be influenced by presidential politics, which has been the case in the past. This agreement will help prevent the future of the research station from becoming an election-year tool and better protect both the tribe and the research station from pressures surrounding the November election.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I agree with Senator NICKLES that Congress should have oversight of this issue and that decisions made about the research station should be made based on the merits of the work performed there rather than political considerations.

If one day Fort Reno is declared surplus or excess property by USDA, I hope that the Cheyenne and Arapaho's interest in the land will be considered. I believe they have a legitimate case in their pursuit of that land, and I look forward to working further with Senator NICKLES on this issue.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4003

(Purpose: To prohibit products that contain dry ultra-filtered milk products or casein from being labeled as domestic natural cheese, and for other purposes)

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 740. NATURAL CHEESE STANDARD.—(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 401 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) by striking "Whenever" and inserting "Whenever"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) The Commissioner may not use any Federal funds to amend section 133.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling), to include dry ultra-filtered milk or casein in the definition of the term 'milk' or 'nonfat milk', as specified in the standards of identity for cheese and cheese products published at part 133 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling)."

(b) IMPORTATION STUDY.—Not later than \_\_\_ days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study to determine—

(A) the quantity of ultra-filtered milk that is imported annually into the United States; and

(B) the end use of that imported milk; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4004

On page 13, line 13, strike "\$62,207,000" and insert "\$62,707,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike "\$121,350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,850,000".

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this amendment will provide \$500,000, for Satsuma Orange research at Auburn University in Alabama. These funds will be used to conduct research on developing technologies that reduce freeze damage, necessary for consistent production and industry expansion for the Satsuma Orange in the United States.

These funds will be used specifically for studies to reduce damage by fall and winter freezes suffered by the Satsuma Orange trees; studies evaluating micro sprinkler irrigation systems as a means of protecting the crop against freezes; evaluations for cold hardiness, cropping, harvest time, and fruit quality; and studies to determine critical temperatures that kill the crop and the factors that affect cold hardiness.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4005

At the appropriate place in title VII insert the following: "None of the funds appropriated by this act to the U.S. Department of Agriculture may be used to implement or administer the final rule issued in Docket Number 97-110, at 65 Federal Register 37608-37669 until such time as USDA completes an independent peer review of the rule and the risk assessment underlying the rule."

## AMENDMENT NO. 4006

(Purpose: To require that any award entered into under the dairy export incentive program that is canceled or voided is made available for reassignment under the program)

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. . DAIRY EXPORT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—Section 153(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (15 U.S.C. 713a-14(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5)(A) any award entered into under the program that is canceled or voided after June 30, 1995, is made available for reassignment under the program as long as a World Trade Organization violation is not incurred; and

"(B) any reassignment under subparagraph (A) is not reported as a new award when reporting the use of the reassigned tonnage to the World Trade Organization."

On page 36, line 9, strike "\$749,284,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$759,284,000"; on page 36, line 12, strike "\$634,360,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$644,360,000".

## AMENDMENT NO. 4007

(Purpose: To require the use of a certain amount of appropriated funds to carry out the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations)

On page 50, line 22, before the period, insert the following: "Provided further, That, of funds made available under this heading and not already appropriated to the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) established under section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)), (1) an additional amount not to exceed \$7,300,000 shall be used to purchase bison for the FDPIR and to provide a mechanism for the purchases from Native American producers and cooperative organizations".

## AMENDMENT NO. 4008

On page 13, line 13, strike "\$62,207,000" and insert "\$62,707,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike "\$121,350,000" and insert \* \* \*

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the emerging field of bioinformatics uses information technology to analyze the billions of bits of data that create a human or plant genome. The research efforts at Virginia Tech will complement and support efforts by the Department to develop new bioinformatic tools, biological data bases, and other information management tools, which hold the promise of reinvigorating our rural communities through high-technology jobs in agri-biotechnology. This amendment provides \$500,000 to support Virginia Polytechnic Institute's (VPI) Bioinformatics initiative.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4009

(Purpose: To set aside funding for the distance learning and telemedicine program to promote employment of rural residents through teleworking)

On page 47, line 8, after "areas," insert the following: "of which not more than \$3,000,000 may be used to make grants to rural entities to promote employment of rural residents through teleworking, including to provide employment-related services, such as outreach to employers, training, and job placement, and to pay expenses relating to providing high-speed communications services, and".

## AMENDMENT NO. 4010

(Purpose: To extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants for State mediation programs dealing with agricultural issues)

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 740. STATE AGRICULTURAL MEDIATION PROGRAMS.—(a) ELIGIBLE PERSON; MEDIATION SERVICES.—Section 501 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5101) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) ISSUES COVERED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be certified as a qualifying State, the mediation program of the State must provide mediation services to persons described in paragraph (2) that are involved in agricultural loans (regardless of whether the loans are made or guaranteed by the Secretary or made by a third party).

“(B) OTHER ISSUES.—The mediation program of a qualifying State may provide mediation services to persons described in paragraph (2) that are involved in 1 or more of the following issues under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture:

“(i) Wetlands determinations.

“(ii) Compliance with farm programs, including conservation programs.

“(iii) Agricultural credit.

“(iv) Rural water loan programs.

“(v) Grazing on National Forest System land.

“(vi) Pesticides.

“(vii) Such other issues as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(2) PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR MEDIATION.—The persons referred to in paragraph (1) include—

“(A) agricultural producers;

“(B) creditors of producers (as applicable); and

“(C) persons directly affected by actions of the Department of Agriculture.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) DEFINITION OF MEDIATION SERVICES.—In this section, the term ‘mediation services’, with respect to mediation or a request for mediation, may include all activities related to—

“(1) the intake and scheduling of cases;

“(2) the provision of background and selected information regarding the mediation process;

“(3) financial advisory and counseling services (as appropriate) performed by a person other than a State mediation program mediator; and

“(4) the mediation session.”.

(b) USE OF MEDIATION GRANTS.—Section 502(c) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5102(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Each” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), operation and administration expenses for which a grant may be used include—

“(A) salaries;

“(B) reasonable fees and costs of mediators;

“(C) office rent and expenses, such as utilities and equipment rental;

“(D) office supplies;

“(E) administrative costs, such as workers’ compensation, liability insurance, the employer’s share of Social Security, and necessary travel;

“(F) education and training;

“(G) security systems necessary to ensure the confidentiality of mediation sessions and records of mediation sessions;

“(H) costs associated with publicity and promotion of the mediation program;

“(I) preparation of the parties for mediation; and

“(J) financial advisory and counseling services for parties requesting mediation.”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 506 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5106) is amended by striking “2000” and inserting “2005”.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4011

(Purpose: To provide increased funding for the Extension farm safety program, including funding at a level of \$3,055,000 for the AgrAbility project)

On page 13, line 16, strike \$121,350,000 and insert “\$120,650,000”.

On page 15, line 2, strike \$494,744,000 and insert “\$494,044,000”.

On page 16, line 6, strike \$3,400,000 and insert “\$4,100,000”.

On page 17, line 8, strike \$426,504,000 and insert “\$427,204,000”.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4012

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide equitable relief to an owner or operator that has entered into and violated a contract under the environmental conservation acreage reserve program if the owner or operator took actions in good faith reliance on the action or advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary)

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 740. GOOD FAITH RELIANCE.—The Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 1230 (16 U.S.C. 3830) the following:

“SEC. 1230A. GOOD FAITH RELIANCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Secretary shall provide equitable relief to an owner or operator that has entered into a contract under this chapter, and that is subsequently determined to be in violation of the contract, if the owner or operator in attempting to comply with the terms of the contract and enrollment requirements took actions in good faith reliance on the action or advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary.

“(b) TYPES OF RELIEF.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) to the extent the Secretary determines that an owner or operator has been injured by good faith reliance described in subsection (a), allow the owner or operator to do any one or more of the following—

“(A) to retain payments received under the contract;

“(B) to continue to receive payments under the contract;

“(C) to keep all or part of the land covered by the contract enrolled in the applicable program under this chapter;

“(D) to reenroll all or part of the land covered by the contract in the applicable program under this chapter; or

“(E) or any other equitable relief the Secretary deems appropriate; and

“(2) require the owner or operator to take such actions as are necessary to remedy any failure to comply with the contract.

“(c) RELATION TO OTHER LAW.—The authority to provide relief under this section shall be in addition to any other authority provided in this or any other Act.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to a pattern of conduct in which an authorized representative of the Secretary takes actions or provides advice with respect to an owner or operator that the representative and the owner or operator know are inconsistent with applicable law (including regulations).”.

“(e) APPLICABILITY OF RELIEF.—Relief under this section shall be available for contracts in effect on January 1, 2000 and for all subsequent contracts.”.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4013

(Purpose: To require the publication of data collected on imported herbs)

On page 89, after line 19, add the following:

SEC. 1111. AVAILABILITY OF DATA ON IMPORTED HERBS.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall publish and otherwise make available (including through electronic media) data collected monthly by each Secretary on herbs imported into the United States.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4014

(Purpose: To adjust the limitation to carry out research related to tobacco)

On page 15, line 6, before the period, insert: “: Provided, That this paragraph shall not apply to research on the medical, biotechnological, food, and industrial uses of tobacco”.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am prepared to be guided by the interest of the Senate. I have a list of the amendments which I am prepared to read if Senators would like. I can send the list to the desk and have it printed in the RECORD. I asked my staff if we read the list last year, and they said we did not. Maybe considering the mood of the Senate, I should not read the list.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, can the Senator estimate how much total spending is in those amendments?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not have an estimate. They are within the budget allocation of the committee. None of them will require a waiver. There are two amendments that are attached to this bill that are not within the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. One is related to methamphetamine laboratory cleanup which comes under Commerce-Justice, and another is related to Customs Service computer systems which comes under the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee’s jurisdiction.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the managers’ package be agreed to en bloc and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendments (Nos. 3982 through 4014), en bloc, were agreed to.

ARS RESEARCH PROJECT IN EAST LANSING, MI

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we have before the Senate S. 2536, the Fiscal Year 2001 Appropriations Act for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. I am concerned that this bill omits an appropriation included in the House version of this bill (H.R. 4461).

H.R. 4461 appropriates \$309,600 for the Agriculture Research Service (ARS) to fund research addressing Postharvest Handling and Mechanization to Minimize Damage for Fruits. This research is vital, not only for Michigan, but for all fruit producing states.

This research has the potential to allow fruit growers to realize greater profits by better ensuring fruit quality. Given the significant potential of this program to assist fruit producers in my home state, I am troubled by its exclusion in S. 2536.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his comments. He is

correct in stating that the House Appropriations Act for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for Fiscal Year 2001 funds research regarding Postharvest Handling and Mechanization to Minimize Damage for Fruits while the Senate counterpart does not.

Mr. LEVIN. I would appreciate the Senate conferees giving full consideration to the House position on this matter.

Mr. COCHRAN. I assure the Senator from Michigan that this specific request will be carefully considered in conference as I can understand how important this matter is.

#### FDA'S ADVERSE EVENT REPORTS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support an increase to the Food and Drug Administration's Adverse Event Monitoring System regarding dietary supplements. This would be administered by the FDA's Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN). This increase in FDA's Adverse Event Monitoring System for dietary supplements is an important component in the overall effort to implement fully the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act.

Mr. HARKIN. I am proud to join my distinguished colleague, the Senior Senator from Utah, in supporting this endeavor. This proposed increase in FDA's Adverse Event Monitoring System for dietary supplements is an important component in the overall effort to implement fully the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act. It also continues our mutual efforts to promote better public health and consumer safety. The FDA monitors adverse events related to dietary supplements. The dietary supplement sales have doubled in the past five years. In fact, surveys indicate that nearly half of all Americans use some type of dietary supplement, spending over \$12 billion annually for these products. FDA estimates that the industry markets approximately 29,000 of these products, which are sold under 75,000 distinct labels.

Mr. HATCH. Despite this phenomenal growth in the supplement industry, the FDA currently does not have the resources to process adverse event reports in a timely manner and with comprehensive information. As a result, a substantial backlog currently exists in reviewing adverse event reports in the dietary supplement area. However, we must assure that these funds for AERs are effectively spent. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that you work with Senator HARKIN and myself on this issue. More specifically, we request that the FDA be directed to assign additional personnel to maintain the timeliness and accuracy of the AER system for dietary supplements. In addition, Congress needs to be assured that all published reports are accompanied by the results of a scientific evaluation of the link between the product and the adverse event and evidence of timely

prior notification of any manufacturer or distributor mentioned in the report.

Mr. COCHRAN. I appreciate your bringing this issue to the attention of the Committee, and I will carefully consider this issue affecting the FDA's Adverse Event Monitoring System regarding dietary supplements. I thank the Senator for raising this matter to my attention.

#### USDA-ARS NEW ENGLAND PLANT, SOIL AND WATER RESEARCH LABORATORY

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for his continuing support for the New England, Plant, Soil, and Water Research Laboratory in Orono, Maine. Quite frankly, with his help and the support of his Subcommittee, we have literally snatched this USDA-Agricultural Research Service potato research laboratory—so important to the Maine potato industry—from the jaws of defeat ever since the Administration called for its closing in 1995. Not only have we kept the doors open, but with his support, the research facility on the University of Maine campus in Orono now has not only Dr. Wayne Honeycutt as its very capable lead scientist, but has added two plant pathologists, a research chemist, and a soon to be added research agronomist because of his support last year. I want to once again re-emphasize just how critical the lab's survival is to the state of Maine, its potato growers, and its economy.

Ninety-five percent of the potato acreage in the six states in the New England region are in Maine, and the lab has the benefit of being in close proximity to the grower's fields. There has been a long and productive history of collaborative potato research involving the state, the university research program, and private agricultural interests.

The laboratory's last need is for a soil physicist to complete its scientific staff and not for a soil pathologist as originally requested and for which \$300,000 is provided for as stated on page 31 of the Report Language for S. 2536. I request that this technical correction be made for a soil physicist.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senior Senator from Maine for her tireless efforts over these past five years to not only keep the ARS laboratory open but to assure that the facility is staffed with skilled scientists and support staff that continue to be of great service to the agriculture community in Maine. This research facility has my support and the appropriate technical change will be made for a soil physicist.

Ms. SNOWE. Once again, I thank the chairman for his support of agriculture throughout my State, and I praise him for your fine leadership as Chair of the Subcommittee.

#### QUALITY AND SHELF LIFE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Mississippi, for drafting an excellent FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill that will

help meet the needs of our nation's farmers and agricultural communities. I especially want to thank him for working closely with me to ensure that issues affecting the Idaho agriculture are addressed in the bill.

I know that the Senator from Mississippi works hard with limited resources to fund worthwhile and fiscally responsible agricultural research programs. One important area of agriculture research involves increasing the shelf life of our food, while maintaining its quality, and one of the most promising methods is irradiation. In Idaho, Idaho State University is home to the Idaho Accelerator Center (IAC) which is proposing a research program to investigate the effects of small amounts of irradiation—as compared to conventional food irradiation—on the behavior of potatoes. IAC and several Idaho-based partners have been studying the positive effects of low doses of x-ray and electron beam irradiation on the storage properties and shelf life of potatoes. Significant improvement in shelf life has been demonstrated over the entire range of standard storage conditions, with virtually no decline in quality. The results indicate that long term storage losses can be reduced to very low levels and that shelf life during transport, storage by vendors and by consumers is extended indefinitely. It is believed that these findings will also hold true for other commodities such as onions, sugar beets, etc. These results are achieved without chemicals, radioactive materials or other environmentally harmful processes. The irradiation is provided by the electron beams produced from compact, portable high-energy electron-linear accelerators.

While I know that the project is not funded in the Senate bill, I want to ask the Chairman to consider the IAC proposal during Conference on the bill. This is a worthy project and one that I am confident will lead to real results that will benefit our farmers and consumers.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Idaho for his kind remarks. We have tried hard to accommodate every worthwhile request but, as we all know, we are constrained by our budget allocation. I want to assure him, however, that I will thoroughly review the request made by the Idaho Accelerator Center at Idaho State University and will give it appropriate consideration during Conference.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I want to thank the Chairman for his willingness to look at this, and for all he does for American agriculture and a safe, secure, food supply.

#### MONTANA FOOD STAMP STANDARD UTILITY WAIVER

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an amendment that Senator BURNS and I were working with the Committee on in this Agriculture Appropriations bill that would

help Montana's senior citizens and low-income citizens. In particular, this measure would provide an additional \$500,000 to enable the State of Montana continue its food stamp program standard utility allowance ("SUA") waiver. Montana is currently operating under an agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to continue extending the waiver.

Montana has approximately 25,000 households using food stamps. Of this number, over 19,000 would be tragically affected by the loss of this waiver. For example, many elderly food stamp recipients who live on fixed incomes and/or reside in public housing would be hard hit by the loss of the Standard Utility Allowance waiver. In many such cases, records from the Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services indicate that the loss could be higher than fifty percent of the benefit.

Second, the state of Montana is currently serving 952 "able-bodied adults without dependents." Many of these are either homeless or at risk of losing their housing. Decreasing their current food stamp benefit would only exacerbate their difficult situations.

Finally, many of these food stamp recipients live in Montana's 634 group homes for the disabled. The loss of the Standard Utility Allowance would decrease food stamps for these individuals with disabilities creating further hardship for group homes which already operate with very little budget flexibility.

The entire Montana delegation has worked hard over the past two years in conjunction with our Montana Department of Public Health and Human Service, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Office of Management and Budget to maintain this critical program. I am pleased that Senator COCHRAN is willing to work with Senator BURNS and myself to address this issue within the context of this Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Mr. BURNS. I wholeheartedly support this amendment which is so critical to so many Montana families. The SUA waiver is of particular concern because long winters and high utility costs are something all Montanans face, regardless of income. This waiver allows a credit to a household's income when determining eligibility and amount of food stamp benefits. Because of the unique set of challenges facing Montanans in terms of extreme weather conditions, termination of the Standard Utility Allowance could very well put many needy households at risk of experiencing hunger.

The current SUA waiver is scheduled to expire on September 30, 2000. However, the USDA Food Nutrition Service has conditionally approved the extension of the Montana SUA waiver for an additional year to September 30, 2001. A primary condition to that approval is congressional approval of adequate funding.

To date, this waiver has been very successful in its goals to provide nutri-

tional assistance to low-income citizens. I strongly support funding this program at \$500,000 and will work with my colleagues to make that happen by the end of conference.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senators from Montana for working with the Agriculture Appropriations Committee to bring to our attention the need for funding of this important measure.

Mr. BAUCUS. Thank you, Senator COCHRAN, for your support. Montana's hungry families appreciate your efforts.

#### BIOINFORMATICS INSTITUTE FOR MODEL PLANT SPECIES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the Chairman of the Subcommittee, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from New Mexico regarding the establishment of a Bioinformatics Institute for Model Plant Species as a collaborative effort between the USDA Agriculture Research Service, New Mexico State University, and Iowa State University.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will be pleased to speak with my colleagues regarding this issue. I understand that this is a cooperative approach to enhance the accessibility and utility of genomic information for plant genetic research, and Senator DOMENICI championed the authorization for this institute in the recently enacted Agricultural Risk Protection Act.

Mr. DOMENICI. The chairman is correct that this cooperatively operated institute would reduce duplication of effort as research institutions across the country find the need to develop bioinformatics systems to validate and disseminate results from plant genomic studies. Three model plant species have been identified by the National Science Foundation, and this institute would incorporate software platforms that will enable the integration of these model plant bioinformatic resources with crop plant bioinformatic resources.

Mr. HARKIN. Over the past several months, my staff and I have had the pleasure of discussing this collaboration between Iowa State University, New Mexico State University, and the Agriculture Research Service with representatives of the National Center for Genome Resources, and want to express my support for establishing this institute. It would bring research scientists from the State Agriculture Experiment Stations and ARS together with the expertise in bioinformatics and software platforms developed by NCGR and its work on the Human Genome Project. Through this combination of expertise, the institute would greatly reduce the chances of having to "reinvent the wheel," so to speak, as genomic research continues to expand into greater numbers of agricultural plant species.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I concur with my colleagues' assessment that this institute would provide a valuable addition in the research area of plant genomics. It would let us avoid redundant

genomics research in crop species and leverage information for crop improvement. Funding for this institute would augment existing skills and resources, rather than building new bioinformatics infrastructure.

Mr. DOMENICI. Funding from the Agricultural Research Service will be needed to establish this institute. I understand that with the funding provided for ARS in this bill, that may not be possible. I ask the Chairman if he would assist us in the upcoming Conference Committee to ensure that ARS funding is adequate to accommodate this important project?

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to thank my colleagues for bringing this issue to the attention of the Senate. I appreciate the significance of establishing this institute, and I will make every effort to accommodate their request in the Conference.

Mr. HARKIN. I want to thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee, and look forward to working with him in the Conference.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I, too, thank the Chairman for his assurance.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee.

#### STUDY TO IMPROVE AFRICAN AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee regarding a study to improve farming practices in Africa.

As the chairman knows, the Trade and Development Act of 2000 was signed into law in May. This Act authorized a study on ways to improve African agricultural practices. This study will be conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in consultation with a land grant university and a not-for-profit organization that has firsthand knowledge of African farming.

While a two year study is authorized, it is my understanding that ample data and research exists supporting the need to establish a more formal relationship to improve farming practices in Africa.

To that end, I ask the Chairman if he would work with me to ensure that the USDA takes up this study in a timely fashion and incorporates the existing data so that we can formally implement these recommendations.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, and appreciate him bringing this issue to my attention.

As move forward, I will work with him to ensure that the USDA takes into consideration the existing data and research, and completes the study within a reasonable timeframe.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Chairman for his commitment, and appreciate his willingness to work with me on this important initiative.

#### BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we have before the Senate the Fiscal Year 2001 Appropriations Act for Agriculture,

Rural Development, and Related Agencies (S. 2536). Included in this bill is funding which will, among other things, assist our nation's farmers, aid rural development, preserve delicate ecosystems and provide food assistance to our nation's most needy individuals. I support these measures, but I also realize that there are urgent agricultural emergencies which cannot be covered by the scope of the annual appropriations process.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Senator from Michigan is correct in stating that frequently there exist many agricultural emergencies which are best addressed by the action of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. One agricultural emergency that currently affects my home state of Michigan, and which threatens livestock in the Upper Midwest is bovine tuberculosis (TB). Due to a host of factors, Michigan is the only state in the Union where bovine TB has actually been transferred from livestock into the wild. Most frequently, this disease has been transferred from cattle to members of the Cervid family, such as whitetail deer. Deer then are able to transfer TB to herds of cattle, wild animals or humans. As a result of this disease, neighboring states have restricted the entry of Michigan cattle, farmers have been required to test their cattle for this disease and some livestock producers have had to eradicate their herds. I would ask the Senator from Wisconsin, if he believes that the matter of bovine TB constitutes an emergency.

Mr. KOHL. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that bovine TB constitutes an agricultural emergency.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I would hope that the Secretary of Agriculture would declare an emergency regarding bovine TB. Doing so would assist areas where this disease is present and prevent the further spread of bovine TB.

#### RED RIVER TRADE COUNCIL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Agriculture Diversity Project, which is administered by the Red River Trade Council through the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. The Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee has funded this program in the past, and I want to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Minority of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee for their support.

As my colleagues know, one of the areas of economy that has not shared in the current economic boom is agriculture. The farmers and those who live and operate businesses in rural America are struggling financially to maintain not only a reasonable standard of living, but also the preservation of a rural lifestyle. They are desperate to find ways that will allow them to stay and to make a living in rural America.

The Agriculture Diversification Project now underway seeks to add

value to existing crop production, establish high value crop alternatives to those crops traditionally grown in the region, develop processing facilities, and create markets for both new crops and the value added products. One added dimension to the program in Fiscal Year 2001 will be an Internet-based information resource for farmers and other rural residents intended for those who are interested in a sustainable rural economy through entrepreneurship, product development, and marketing. This new aspect of the project will demand additional resources above what the Subcommittee provided in this bill. I hope that we might be able to provide at least \$500,000 for this project—which is the level of funding that the House provided in its bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. I am grateful that the Committee has recognized the need for this project in the past and also in the legislation being considered today. However, with the expansion of this project beyond the original states of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota to also include Iowa, and Nebraska, and to establish the Internet resource a higher level of funding for this project is necessary.

Does the Subcommittee Chairman, the senior Senator from Mississippi, agree that the House level of \$500,000 would be a more appropriate funding level for this program?

Mr. COCHRAN. I understand that this project is a priority for the Minority Leader and the Senator from North Dakota. I will work in conference to consider \$500,000 for the Red River Trade Council's Agricultural Diversity Project in the final version of the Agriculture Appropriations bill.

#### LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Mrs. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the Nation's Land-Grant University system is very fortunate to have historically black land-grant colleges and universities like Southern University of my home State of Louisiana, Tuskegee University of Alabama and Alcorn State of Mississippi, to name just three of them. These universities were granted Land-Grant status under the Evans-Allen law enacted by Congress in 1890. An amendment accepted in House of Representatives during debate on the Agricultural Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2001 increases formula funds for research and extension science performed at these universities in a total amount of \$6.8 million. There are 18 such historically black universities in America which are part of the entire national land-grant university system.

The historically black land-grant universities play a very special and unique role in our nation. Since 1988, the base formula funding provided to our nation's historically black colleges has eroded. Funding provided to these institutions through this mechanism has remained flat from the previous fiscal year. Investing in the 1890s Land-Grant institutions is a wise investment indeed. Together, our historically

black land-grant universities comprise a unique asset with the multi-cultural depth to enrich the research, extension and education capacity of the nation. Strengthening minority serving institutions and making them equal partners in the Land-Grant System are key elements toward improving minority access to USDA programs. Our universities need a significant boost in infrastructure investment to fully participate and compete for research, extension and education funding. The amendment passed by the House of Representatives would increase base (formula) funding and as a result would be a significant step in that direction. I appreciate Senator COCHRAN's recognizing the importance of this funding and hope you will give strong consideration during conference to acceding to the amendment passed by the House of Representatives. \$6.8 million divided among the 18 historically black institutions is not much, but it does mean a great deal to these institutions and the people they serve through their research and extension programs.

Mr. COCHRAN. I recognize the need to provide adequate support for the 1890 institutions. The Senator will be pleased to know that this bill provides increases above the fiscal year 2000 level for the 1890 institution's capacity building grants program and the facilities grants program. I share the Senator's interest in these institutions and will keep her comments in mind as we work to enhance funding for these programs in conference.

Mrs. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator.

#### CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS TRADING CREDIT MODELS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I want to ask the Chairman about a small provision in report language, under the Natural Resources Conservation Service. The report encourages the agency to interface with a consortium of universities on developing carbon dioxide emissions trading credit models. I am just seeking clarification on the academic nature of the efforts described and the intent of the Committee.

In numerous appropriations bills and reports, the Committee and the Senate have reiterated the position, consistent with the unanimously-passed Byrd-Hagel resolution, that the Kyoto Protocol on global climate change and control of greenhouse gases has not been approved by the Senate and must not be implemented by the Administration through the regulatory backdoor. Every year, language to this effect has been included in a growing number of appropriations laws, including the Agriculture Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000.

My question arises because emissions trading is inextricably, and most visibly, linked to the limits envisioned in the Kyoto Protocol. I assume there is no intention in the report language to be inconsistent with our longstanding position on Kyoto and no implied endorsement of emissions trading. I

would read the report as simply encouraging the agency in giving technical assistance to an academic research project relevant to agriculture.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Senator has correctly characterized the Committee's intent.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak for a few minutes about my amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations Bill now before the Senate. The amendment identifies vital funding for Indian Country in four programs under the Rural Community Advancement Program. The cosponsors of the amendment are Senators CAMPBELL, INOUE, DOMENICI, LEAHY, DASCHLE, DORGAN, FEINSTEIN, BENNETT, MURRAY, JOHNSON, HATCH, SNOWE, and CONRAD.

First, I want to thank Chairman COCHRAN and Senator KOHL for their work on this Agriculture Appropriations Bill. This bill provides funding for a number of programs that are vital to my state of New Mexico and to the nation.

The rural development programs funded in this bill are especially important for a rural state like New Mexico. Through a variety of grant and loan programs, rural development is helping to make sure that our smaller communities are not being left behind in basic infrastructure, in quality of housing, in economical utilities, in community facilities, or in business development. Rural development is making tremendous progress in improving the quality of life of our smaller communities and in Indian Country. The basic health and well being of rural people in New Mexico, as well as their economic future, are much brighter as a result of the rural development programs.

This amendment is straight forward. The bill already provides \$24 million for tribal programs, and I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for providing this important set aside. The amendment simply sets the priorities for how the existing tribal funding in the bill should be divided among the various Rural Development Programs. Under our amendment, \$1 million is set aside for rural business opportunity grants, \$5 million for community facilities for tribal colleges, \$15 million for grants for drinking water and waste disposal systems, and \$3 million for rural business enterprise grants. These priorities have the support of the National Congress of American Indians and the American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

I ask unanimous consent that letters from the NCAI and AIHEC supporting our amendment be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. BINGAMAN. The \$15 million in water and wastewater grants in this amendment include a special provision that allows the department to provide up to 100 percent of the cost of a

project for the most economically disadvantaged tribes that can't otherwise qualify for a loan as normally required. A similar grant program was first established by Congress last year to address the urgent needs in Indian Country for basic water and waste water systems. I am pleased that the Rural Utilities Service has moved quickly this year to implement this new program and we are seeing immediate results. To date, 26 grants have been awarded to tribes in 14 states—from Maine to California. The average grant is a little more than \$400,000. The RUS already has in hand requests for many millions of dollars in important projects for next year. This amendment will provide the funding to address these urgent needs.

In addition, the amendment provides \$5 million in much needed funding for facilities construction and maintenance at our 33 tribal colleges that comprise the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, AIHEC. Many of these institutions are operating in donated, abandoned, and in some cases, even condemned structures. Hazards include leaking roofs, asbestos insulation, exposed and substandard wiring, and crumbling foundations. Tribal colleges receive little or no funding from the states. These institutions are located on federal trust land and are a federal responsibility. The \$5 million provided in this amendment will begin to address the backlog in facility requirements for tribal colleges.

The development of new businesses in Indian Country is one key to self sufficiency for Native American communities. The amendment provides \$3 million in rural business enterprise grants to support the development of small and emerging tribal business enterprises. These funds can be used to develop land, construct buildings and factories, purchase equipment, provide road access and parking areas, extend basic utilities, or provide technical assistance, startup and operating costs, or working capital for new business.

Finally, the amendment provides a \$1 million set aside for tribal rural business opportunity grants. Tribes may use these funds to analyze business opportunities that will make use of the existing economic and human resources in Indian Country. Funding can also be used to train tribal entrepreneurs and to establish business support centers. Unemployment rates in Indian Country are the highest in the nation, sometimes topping 50 percent. Development of new business opportunities on tribal lands is one of the keys to improving the standard of living in Native American communities.

Congress established the rural development programs to assist in the economic development of rural areas of the nation with the highest percentage of low-income residents. Today, some of the most economically disadvantaged communities in America are in Indian Country. The \$24 million set aside in this bill for tribal programs

represents only a tiny percentage of the total funding available for Rural Community Advancement Programs. This funding will begin to address the needs of some of America's poorest communities.

Again, I want to thank Chairman COCHRAN and Senator KOHL for their support for the tribal funding in this bill. These are important programs to help deal with the critical needs of our tribes. I hope the Senate will support our amendment.

#### EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF  
AMERICAN INDIANS,  
Washington, DC, May 24, 2000.

Re Support for Bingaman Tribal Amendment

DEAR SENATOR: The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the oldest and most representatives Indian advocacy organization, respectfully request your support for an amendment to be offered by Senator Jeff Bingaman to S. 2536, the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill during full Senate consideration. This amendment would designate the \$24 million currently proposed for water and wastewater loans and grants in the Indian Rural Utilities Service (RUS) programs into four grant programs: 1) Rural Business Opportunity Grants; 2) Community Facilities Grants for Tribal College Improvements; 3) Drinking Water and Waste Disposal Systems for Economically Disadvantaged Tribes; and 4) Rural Business Enterprise Grants.

NCAI supports this amendment because it designates the funds for grant programs that are targeted to the specific rural development needs of tribes and tribal colleges, rather than for the general purpose of benefiting federally recognized Native American tribes.

In FY2000, Senator Bingaman was instrumental in securing the original set aside of \$12 million for the Indian RUS program. To date, 19 Indian projects have been funded, with five requests on hand, and an additional four that are or forthcoming.

NCAI respectfully request your support of the Bingaman Tribal amendment when it is offered for full Senate consideration. If you have any questions in regards to this amendment, please contact me or Victoria Wright, NCAI Legislative Associate at (202) 466-7767.

Sincerely,

JOANN K. CHASE,  
Executive Director.

AMERICAN INDIAN HIGHER  
EDUCATION CONSORTIUM,  
Alexandria, VA, July 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: The 33 Tribal Colleges and Universities that comprise the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) respectfully request your support of the Bingaman amendment to be offered during Senate consideration of the FY01 Agriculture Appropriations bill (S. 2536/H.R. 4461). This amendment would simply allocate the proposed \$24 million available for loans and grants to federally recognized American Indian tribes through the Rural Community Advancement Program into four grant programs: 1) Rural Business Opportunity Grants; 2) Community Facilities Grants for Tribal College Improvements; 3) Drinking Water and Waste Disposal Systems for Economically Disadvantaged Tribes; and 4) Rural Business Enterprise Grants.

Tribal Colleges serve as community centers, providing libraries, tribal archives, child care centers, nutrition and substance abuse counseling and a broad range of other vitally needed facilities to their rural communities. Yet, many of our colleges are still



operating in trailers, renovated gymnasiums, reclaimed abandoned BIA facilities with leaking roofs, exposed and substandard wiring and crumbling foundations. The Federal government has never funded authorized facilities programs for the Tribal Colleges. The Rural Community Programs were created to assist in the development of essential community facilities located in rural areas with a high concentration of low-income residents. This is by definition of the reservation communities served by the Tribal Colleges.

Our 33 colleges, 26,000 students and the 250 tribal nations we serve are extremely grateful to Senator Bingaman for championing this effort and for your support. The inclusion of the amendment will be a first step in bringing the Tribal Colleges much needed resources to address critical facilities needs.

Respectfully,

VERONICA N. GONZALES,  
*Executive Director.*

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the agricultural appropriations bill is very important bill—it provides federal assistance to our nation's farming communities, funds social service programs for women and children, and addresses natural resource management needs across the country.

I commend Chairman COCHRAN and other members of the Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee for their hard work to complete this year's bill. So, it is with regret that I had to vote against passage of this bill.

Mr. President, approval of the annual budget is among our most serious responsibilities. We are the trustees of billions of taxpayer dollars, and we should evaluate every spending decision with great deliberation and without prejudice.

Unfortunately, each year, we find new ways to violate budget policy. Appropriators have employed every sidestepping method in the book to circumvent Senate rules and common budget principles that are supposed to strictly guide the appropriations process. The excessive fodder and trickery have never been greater, resulting in the shameless waste of millions of taxpayer dollars. Included in this bill is more than \$243 million in pork-barrel spending and additional "emergency spending" at the cost of \$2 billion.

Traditional earmarks run rampant in this bill and its accompanying report for unrequested and low-priority spending. Other sly methods are also utilized to secure funding for parochial projects. If a direct amount is not earmarked, then the committee has covertly directed the USDA to grant special consideration to certain projects that would otherwise be subject to a competitive grant review. Appropriations bills are also popular targets to attach policy riders which clearly have no place in budget bills.

Another \$2 billion in designated "emergency" spending was also added to this bill for various crop and disaster related assistance. This "emergency" spending is in addition to billions already spent in the past few years for farm relief spending, as well as other supplemental appropriations included in the military conference re-

port for fiscal year 2000, and several billion more included in the recently passed crop insurance reform bill.

I rise today to tell my colleagues that I object.

I object to the \$243 million in directed earmarks for special interest projects in this bill. I object to sidestepping the legislative process by attaching erroneous riders to an appropriations bill. I object to speeding through appropriations bills without adequate review by all members. I object to budget gimmickry practiced by attaching non-germane and non-priority items to appropriations bills and designating them as "emergencies" to avoid exceeding budget allocations.

It is no surprise that many of these earmarks are included for political glamour rather than practical purposes. Members can go back to their districts to ride in public parades and garner votes at the expense of average citizens who are struggling to maintain minimum wage jobs.

Again, some of these items are not particularly objectionable on an individual basis. However, I am merely objecting to the way these projects have been selectively identified and prioritized for earmarks when so many other needs around our country go unaddressed. Other items clearly do not belong in this particular bill and, therefore, could be subject to budget points-of-order.

Numerous earmarks are included that are of questionable relation or priority to the purposes of this bill. A few examples are:

\$20 million for construction of a Los Angeles replacement laboratory and office space project in California;

\$3.5 million for the Delta Teachers Academy;

\$5 million for demonstration housing grants for agriculture, aquaculture, and seafood processing works in Mississippi and Alaska;

\$500,000 for cooperative efforts with the Claude E. Phillips Herbarium in Delaware;

\$87,000 for North American Studies in Texas;

\$436,000 for a clean air PM-10 study in Washington;

\$2,150,000 for a rural health program in Mississippi to train health care workers to serve in rural areas; and,

An additional \$520,000 for seven additional inspectors at the U.S.-Mexico Border at the San Diego ports of entry.

Again, Mr. President, these projects may be meritorious and helpful to the designated communities, but they do not appear appropriate to tag onto this year's agriculture spending bill. This appropriations measure is intended to address farmers, women, children and rural communities with the greatest need. Yet, by diverting millions to non-agricultural needs, we fail in this responsibility, forcing Congress to pass ad-hoc emergency spending bills with billions in farm relief and bail-outs for producers who cannot pay back their federal loans.

I hope my colleagues will agree that we have higher spending priorities that are directly related to the purposes of this agriculture bill. Had we more responsibility allocated funding in these appropriations bills, we certainly could have avoided this type of egregious pork-barrel and emergency ad hoc spending which cuts deep into the budget surplus.

Mr. President, I have compiled a list of objectionable provisions in this bill and its accompanying report. However, the list is too lengthy to include in the RECORD, but will be available from my Senate office.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the American food supply is one of the safest in the world—but it is not safe enough. Over 75 million Americans a year are stricken by disease caused by contaminated food they eat. Each year, 9,000 people—mostly the very young and the very old—die as a result. The costs of medical treatment and losses in productivity from these illnesses are as high as \$37 billion annually.

The emergency of highly virulent strains of bacteria, and the increase in the number of organisms resistant to antibiotics, are compounding these problems and making foodborne illnesses an increasingly serious public health challenge.

Americans deserve to know that the foods they eat are safe, regardless of their source. Yet too many citizens today are at unnecessary risk of foodborne diseases. This Congress can make a difference. The FDA requested a budget increase of \$30 million in 2001 for its Food Safety Initiative activities. With these additional funds, the FDA can improve its inspection of high-risk food establishments and strengthen its laboratory capabilities. Without this funding, the agency will conduct 700 fewer inspections next year. The Senate Appropriations Committee recognized the importance of protecting our food supply by granting the FDA the majority of its requested increase for food safety. The amendment I propose will give the FDA the additional \$6 million it needs for these efforts.

In response to improved surveillance and increased sampling and testing, illnesses from the most common bacterial foodborne pathogens decreased by 21 percent from 1997 to 1999. As a result, 855,000 fewer Americans each year suffer from foodborne diseases. But contaminated food still remains a significant public health problem.

Recently, a new strain of an organism contaminated oysters in Texas, and caused an epidemic of diarrhea. This year, the FDA recalled several smoked fish products manufactured in New York because of outbreaks of disease. In March, 500 college students in Massachusetts became ill with Norwalk-like virus. Each year there are also at least 4700 cases of Salmonella in Massachusetts. We must do more to protect our citizens from foodborne diseases.

Imported foods are a significant part of the problem and often pose especially serious health risks. Americans are consuming foods from other countries at increasing rates. Since 1992, the number of food imports has tripled. At that time, the FDA was able to inspect only 8 percent of these imports. Since then the rate of FDA inspections of imported food has dropped to less than 1 percent, because resources did not increase for monitoring these imports.

Other countries have often not implemented food safety protections comparable to those in the United States, and general sanitary conditions are often poor. As a consequence, foods from such countries are more likely to be contaminated with disease-producing organisms. In 1995, 242 people contracted Salmonella from alfalfa sprouts imported from the Netherlands. In 1996, over 1,400 people became ill from contaminated raspberries from Guatemala. Just this year, infected shrimp from Vietnam caused Salmonella and E. coli outbreaks.

In earlier decades, diseases such as tuberculosis and cholera were the focus of food safety concerns. Today diseases caused by dangerous new strains of E. coli have become primary causes of foodborne illness. These new organisms necessitate increased investment in research, technology, and surveillance to protect the safety of our food supply.

Food safety efforts are also especially important to protect the growing number of individuals in vulnerable populations, such as young children, the elderly, those with lowered immunity from HIV, and those with inadequate access to health care.

By providing the FDA with the necessary resources to combat foodborne diseases, we can protect tens of millions of our fellow citizens across the country each year. Investment in food safety is an investment in the health of every American. Congress should give the FDA the resources it needs in order to ensure the safety of the food we eat. The amendment I am proposing is a major step to meet this challenge, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for and cosponsorship of the Hatch-Durbin amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill to increase funding for the Office of Generic Drugs (OGD) at the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) by \$2 million.

As we all know, the high costs of prescription drugs are on the minds of Americans because having access to affordable prescription drugs is essential for people of all ages. Over the next 5 years, the patents of name brand drugs with approximately \$22 billion in sales will expire. Consumers will save millions of dollars from generic prescription drug alternatives. This will help to alleviate cost pressures facing some of our most vulnerable citizens—seniors and the chronically ill.

The FDA will be able to help make drugs more affordable only if it has

adequate resources to review and approve generic drug applications in a timely manner. In recent years, I have worked with Senators SPECTER, HARKIN, and other cosponsors of this amendment to urge our colleagues to increase funds for the Office of Generic Drugs. These efforts have paid off in a reduction in the backlog of generic drug applications. Unfortunately, the President did not request an increase for the Office of Generic Drugs for the 2001 fiscal year. However, the workload for the office continues to increase and for the first time in several years, the backlog of applications has increased rather than continue to decline.

An increase of \$2 million for the Office of Generic Drugs will be used for training and the upgrade of information technology systems that will allow for the electronic submission and review of generic drug applications.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment. This amendment will put the review record of the Office of Generic Drugs back on course.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001.

The Senate-reported bill provides \$75.1 billion in new budget authority (BA) and \$39.4 billion in new outlays to fund most of the programs of the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies. All of the discretionary funding in this bill is nondefense spending.

When outlays from prior-year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the Senate-reported bill totals \$64.2 billion in BA and \$46.7 billion in outlays for FY 2001. Including mandatory savings, the subcommittee is at its 302(b) allocation in both BA and outlays.

The Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee 302(b) allocation totals \$64.4 billion in BA and \$46.7 billion in outlays. Within this amount, \$14.9 billion in BA and \$15.0 billion in outlays is for nondefense discretionary spending.

For discretionary spending in the bill, and counting (scoring) all the mandatory savings in the bill, the Senate-reported bill is \$315 million in BA and \$6 million in outlays below the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation. It is \$75 million in BA below and \$131 million in outlays above the 2000 level for discretionary spending, and \$630 million in BA and \$77 million in outlays below the President's request for these programs.

I recognize the difficulty of bringing this bill to the floor at its 302(b) allocation. I appreciate the committee's support for a number of ongoing projects and programs important to my home State of New Mexico as it has worked to keep this bill within its budget allocation.

I urge adoption of the bill.

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

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

S. 2536, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 2001 SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

(Fiscal year 2001 in millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget authority .....	14,539	49,616	64,155
Outlays .....	14,961	31,775	46,736
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority .....	14,584	49,616	64,470
Outlays .....	14,967	31,775	46,742
2000 level:			
Budget authority .....	14,614	50,295	64,909
Outlays .....	14,830	33,088	47,918
President's request			
Budget authority .....	15,169	49,616	64,785
Outlays .....	15,038	31,775	46,813
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority .....	-315		-315
Outlays .....	-6		-6
2000 level:			
Budget authority .....	-75	-679	-754
Outlays .....	131	-1,313	-1,182
President's request			
Budget authority .....	-630		-630
Outlays .....	-77		-77

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4461, the FY2001 Agriculture appropriations bill. I commend Senator COCHRAN for bringing forward what I believe is a solid bill to fund those programs of greatest importance to production agriculture and rural America. The task to complete this legislation is never easy, but the Senator from Mississippi has again worked to craft a bill that serves the states of all members of the Senate.

In this era of tight budget caps, crafting this legislation becomes more difficult each year. Despite these difficulties, the chairman has still found a way to provide increases in funding for several vital programs, including:

Farm Service Agency Staffing +\$20 million from FY00; Conservation Programs +\$63.4 million; Food Safety Inspection Service +\$29 million; and Agricultural Research +60.4 million.

Mr. President, I know that many Senators and our constituents are often upset to see increases in funding for federal staffing. But, I must tell you that this increase in funding for FSA staffing is essential.

The Farm Service Agency is responsible for distributing all AMTA, LDP, and market loss payments and programs to our producers. With the low prices of the past two years, these staff have faced a tremendous workload. These programs are essential to our producers and without proper staffing the delivery of these programs will be delayed. This is funding that will benefit our producers.

The productivity of today's U.S. agricultural machine is a modern day miracle that is a model for the rest of the world. We grow more food, for more people, on less land each year. Much of this productivity is a direct result of the commitment Congress has provided to agricultural research in the past. Additional research and productivity

will be essential, as the world's population continues to grow in the next fifty years. The U.S. must be a leader in this area, and I thank the chairman for his commitment to research funding in this legislation.

In addition, I want to thank the chairman for the additional funding provided for the Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS). Kansas is the largest beef packing state in the country and beef accounts for nearly 1/2 the farm income in my state each year. We have many small plants and lockers located throughout the state, and we have the "Big 4" packers located within a 100-mile radius of each other in the southwestern part of the state. These plants have experienced inspector shortages at several points during the past year. These shortages result in reduced production chain speeds, which results in lost income for the processors, and fewer cattle being slaughtered which directly affects the pocketbooks of my cowboys and cattle ranchers. I am hopeful FSIS will use this money to hire inspectors and locate them in those areas where they are most needed.

I think it is also important to point out the significantly larger amount of funding for USDA agricultural export programs in the Senate bill compared to the House Agricultural Appropriations bill. We need full funding of these programs if our producers are to continue gaining additional world market shares, and I am hopeful the Senate position will prevail in conference with the House.

Finally, I thank the chairman for the funding he has provided for continued wheat and grain sorghum research in the State of Kansas through the Agricultural Research Service and Kansas State University. Kansas is the No. 1 producer of both wheat and grain sorghum in the U.S. Thus, the two crops play a vital role in our state's agricultural economy. This funding will allow us to continue research that allows us to combat emerging diseases in these crops and to find better ways to market them as well.

Again, I thank the Chairman for his efforts on this legislation. As always, he and staff—Rebecca Davies, Martha Scott Poindexter, Les Spivey, and Hunt Shipman—have taken very difficult budget numbers and have gone out of their way to address the needs of the constituents of all members of the Senate. They should be applauded for their work, and I urge my colleagues to support quick passage of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, during consideration of the 1990 Farm Bill, a provision was inserted granting the USDA Graduate School the ability to enter non-competitive, interagency agreements for the provision of training services to other agencies. The Graduate School pursues and enters into these side agreements with other Federal agencies on a non-competitive basis. The private sector is shut out, unable to bid on these contracts.

Section 1669 enables the United States Department of Agriculture Graduate School (Graduate School) to accept non-competitive agreements from federal agencies to provide training and other human resource services. The provision limits—and even discourages—competition in contracting, the cornerstone of fair and equitable pricing in the award of government contracts.

Despite its name and 80-year history, the Graduate School is not a part of the federal government. The Comptroller General of the United States ruled that the Graduate School is a "Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality" (NAFI). NAFIs do not receive budget authority or appropriations from Congress and are supported entirely by fees or prices for their services. Like other NAFIs the Graduate School is not subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulations, the Freedom of Information Act, or other laws and regulations governing the operations of federal agencies. The Comptroller General ruled that the Graduate School, as a NAFI, is not a proper recipient of interagency order from Government agencies for training services. And under law, these orders are only permissible if a commercial enterprise can't provide the goods or services as conveniently or cheaply.

Various federal laws do indeed provide preferential treatment for economically disadvantaged firms in the award of government contracts. Under these programs administered and monitored by federal agencies, such as the Small Business Administration, Department of Labor, and Department of Commerce, many small businesses, minority-owned enterprises, and firms in labor surplus areas qualify by meeting established regulatory standards.

The Graduate School, however is not economically disadvantaged. The Graduate School earned net profits exceeding \$13 million over the past five years. Effective on the close of its 1998 fiscal year on September 30, its net worth was \$18.5 million; its aggregate retained earnings (1993-1998) were \$13.3 million, and its current asset/liability ratio was 2.01. In spite of this financially advantageous position, the Graduate School pays "bargain rate" non-profit postage, receives donated space and services from federal agencies, and pays no federal income tax.

Only the Graduate School benefits from the preferential treatment afforded by Section 1669.

The Graduate School has government subsidized facilities in Washington, D.C., Chicago, Philadelphia, Honolulu, Atlanta, Dallas, and San Francisco. It offers a range of business, finance and management courses that could be offered by hundreds of local community colleges or private training firms.

The Graduate School benefits at the expense of small and large tax-paying businesses and is not selling any commodity they could not provide. Indeed, many large and small-business training

enterprises are ready, willing, and able to compete for the Graduate School's share of agency training budgets.

Mr. President, competition requires a level playing field. Without it, American taxpayers take the hit. And agencies and taxpayers are not receiving the benefits for quality and pricing that competition provides. In Section 1669 restrictive, narrowly based, preferential legislation undermines proven forces of the market economy to determine fair and equitable prices. Section 1669 of the 1990 Agriculture Act (PL 101-624) must be repealed.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed by a margin of 74-21 the Jeffords-Dorgan amendment to allow for importation of FDA-approved prescription medicines by licensed pharmacists and drug wholesalers. This amendment addresses a very important issue for American consumers, especially for senior citizens who must pay for their medicines out of their own pockets. The same medications sold in the United States are also sold in Canada and other countries, often at substantially lower prices. This amendment has the potential to save American consumers millions of dollars by giving them access to their medicines at these lower prices at their local pharmacies.

I am pleased that this amendment has the support of the National Community Pharmacists Association, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support from the NCPA be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL COMMUNITY  
PHARMACISTS ASSOCIATION,

July 17, 2000.

Re H.R. 4461—Ag Appropriations Jeffords/Dorgan/Wellstone et al., amendment.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the independent pharmacists in your state, I would like to express the National Community Pharmacists Associations' endorsement of the strongly bipartisan cited amendment that safely allows American consumers to benefit from international price competition for prescription medicines.

The Jeffords/Dorgan/Wellstone amendment is designed to permit the importation of prescription drugs by American pharmacies so long as the drugs meet Food and Drug Administration standards, including compliance with current good manufacturing practices. Such FDA-approved drugs are sold in Canada, the United Kingdom, EU countries, and other countries for prices considerable lower than the best prices available to retailers in this country. We agree with its sponsors that it "is a fair commonsense, free-market approach to lowering drug prices for constituents while benefiting small businesses" and that "it's outrageous that Americans should have to resort to crossing borders to purchase their prescriptions. We should be able to buy our medications at reasonable prices from pharmacies in our neighborhoods."

This amendment encourages and supports the role of pharmacists in our health care system and strengthens their ability to continue to provide affordable, critical products and services. It also will likely encourage

more employers to continue and even initiate prescription drug coverage for their employees.

The objectives of this amendment are fully compatible with the 1988, Prescription Drug Marketing Act [PL 100-293] authored by your former colleague Spark Matsunaga and the dean of the House of Representatives, Representative John Dingell. This law in an effort to prevent the importation of counterfeit or adulterated prescription drugs banned reimportation of all prescription drugs, except by manufacturers. The proposed amendment would authorize importation including reimportation by legitimate pharmacists, pharmacists buying groups and wholesalers. Under the amendment, pharmacies and wholesalers importing drugs would still have to meet the *same* standards set by FDA, which allowed \$12.8 billion worth of Rx drugs to be imported into the U.S. by manufacturers in 1997.

Obviously, imports by legitimate businesses including the independent pharmacies will not increase counterfeit drugs and will not put the health of American consumers at risk. To claim otherwise would at best be deceptive.

According to the United States International Trade Commission staff, more than 16% of the prescription drugs consumed by American patients were in fact imported. Typical, would be a nasal inhaler for asthma patients whose labeling reads "Assembled in Great Britain from products manufactured in Great Britain, Sweden, and Finland and manufactured for Astra USA, Inc. Westborough, MA."

Further, the amendment provides for a paper trail to assure that the drugs are properly transported and stored; and to prevent the importation of counterfeit, adulterated or other inappropriate prescription drugs. It also allows for testing of imported drugs when appropriate.

It is noteworthy that both the FDA and the PMA (now PhRMA) testified against and otherwise opposed the 1988 reimportation provision. Now the drug maker organization has done a 180, claiming that limiting reimports to them protects the public and disingenuously claiming that community retail pharmacy is not a competitive marketplace and that, consequently, any lower acquisition cost available to community pharmacies would benefit consumers only if pharmacies were forced through price controls to pass on savings to patients.

The truth is that the community pharmacy marketplace has virtually all of the characteristics of a healthy competitive marketplace. It has a significant number of widely dispersed, diversely owned businesses that are readily available to consumers. These competitive businesses predictably have modest gross margins or markups and low profits. What these businesses do not have is access to fairly priced branded Rx's based on economies of scale. Drugmakers, through discriminatory pricing practices, are responsible for this unhealthy characteristic of the community pharmacy marketplace.

In addition to the strong and growing number of bipartisan cosponsors, Congress has already taken key steps in support of the Jeffords/Dorgan/Wellstone approach. On April 6, 2000, the Senate approved the Gorton/Jeffords Sense of the Senate resolution that the "cost disparity between identical prescription drugs sold in the United States, Canada and Mexico should be reduced or eliminated." On Monday, July 10, 2000, two relevant and significant amendments were approved by the House of Representatives on the Agriculture Appropriation bill, H.R. 4461. The first amendment was approved 363 to 12. It forbids the FDA from enforcing the ban on

reimportation. The second amendment was approved 370 to 12. It prevents any FDA action regarding prescription drugs manufactured in FDA approved facilities in the US, Canada and Mexico. Notably, the House Commerce Committee Chairman and its five subcommittee chairs voted for both of these amendments.

A recent survey by the Senior Citizens League found that 88% of seniors favor the Jeffords/Dorgan/Wellstone amendment to allow safe prescription drugs to be imported from Canada and other countries.

The small businesses, independent health care professionals we represent are the preferred choice of American consumers. Our members function in the market in a variety of forms. They do business as single stores ranging from apothecaries to full line high volume pharmacies; as independent chains (e.g. 100 pharmacies) and as franchises (e.g. Medicine Shoppe, 1200 pharmacies). Whatever the form of business entity, however, independent pharmacists are the decision makers for this wide variety of NCPA member companies.

The most in depth consumer survey to date conducted by *Consumer Reports*, involving 15,000 consumers, published last fall, found that consumers preferred independently owned pharmacies for several reasons: Independents provided more personal attention; Independents provided more useful information about both prescription and non-prescription drugs; Independent druggists were seen as more professional, more sensitive to families' needs, and easier to talk to; Independents kept consumers waiting less time for drugs, had prescriptions ready for pickup more often, and provided out-of-stock medicine faster.

Our 1200 plus independently owned members in the Medicine Shoppes franchise were ranked second; the supermarket drugstores were third, the mass merchandisers were fourth; and the worst stores overall were the big corporate run chains. No preference was expressed for mail order.

The community pharmacist of today is simultaneously a health care professional and a small businessperson. As owners, managers, and employees of independent pharmacies, our member's 30,000 pharmacies and our 75,000 are committed to provide legislative and regulatory initiatives, which are designed to protect the public; to provide them a level playing field and a fair chance to compete; and to provide quality pharmacists services to your constituents. The Jeffords/Dorgan/Wellstone et. al. amendments with its safe, but free trade approach, meets each of these criteria.

We urge you to vote for the Jeffords/Dorgan/Wellstone amendment to H.R. 4461. It will unleash market forces to help reduce the cost of safe prescription drugs for all of your constituents, including seniors.

Warm Regards,

JOHN M. RECTOR,  
Senior Vice President.

*Government Affairs and General Counsel.*

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator COCHRAN, my chairman, and his fine staff for the efficient completion of S. 2536. My friend from Mississippi has conducted this debate—as he always does—in a balanced, fair, and non partisan manner. He is a gentleman and a friend, and it is an honor and a pleasure to work with him.

The bill we just passed includes funding for a wide variety of programs important to the American people. This is especially true now due to economic conditions in rural America which have not kept pace with the general prosperity enjoyed by most Americans.

The bill also responds quickly and adequately to the very real crisis that has hit the dairy industry across this nation. Last December, milk prices dropped unexpectedly and dramatically. Today, the base price farmers receive for their milk is \$9.46. The average base price for 1998 was \$14.21, and the average for 1999 was \$12.43.

Those cold numbers cannot express the hard damage that has been done to dairy farmers and their families throughout my State, and throughout the nation. They add up to families that have stopped milking after generations, and rural towns that are collapsing as farms disappear. America's dairyland is in real danger of becoming a wasteland.

And today with this bill, the Senate has responded with emergency payments to the small farmers hardest hit by this disaster. I am proud of this institution for putting aside regional differences and interests, and for seeing this provision as—not just helping Wisconsin farmers, or Vermont farmers, or Pennsylvania farmers—but as helping American families.

I also thank the Senator from West Virginia, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, for his vital assistance in securing these emergency dairy payments. At the end of last year, when we spent a great deal of the Senate's time on dairy issues, he listened to me and to the unique struggles of Wisconsin dairy farmers. He said then he would do whatever he could to help. And he has. He is a man who speaks some of the most inspiring and powerful words spoken on the Senate floor—and he is a man of those words. It is an honor to serve with him.

This is a good bill and, again, we should all congratulate Senator COCHRAN for his fine leadership of our subcommittee. I also want to thank the members of my staff who have helped make this process run as smoothly as it has this year: Paul Bock, my chief of staff, and Ben Miller, who is new on my staff this year, have done a fine job. Special thanks goes to the subcommittee's minority clerk, Galen Fountain, without whom I do not believe there could be an Agriculture bill in the Senate. His knowledge of the subject, his patience, his loyalty, and his work ethic are legendary around here, and deservedly so.

I look forward to moving this bill through conference quickly, and having a solid Agriculture budget in place well before October 1st.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, there are no more amendments. I appreciate very much the cooperation of all Senators. We are ready to go to third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Did we just pass the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not yet announced the final passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Abraham	Durbin	McConnell
Akaka	Edwards	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Moynihan
Baucus	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Bayh	Frist	Reed
Bennett	Gorton	Reid
Biden	Grams	Robb
Bingaman	Grassley	Roberts
Bond	Gregg	Rockefeller
Breaux	Hagel	Roth
Brownback	Harkin	Santorum
Bryan	Hatch	Sarbanes
Burns	Helms	Schumer
Byrd	Hollings	Sessions
Campbell	Hutchinson	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Inhofe	Snowe
Cochran	Jeffords	Specter
Collins	Johnson	Stevens
Conrad	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Landrieu	Thompson
Crapo	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Warner
DeWine	Levin	Wellstone
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Domenici	Lott	
Dorgan	Lugar	

NAYS—13

Allard	Kyl	Smith (NH)
Enzi	Lieberman	Torricelli
Feingold	Mack	Voinovich
Graham	McCain	
Gramm	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—7

Boxer	Kennedy	Murray
Bunning	Kerrey	
Inouye	Kerry	

The bill (H.R. 4461), as amended, was passed.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate insists on its amendments and requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I want to express my deepest appreciation for the excellent cooperation of our professional staff members of the Appropriations Committee. Our subcommittee staff, in particular, led by our chief clerk, Rebecca Davies, and other staff members, including Martha Scott Poindexter; Hunt Shipman; Les Spivey; and Coy Neal; the minority professional staff, Galen Fountain and Carole Geagley; the full committee staff member, Jay Kimmitt; Senator KOHL's personal staff members, Ben Miller and Paul Bock. They were all enormously helpful in the handling of this legislation and the passage of this legislation tonight in the Senate. For all of their assistance, I am deeply grateful.

I also have to thank Senator HERB KOHL, the distinguished ranking member of the Democratic side of the aisle on this subcommittee.

I appreciate the able assistance we received during the final, crucial stages of the handling of this bill from Senator LOTT, the majority leader; Senator STEVENS, chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations; and Senator REID of Nevada, who provided assistance all during the handling of the bill on the floor of the Senate today. We appreciate all of the good work they did. We also thank all Senators for permitting us to pass this legislation tonight.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the manager of the Agriculture appropriations bill for allowing me to begin this unanimous consent request and for his patience in working through this long series of amendments. Again, I thank HARRY REID and Senator DASCHLE for their work with us. We have a unanimous consent request so Senators will know how to proceed tonight.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the reconciliation/marriage tax relief conference report to H.R. 4810, and there be up to 90 minutes for debate this evening, to be equally divided between the two managers.

I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes at 9 a.m. on Friday, there be 30 minutes of debate on the marriage tax penalty conference report, to be equally divided

between the two managers, and following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to the vote on adoption of the reconciliation/marriage tax relief conference report, without any intervening action, motion, or debate.

I further ask consent that following the disposition of the marriage tax relief conference report on Friday, the Senate immediately proceed to executive session in order to consider the following nominations, that they be considered en bloc, confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be notified, and the Senate return to legislative session. Those nominations are:

Johnnie Rawlinson, to be a Ninth Circuit Judge; Dennis Cavanaugh, to be a district judge; John E. Steele, to be a district judge; Gregory Presnell, to be a district judge; and James Moody, to be a district judge.

If we can get an agreement, Senator DASCHLE and I are prepared to go forward with the Department of Defense appropriations bill. We don't have that yet, but we will try to clear that on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I thank Senator DASCHLE, Senator REID, and Senator COCHRAN for their help in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, the ranking member of the Finance Committee, has been here. He checked with the minority and there is nobody on the minority side who wishes to speak tonight. The Senator will be here in the morning to lead the debate for the minority on the marriage tax issue. I wanted the RECORD to be clear because my friend, Senator ROTH, indicated that the ranking member would be here. He was here and he checked to see if anybody on our side wished to speak and nobody did. So he has departed from the Chamber.

MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 4810 have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD, of July 19, 2000.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, tomorrow this Senate will approve the Marriage Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000. This is a great victory for the American family—all of America's families. It is not one that has been won for America's families, as much as it has been earned by America's families.

This bill is the centerpiece of our efforts to reduce the tax overpayment by American taxpayers. It is fair, it is responsible, it is the right thing to do for American families. And it is long overdue that they receive it.

The provisions in this bill will help 45 million families. That is substantially every family in the U.S. Some of my colleagues have argued that almost half of those families—21 million families located in every state in this country—do not deserve any tax relief. I reject that. I reject it because in my home state of Delaware it would mean leaving over 30,000 families that contributed to our ever-growing budget surplus out of family tax relief.

Why should the family in which one spouse stays home to raise the children and keep the house not receive a tax break? Does that spouse not work? Do you imagine that spouse doesn't work just because she or he does not get paid? Does that family not count? They do in Delaware, they do in this country, and they do in this bill.

All of these American families have contributed to the record surplus that we have in Washington. They deserve to get some of it back. I believed that three months ago when I first unveiled this package. And I believe it even more so now in light of estimates recently released by the Congressional Budget Office.

Today's bill amounts to less than 5 percent of the total budget surplus over the next 5 years. That is less than a nickel on the dollar of our total budget surplus. It amounts to just 9 percent of the total non-Social Security surplus over the next five years. That is less than a dime on the dollar of the non-Social Security surplus. A nickel and a dime. By any comparison or estimation, this marriage tax relief is fiscally responsible. Those who dispute that are themselves seeking to "nickel-and-dime" America's families out of tax relief.

I would ask those who oppose this family tax relief: just how big will America's budget surplus have to get before America's families deserve to receive some of their tax dollars back? If not now, when? If just 5 percent of the budget surplus and just 9 percent of the tax overpayment is too big a refund, how little should it be? How long do they have to wait? How hard do they have to work? How large an overpayment do they have to make? How large a budget surplus do we need to have?

This bill is fair. We have addressed the three largest sources of marriage tax penalties in the tax code—the standard deduction, the rate brackets, and the earned income credit. And we have done so in a way that does not create any new penalties—any new disincentives in the tax code. We have ensured that a family with one stay-at-home parent is not treated worse for tax purposes than a family where both parents work outside the home. This is an important principle because these are important families.

Let's take a look at what all these families will receive under our bill—and just as importantly, let's look at when they will get it. First, our bill increases the standard deduction for married couples filing a joint return to twice the deduction for singles.

This benefit, which would reduce a couple's taxable income by \$1,450, is effective for this taxable year. That's right—for the year 2000. That means when a couple files their tax returns this coming April, they will be able to see and feel the results of our work. This provision will benefit about 25 million taxpayers. As a result, I believe that we should call this bill the ASAP tax relief bill for America's taxpayers—tax relief for America's families now.

Now, I know that those who search for excuses to oppose tax relief will question the immediacy of this tax cut. Before they do, I would remind those people: it was not a problem for them to raise taxes retroactively seven years ago. And of course, when you are raising taxes retroactively, it is a big problem because people have already made their financial commitments. In contrast, giving people an immediate tax cut is only a problem if you object to letting people keep their money.

Second, our bill increases the 15 percent rate bracket for married couples so that it is twice the size of the corresponding rate bracket for singles. While we phase in this doubling, we begin the increase immediately. Taxpayers will receive a portion of the benefit as soon as possible—as soon as they file their year 2000 tax returns. And they will see the entire benefit—a total of over \$1,100 per family—in the year 2004. This provision will help about 21 million taxpayers.

Third, our bill helps married couples who are receiving the earned income credit. We increase the beginning and ending points of the credit's income phase-out for these couples by \$2,000. Just like the other provisions in the bill, we deliver this relief immediately—for the tax year 2000. The hard working families who receive the EIC will see the benefit as soon as they file their year 2000 tax returns. This provision helps almost four million families, including an expansion of the EIC to one million families who were previously ineligible for the credit because of their combined income.

Finally, our bill ensures that families will continue to receive their family

tax credits. Congress has delivered a variety of tax credits to American families—credits like the child credit, the HOPE credit, the Lifetime Learning credit, the dependent care credit, and the adoption credit. This bill extends a temporary provision that carves out these credits from the ever-reaching grasp of the alternative minimum tax. Millions of families will also see this benefit. For them, this tax relief won't be an empty promise.

In any House-Senate conference, both sides are forced to make compromises. This one was no exception. I would like to have included the doubling of the 28 percent bracket as we did in the Senate and as 61 Senators supported. I think that these families deserve their full tax break as well. Even the Democratic alternative offered in the Senate accounted for these families by not completely phasing-out their relief until \$150,000. I fought hard, but our colleagues in the House did not agree and they refused to budge. I also would have liked to keep our earned income credit provision at \$2,500. Once again, the House disagreed. But this is still a good bill and it still delivers the tax relief families have earned and deserve.

Despite the red flags thrown up by those who want to stand in the way of marriage tax relief, this bill actually makes the tax code more progressive. Families with incomes under \$100,000 receive a tax cut under our bill that is proportionally higher than the amount of taxes they currently pay. In other words, their tax burden will fall.

Let's look at a few examples prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation. First, let's take a married couple with two children earning \$30,000. When this bill is fully effective, that couple would see a reduction in its taxes of over 143 percent. On the other hand, a two-child couple earning \$100,000 would see its taxes drop by 11 percent, and a couple earning \$200,000 would see its taxes drop by less than 4 percent.

This same dynamic holds true for a couple with no children. Under our bill, a couple earning \$20,000 would see its taxes reduced by 28 percent; a couple earning \$75,000 would have its taxes reduced by 16 percent, and a couple earning \$100,000 would have its taxes reduced by 9.5 percent.

There is no honest way people can claim that this bill is tilted towards the rich. I believe that the real complaint of those who oppose this bill is not that it is tilted towards the rich—because it is not—but because it is tilted away from Washington. As a result, some of America's tax overpayment will flow back to America's families.

And while I would rather have seen the 28 percent bracket doubling included in the bill, its absence does do one thing. Its absence removes any excuse for the President not to sign this bill. If President Clinton does not sign this bill, then there is only one explanation. No matter how much the amount of surplus, no matter how much the size of the tax overpayment,

no matter how high the overall tax burden, and no matter how much families deserve tax relief, it is all less important than the fact that Washington wants the money more. They are saying to America: those in the White House need your money more than the people in your house do.

With the passage of this bill, Congress has met every test that the President has set for tax relief. He wanted it to go to deserving people. Who could be more deserving than America's families? He wanted it to be fiscally responsible. What could be more fiscally responsible than using just a nickel on America's budget surplus dollar and a dime on its tax overpayment? He wanted it to be one provision and not part of a large package. How could it be smaller than the single proposal of family tax relief included here?

Every test, no matter how illusory, has been met. With this bill, President Clinton has run out of excuses for not giving American families tax relief. No more if's, and's, or but's. No more excuses. No more obstacles and no more conditions, this Senate will go on record tomorrow: Family tax relief now.

Madam President, the time for excuses has passed, the time for family tax relief has come. While President Clinton has been focused on international affairs, families across America have been waiting for us to make good on our promise. For President Clinton to make good on his promise. They have been patient. They are waiting for us to return some of this record surplus to them.

There is no reason, none whatsoever, that this bill, the ASAP tax relief bill for America's family taxpayers, should not be immediately signed. Let's approve the Marriage Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000 and let's divorce the marriage tax penalty from the tax code once and for all.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back the time of the minority tonight, leaving the equally divided half hour in the morning.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, I will yield back whatever time is not used by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who wishes to speak.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Madam President, I will need somewhere around 10 minutes to discuss the conference report. May I proceed at this time?

Mr. ROTH. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kansas, and I will yield back the remainder of our time tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Madam President, I thank the chairman of the Finance Committee for putting forward this legislation. This is the marriage penalty tax. It has been before this body. We passed it with 61 votes in favor of it, and 9 Democrats voted in favor of this bill. Almost the entire Republican side voted for this bill. Now we have a conference report in front of us.

I hope people will look at this and look at what is in the conference report. That is why I wanted to take some time to go through it. It is a 5-year package, \$89 billion. I don't want people saying it is \$250 billion or anything; it is an \$89 billion package. It only hits the 15-percent tax bracket. There has been concern about the 28-percent bracket being hit. It doesn't include the 28-percent bracket. The House side has a 15-percent bracket in dealing with the marriage penalty but not the 28-percent bracket. So we went with the House side and said: OK, we will pull out the 28-percent bracket. So it is just that 15-percent bracket. It is phased in faster than the Senate bill that passed. It does continue to contain the earned-income tax provisions within it so that married couples who are currently being hit by a marriage penalty associated with the earned-income tax credit are no longer impacted by that.

This is an overall excellent bill that meets virtually everybody's suggestions that they were making about this bill. I hope we can get 100 percent support within the Senate for this bill.

It eliminates the marriage penalty built into the standard deduction effective back to the beginning of this year. It backs it up to the beginning of the year 2000. It widens the 15-percent bracket gradually so that joint filing is two times that of singles. It starts at the beginning of this year, and is fully effective by the year 2004.

In other words, we are taking that 15-percent bracket for two-wage earners, or spouses with combined incomes, or even only one spouse, and we are doubling the standard deduction. We are doing it up until 2004.

It increases the top phaseout amount of the earned-income tax credit—the provision I was talking about earlier—for joint filers by \$2,000 effective to the beginning of this year; again, the beginning of the year 2000. It sunsets the tax relief provisions in accordance with the Byrd rule at the end of 2004. I want to make sure to point out that provision to people as well. This is a 5-year marriage penalty elimination for the 15-percent tax bracket and earned-income tax credit.

That is basically what the package is. I think it should contain more. I think we ought to have the 28-percent bracket as well on combined incomes. We couldn't get agreement to that in the House. We did on the 15-percent bracket.

I direct most of my statement tonight to the administration. This is going to pass. It is going to pass strong. We have had a lot of calls and contacts in our office from people saying: Of course you shouldn't tax marriage. Let's do away with this penalty. That is what we are simply pleading to the President.

After tomorrow morning when this passes with at least 61 votes, this will be on the administration's desk. It is up to the President and Vice President

to determine whether they are going to sign this tax cut. Are we going to sign this tax correction and send to the American people, or are we going to veto it?

The President has been saying: OK. Send me prescription drugs and I will sign the marriage penalty. In the State of the Union Message, he said: Let's deal with the marriage penalty tax, and let's eliminate it. He didn't say then that you have to send this to me at the same time. He asked for a hundred things in the State of the Union Message. He didn't say they have to be linked together. I think he is hiding behind that issue rather than saying whether he is for or against eliminating the marriage penalty within the Tax Code.

I call on the President to sign this for the American people. After tomorrow morning, the President and the Vice President and this administration are all that stands in the way of the American people being able to receive this correction within the Tax Code so people who are married don't pay more taxes than people who are single.

It simply makes equitable a situation for most people impacted by the marriage penalty; not all. It would be better if it dealt with everybody. It is a simple statement that we should not be taxing marriage. We have said that repeatedly. For most people impacted by the marriage penalty, this bill will deal with that situation. We will not be taxing people just for being married. Plus, I think it is just the right message to send across to the American public saying we think marriage is a valuable institution; it shouldn't be taxed. We think it is at the center of family values. Let's all say we are for it and that we shouldn't be taxing it.

Also, it gets around that iron rule in government that if you want less of something, tax it; if you want more of something, subsidize it. I don't think we want to tell the American public we want less marriage, and therefore we are taxing them.

This is the time for us to accomplish this.

I say in conclusion that this is going to pass, and it will pass large tomorrow morning. At least nine Democrats voted for it the last time. The only thing that stands in the way of this tax relief—this tax sanity, that we shouldn't be taxing marriage and the American public—is the President of the United States. Please, Mr. President, sign this bill.

This is good tax policy. This Congress is doing a number of things. We are getting them to the President. It is up to the President whether he will sign them into law.

I note the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Madam President, the Marriage Tax Relief Act that passed in the Senate previously and that has now come back to us from conference is a piece of legislation of historic importance. I would like to share a few thoughts with this body concerning why I think it is so important.

Not long ago a Harvard president wrote a book about the beginning of our Republic—the first 150 years. He said every piece of legislation that was considered and passed was debated on the principle of whether or not it would make the American people better as individual people, as human beings. It would encourage their self-reliance, their discipline, and their work ethic. It would encourage them to educate themselves and their families. It would make them more law abiding.

We know that public policy does, indeed, affect social policy and that actions have consequences. We know that a tax is a penalty. A tax is a detriment. When you tax something, you get less of it. In fact, that is why we tax cigarettes and beer more than we do food and medicine. We believe you can reduce certain activities to some degree by a tax. We now know if you subsidize an event, you get more of it.

Those are principles that I think are undisputed. How much I don't know. How much it affects any one single event in the life of a nation I don't know. But when you have over 200 million people making thousands and thousands and hundreds of thousands of decisions every day, every week, and every month of the year, penalties on one type of decisionmaking and a subsidy on another type of decisionmaking can affect what happens.

We are in the position that this great Nation through inadvertence, I suppose, has created a system that actually penalizes marriage. It, indeed, can be said to subsidize divorce.

I know a friend who got a divorce in January. I was told had they divorced in December it would have saved them \$1,600 in tax dollars; the Federal Government would be prepared to subsidize that divorce. But had they married in December, it would have cost them on their tax return an additional \$1,600; \$1,600 is a lot of money.

The average family who pays this marriage tax penalty according to the best estimates pays around \$1,400 more per year in taxes. That is \$100 a month. That is real money for American families.

I want to say how excited I am that I believe we are on the verge of passing and sending to the President a bill that I trust he will feel quite comfortable signing—a bill to eliminate this bizarre penalty.

How much has it impacted marriage and families in America? I don't know. But we know this: Marriage and family is a good institution. It strengthens America through families. Traditions,

stability, and education are ways of getting along in the world and transmitted partnerships occur. People live longer who are married, for the most part. It is a good institution. It is the institution that raises our next generation, trains them, and prepares them for the world.

It is such a delight and a thrill to know that we will, tomorrow, I am quite confident, vote to eliminate this penalty on one of America's most valuable institutions, the family. What a good day that is going to be. I look forward to it. I am going to celebrate it when it is signed, as I am confident the President will do. We will have made a major step in this body to strengthening one of America's greatest institutions, and that is the family.

#### HONORABLE NANCY EKSTRUM, MAYOR OF PHILIP

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, on July 10, 2000, one of South Dakota's finest mayors stepped down after two decades of public service. Nancy Ekstrum, former city council member and mayor of the town of Philip for 12 years, provided thoughtful and decisive leadership for her community during a time of considerable change.

The first woman to lead Philip, Mayor Ekstrum began her service as mayor facing difficult issues that would be familiar to anyone who lives in a rural community. Poor quality water supplies made treatment expensive and difficult. An aging sewer system needed repair and road projects awaited completion. Meeting these challenges with a shrinking tax base and during a time of hardship for area ranchers required a sense of vision and tenacity. Most of all, it required a mayor who was willing to roll up her sleeves and put her heart and soul into finding creative solutions to difficult problems.

Nancy Ekstrum was just that kind of mayor. Under her leadership, the city built long-needed roads and made great strides toward providing its citizens with clean, healthy drinking water. When it became clear that the Mni Wiconi Rural Water System was still several years from reaching the community, Mayor Ekstrum rallied area residents to work with the congressional delegation to find an affordable interim solution to the city's water crisis. It is my hope that this project will be funded this year so that clean water will be Mayor Ekstrum's lasting legacy to the city.

On a more personal level, I will miss working with Mayor Ekstrum. Her advice on issues facing western South Dakota is always thoughtful and on target. I suspect that I will continue to turn to her long into the future for her thoughts and input as South Dakota faces the challenges of adapting a rural state to a global economy. I look forward to maintaining our strong friendship.

In conclusion, I simply would like to extend my congratulations to Mayor

Ekstrum on her 23 years of service to her community. I am delighted that she plans to stay involved in education and will continue to make a difference for the youth of Philip. I wish her the best as she enters this new phase of her life.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURRAY be granted leave from the business of the Senate from on today, July 20, and Friday, July 21. She is attending a funeral in Washington.

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

#### UNILATERAL ECONOMIC SANCTIONS: LESSONS LEARNED

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, the role of unilateral economic sanctions in the conduct of American foreign policy has been part of our debate in the Congress and in the executive branch for the past three years. Attempts to modify or reform the way the United States utilizes unilateral economic sanctions in the conduct of our foreign policy have consumed the attention of several committees, spawned numerous sanctions reform bills—including my own efforts—resolutions and amendments, generated a number of floor debates, stimulated countless discussions within this body and with the administration and prompted many press conferences and news releases. It even moved the distinguished Majority Leader to appoint an ad hoc bipartisan Senate task force to sort through the issue in the hopes of finding a policy path or sanctions that best promotes our national interest.

Outside the United States Government, virtually every think tank, university, trade association, and foreign policy association has invested time and resources to studying, analyzing and making recommendations on the subject of unilateral economic sanctions. This is as it should be. The subject is integral to our approach on foreign policy, national security and international trade.

I have been pleased that our debate and the large volume of literature have led to considerable re-thinking about the efficacy of unilateral economic sanctions. I have noted that the frequent resort to use of unilateral sanctions to achieve foreign policy goals has declined and that our sophistication about the inter-relationship between unilateral economic sanctions and policy has grown dramatically. One of the most important players in our debate over the past few years has been the unique coalition of some 675 export-oriented companies in the United States called USA\*ENGAGE. They have been critical in helping to shape the debate on unilateral economic sanctions, a debate which continues virtually as I speak.



I recently read a short speech by Mr. William Lane who serves as the Chairman of the USA\*ENGAGE trade association and the Washington Director of Caterpillar corporation titled "USA\*ENGAGE: Lessons Learned: The Cost of Conducting Foreign Policy on the Cheap." The remarks were offered at the French Institute on International Relations last month.

I believe my colleagues will find Mr. Lane's remarks insightful and informed so I ask unanimous consent that the full speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF WILLIAM LANE: USA\*ENGAGE:  
LESSONS LEARNED  
THE COST OF CONDUCTING FOREIGN POLICY ON  
THE CHEAP

I very much appreciate the opportunity to discuss the issue of economic sanctions before such an influential audience. For the past four years I've been closely associated with the public policy effort known as USA\*ENGAGE. Today, I'd like to talk about that effort—with specific focus on the lessons we've learned during what has turned into a rather remarkable campaign.

USA\*ENGAGE was organized in reaction to a disturbing development: for much of this decade the United States has embraced an outdated policy tool—unilateral sanctions—to influence foreign governments. In fact, the U.S. has imposed sanctions with such vigor that by 1997 over half the world's population was the target of some form of economic punishment at the hands of the United States.

Recognizing that such sanction policies rarely work, are often counterproductive and almost always costly to other national objectives, U.S. business and agriculture felt compelled to challenge the wisdom of a sanctions-based foreign policy. Organized as USA\*ENGAGE, the four-year-old effort has had a definite impact on how America's policymakers now view sanctions.

To appreciate the lessons learned, it is best to recall the scope of the problem. Put bluntly, with the end of the Cold War, many U.S. policymakers embraced the simplistic view that sanctions were the perfect compromise between doing nothing and taking military action.

So the United States sanctioned. It sanctioned South Korea and Saudi Arabia over labor rights; India and Pakistan for nuclear testing; Colombia for narcotics; and China for human rights abuses and environmental concerns. Citizens of Canada and Israel were sanctioned for doing business in Cuba. Egypt and Germany were threatened with sanctions because of concerns about religious persecution, as were companies in Russia, Malaysia and France for investing in Iran's petroleum sector.

How many sanctions were imposed? In 1997, the President's Export Council found that the U.S. was targeting unilateral sanctions against 73 countries, while the Congressional Research Service cited 125 measures authorizing unilateral sanctions.

Did the sanctions work? The Institute for International Economic concluded that less than one in five unilateral sanctions resulted in anything close to the desired result. However, the one thing unilateral sanctions have clearly done is to hurt U.S. interest—annually costing as many as 250,000 high-paying American jobs and reducing U.S. exports by about \$19 billion.

From our perspective, sanctions also ran counter to the reality that in many devel-

oping countries American business represents one of the most progressive elements of society. By encouraging trade and investment abroad, America not only helps create jobs and higher living standards; if also promotes values that encourage political freedom, the rule of law, and respect for human rights. From better schools and health care to improved infrastructure and housing, commercial engagement can make a positive difference in the lives of millions.

At the same time, the positive contribution made by the many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) cannot be underestimated. While we recognize there are no guarantees in foreign policy, we've learned that for engagement to work, it needs to be pursued at many levels—political, diplomatic, economic, charitable, religious, educational, and cultural. Rather than view each other as adversaries, business and the NGO communities would be well served to be supportive of common objectives.

So, the strategy of USA\*ENGAGE was to engage friend and foe alike in the sanctions debate. Our original hope was that 100 companies would join us. Clearly, this was an issue of great concern for the business community, as our membership quickly swelled to 675 companies.

Moreover, we engaged the academic community and think tanks. We engaged non-traditional business allies ranging from religious and humanitarian organizations to human rights groups. We engaged the Congress and Clinton Administration. We worked with the media and aggressively used the Internet to engage the public—building a web outreach program that was receiving 140,000 hits per month at its peak. With our encouragement, the sanctions issue even became the national college-debating topic.

To be frank, our message evolved with time. Initially we stressed what our experience told us was true:

- (1) Unilateral sanctions don't work and can be costly;
- (2) Engagement—when pursued at all levels—can be a strong force for positive change;
- (3) Isolating a country from positive values and means of influence rarely gets results;
- (4) Multilateral actions are almost always more effective than unilateral ones.

As the public debate continued, our views coalesced around one overriding theme: the United States cannot conduct an effective foreign policy on the cheap. Unilateral sanctions are not only the lazy man's foreign policy, but a symptom of a larger problem: a lack of recognition of the broad array of foreign policy tools—ranging from carrots to sticks—that are available.

Sanctions—even unilateral ones—at times may be necessary, but other foreign policy tools must be part of the equation. These include the Foreign Service, USAID, military and intelligence agencies, as well as multilateral institutions like the UN, World Bank, IMF and WTO. But for these tools to work, U.S. leadership, commitment, and funding is essential.

The problem with unilateral sanctions is that they often cut off American influence and hurt the very people the U.S. is trying to help. We don't think it is an accident that the countries the United States has attempted to isolate the most—Cuba and North Korea—have changed the least over the past 40 years.

The efforts of USA\*ENGAGE have prompted a reexamination of many U.S. sanction policies. Sanctions have been lifted against Colombia, Vietnam, and both South and North Korea. The U.S. has rejected sanctions against Mexico, Indonesia, Russia, Malaysia and France and waived sanctions against India and Pakistan. Earlier this week, the

U.S. Supreme Court, in a rare unanimous vote, ruled that state and local sanctions are unconstitutional. There has even been movement toward engaging Cuba, with legislation now moving in the Congress that would open the door to U.S. shipments of food and medicine.

While a few new sanctions—Burma and Sudan—have been imposed in recent years, it is clear that policymakers view unilateral sanctions in a more critical light. It is important to note that last year, and so far this year, the United States has not imposed any unilateral sanctions of note. This is a far cry from 1996, when USA\*ENGAGE was organized. In that year alone, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. imposed 23 unilateral sanctions, including two measures—the Helms-Burton Act and the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act—that were unusually onerous in that extraterritorial sanctions were authorized.

For our part, business now sees value in supporting issues that it previously ignored—such as encouraging America to pay its UN arrears and ensuring that the IMF and Foreign Service are adequately funded.

Under the leadership of foreign policy and trade experts like Senators LUGAR, KERREY and HAGEL and Representatives CRANE, DOOLEY and MANZULLO, there is a serious effort in Congress to enact legislation that would put in place a more deliberate process to use when the U.S. considers new unilateral sanction proposals. Known as The Sanctions Process Reform Act, this common sense legislation is a good bill and should be enacted.

While this legislation is important, it won't be new laws that stop policymakers from adopting new unilateral sanctions rather than pursuing more effective multilateral actions. Nor will new laws ensure that our leaders recognize the full power of engagement and the risks associated with isolation. That is why we must continue to be vigilant and keep U.S. foreign policymakers on a path that included multilateral solutions to international problems.

What will ultimately change America's sanctions-base foreign policy will be Americans who—armed with the facts—demand a more effective foreign policy. To that end, the ultimate success of USA\*ENGAGE will depend on whether the lessons learned are reinforced by a commitment from our leaders to refrain from conducting foreign policy on the cheap.

As a conclusion, I'd like you to note that perhaps the most telling event to illustrate the evolution of U.S. sanctions policy took place earlier this week. The decision this week by President Clinton to drop many of the U.S. sanctions that have been in place against North Korea for nearly a half a century was indeed profound. What better way to mark the 50th anniversary of the Korean War than to finally make significant progress towards ending the Cold War on the Korean Peninsula?

The United States should now further follow the lead of South Korea, as we too face an opportunity to ease tensions with a hostile neighbor. America can learn from the Koreans by opening a dialogue with the government of Cuba. Engagement is working throughout the world—it can work in our backyard too. Perhaps that will be the greatest lesson we have yet to learn.

Thank you.

#### BANKRUPTCY REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take a brief moment to speak on bankruptcy reform legislation, which in my view, our Nation desperately needs. We

have a balanced bankruptcy reform bill. The administration is on record as saying they support it. If the President really wants a bill, and if my colleagues in the Senate really want a bill, then they should let us move to a formal conference. Furthermore, they should tell us why the clinic violence provision is even necessary.

Current law already prevents perpetrators of clinic violence, as well as other types of violence, from discharging the judgments against them in bankruptcy. Given this, it is clear that the overbroad abortion clinic violence amendment serves no substantive purpose. No one has brought forth a single case in which current law has been used to discharge debts from clinic violence. I raised this issue in a letter to Senator SCHUMER last week, and am still awaiting a response.

Let's move forward with a bankruptcy conference—we have waited long enough.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 2000.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER

Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHUCK: I am writing you regarding your clinic violence amendment to the bankruptcy reform legislation. This amendment appears to be one of the final remaining issues holding up the overdue reform our bankruptcy laws truly need to both stop the abuse of the system by those who are able to pay back a portion of their debts and to implement new consumer protections such as enhanced credit card disclosures, which you played a major role in drafting.

I respect your views and the general objective of your amendment to prevent criminals from paying their debts to society or to others by using our bankruptcy laws. Furthermore, I am committed to addressing any legitimate abuse of our bankruptcy laws. However, I am concerned that some who oppose the broadly supported proposed reforms have capitalized on the issue of abortion clinic violence and have spread some misconceptions regarding this issue. Such misconceptions, unfortunately, appear to be jeopardizing passage of the important bankruptcy reform legislation.

For example, in a document circulated by one of our colleagues, it was represented that "[t]he Schumer amendment prevents a documented abuse of the bankruptcy system. . . ." and the compromise language that is in the conference report "would continue to allow many perpetrators of clinic violence to seek shelter in the nation's bankruptcy courts."

There has not been a single case reported or presented where the current bankruptcy laws were held to allow a perpetrator of clinic violence to "seek shelter in the nation's bankruptcy courts," nor is this a "documented abuse" of the system. On the contrary, when those who have committed violence have tried to hide behind the bankruptcy laws, they have found their debts were non-dischargeable under current bankruptcy law. Given this, I do not think that the amendment you offer is necessary.

Indeed, the abortion rights group NARAL recognized in a 1999 publication that "[c]oncluding that clinic violence-associated

debts are non-dischargeable under section 523(a)(6) is consistent with the Supreme court's interpretation of [current bankruptcy law's] "willful and malicious injury." Therefore such true debts are non-dischargeable.

Even given such interpretation of current law, and though the House-passed bill had no abortion-related provision, the current reform legislation goes further and incorporates compromise language that would expand current law and further make debts arising from willful and malicious threats also non-dischargeable. This is done in a politically neutral manner and protects debts from all threats of injury irrespective of the political message of the protestors. In addition, knowing that one of your biggest concerns regarding this subject is the ability of perpetrators to avoid debts arising from settlement or contempt orders, the compromise language specifically covers debts from settlement orders and violations of other orders of the court.

I appreciate your consideration of these points and would welcome any response you might have.

Sincerely,

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
Chairman.

CHANGES TO H. CON. RES. 290  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 213

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 213 of H. Con. Res. 290 (the FY2001 Budget Resolution) permits the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to make adjustments to the revenue aggregate, the reconciliation instructions, and the Senate pay-as-you-go scorecard, provided certain condition are met.

Pursuant to section 213, I hereby submit the following revisions to H. Con. Res. 290:

Current Revenue Aggregate: (sec. 101(1)(A))—FY 2001 Recommended Level of Federal Revenues .....	\$1,503,200,000,000
Adjustment: Additional reduction in revenues	-5,000,000,000
Revised Revenue Aggregate: FY 2001 Recommended Level of Federal Revenues .....	1,498,000,000,000
Current Reconciliation Instruction: (sec. 104(2))—Reduce revenues by no more than	11,600,000,000 in 2001, 150,000,000,000 in 2001-05
Adjustment: Additional reduction in revenues	5,000,000,000 in 2001
Revised Reconciliation Instruction: Reduce revenues by no more than .....	16,600,000,000 in 2001 150,000,000,000 in 2001-05
Current Senate Pay-as-you-go Scorecard: FY 2001 beginning balance	26,509,000,000
Adjustment: Additional balance added to scorecard .....	5,000,000,000
Revised Senate Pay-as-you-go Scorecard: FY 2001 beginning balance	31,500,000,000

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

July 20: Earl Lee Bannister, 23, Washington, DC; Charles L. Barre, 33, New Orleans, LA; Chastity Calhoun, 2, New Orleans, LA; Kevin Calhoun, 27, New Orleans, LA; James Fien, 41, Rochester, NY; Derrick Ginn, 25, New Orleans, LA; Carl Hamilton, 24, Baltimore, MD; Michael Harrell, 48, Dallas, TX; Anthony Hudson, Detroit, MI; Darryl Newhouse, 40, Oakland, CA; Damian Nix, 23, Pittsburgh, PA; Jacquaeaz H. Solomon, 22, Chicago, IL.

TAKE CONCRETE ACTION ON  
CHECHNYA AT THE G-8 SUMMIT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to once again draw attention to the continuing war in Chechnya. This war has raged for too long. The war in Chechnya from 1994-1996 left over 80,000 civilians dead, and the Foreign Relations Committee has received credible evidence that the current war has again resulted in the death of thousands of innocent civilians and the displacement of well over 250,000 others. The committee also received credible evidence of widespread looting, summary executions, detentions, denial of safe passage to fleeing civilians, torture and rape, committed by Russian soldiers. Colleagues, regardless of the politics of this war, this kind of behavior is unacceptable. War has rules, and the evidence and testimony the Foreign Relations Committee received raises serious doubts as to whether or not the Russian Federation is playing by those rules. Much of the evidence we received showed clear violations of international humanitarian law, including the well-established Geneva Convention.

Tomorrow is the official opening of Group of Eight Summit in Japan. The President must use this opportunity to relay our serious concerns with the actions of the Russian Government in Chechnya. Let's remember, what was the Group of Seven and became the G-8 with the inclusion of the Russian Federation, is an association of democratic societies with advanced economies. Although Russia is not yet a liberal democracy or an advanced economy, it was invited to take part in this group to encourage its democratic evolution. Today as I watch Russia refuse to initiate a political dialogue with the Chechen people, and continue to deny international humanitarian aid organizations and international human rights monitors access to Chechnya, I must question that evolution.

I am disappointed that the Group of Eight will not include the situation in

Chechnya on is formal agenda, but I am hopeful that the President will voice our serious concerns about Russia's conduct in Chechnya and take concrete action to demonstrate our concern, during bilateral talks with President Putin.

The United States should demand that the Russian Federation push for a negotiated, just settlement to this conflict. The conflict will not be resolved by military means and the Russian Federation should initiate immediately a political dialogue with a cross-section of representatives of the Chechen people, including representatives of the democratically elected Chechen authorities. The United States should remind the Russian Federation of the requests the Council of Europe for an immediate cease-fire and initiation of political dialogue, and of Russia's obligation to that institution and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

And colleagues, the President must also remind the Russian Federation government of its accountability to the international community and take steps to demonstrate that its conduct will effect its standing in the world community. This body and the U.N. Human Rights Commission has spoken out demanding the Russian government allow into Chechnya humanitarian agencies and international human rights monitors, including U.N. Special Rapporteur, yet the Russian government has not done so. This body and the international community has also demanded that the Russian Federation undertake systematic, credible, transparent and exhaustive investigations into allegations of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Chechnya, and to initiate, where appropriate, prosecutions against those accused. But again, the Russian Federation has not done so.

During his meeting with President Putin, the President is expected to discuss economic reform in Russia and regional stability issues. President Clinton must relay to the Russian President that Russia's conduct in Chechnya is not only in violation of international humanitarian law, but that it threatens Russia's ability for economic reform and creates instability in the region. And President Clinton must make clear to President Putin that while the United States fully supports the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation, and is fully aware of the evidence of grave human right violations committed by soldiers on both sides of the conflict, we strongly condemn Russia's conduct of the war in Chechnya and will continue to publicly voice our opposition to it. President Clinton should tell President Putin that the United States will take into consideration Russian conduct in Chechnya in any request for further rescheduling of Russia's international debt and U.S. assistance, until it allows full and unimpeded access into

Chechnya humanitarian agencies and international human rights monitors, in accordance with international law.

Colleagues, the war in Chechnya has caused enormous suffering for both the Chechen and Russian people, and the reports of the grave human rights violations committed there, on both sides of the conflict, continue daily. We must raise our concerns about the war in Chechnya at every chance and in every forum possible, including the G-8 Summit. I remind you again that the Group of Eight is an association of democratic societies with advanced economies—the Group of Seven invited the Russian Federation to encourage its democratic evolution. It is not yet a liberal democracy or an advanced economy. By not taking concrete steps during this Summit to demonstrate to the Russian Federation that its conduct is unacceptable for a democratic nation, is to condone it. I fear we have already put given human rights a back seat to economic issues by not placing Russian conduct in Chechnya on the formal agenda of the G-8 Summit. I hope that will not be the outcome of our bilateral talks with Russia in Japan.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, July 19, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,678,196,782,955.74 (Five trillion, six hundred seventy-eight billion, one hundred ninety-six million, seven hundred eighty-two thousand, nine hundred fifty-five dollars and seventy-four cents).

One year ago, July 19, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,628,493,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred twenty-eight billion, four hundred ninety-three million).

Five years ago, July 19, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,932,430,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred thirty-two billion, four hundred thirty million).

Ten years ago, July 19, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,163,599,000,000 (Three trillion, one hundred sixty-three billion, five hundred ninety-nine million).

Fifteen years ago, July 19, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,796,183,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred ninety-six billion, one hundred eighty-three million) which reflects a debt increase of almost \$4 trillion—\$3,882,013,782,955.74 (Three trillion, eight hundred eighty-two billion, thirteen million, seven hundred eighty-two thousand, nine hundred fifty-five dollars and seventy-four cents) during the past 15 years.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPARKY ANDERSON INDUCTED INTO BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Mr. George Lee

“Sparky” Anderson, who will be inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame Museum in Cooperstown, New York on July 23, 2000. Mr. Anderson spent 26 seasons as a manager in the Major Leagues, 17 of these with the Detroit Tigers. During this time, he was recognized not only as one of the best managers in the game of baseball, but also as one of the best ambassadors for the game of baseball.

Mr. Anderson was born on February 22, 1934, in Bridgewater, South Dakota. Upon graduation from high school, he signed with the Brooklyn Dodgers. He spent six years in the minor leagues before being called up to the major leagues by the Philadelphia Phillies in 1959. He was the regular second baseman for the Phillies that year, and was recognized as an intelligent, hustling player. He had a batting average of .218, 0 home runs and 34 runs batted in. He earned the nickname “manos de oro” from his teammates: “the man with the golden hands.”

As it turned out, 1959 was the only year Mr. Anderson spent in the major leagues as a player. He never left the game of baseball, though, and in 1964 he became the manager of a minor league team in Toronto. In 1969, he accepted a coaching position with the San Diego Padres, and prior to the 1970 season the Cincinnati Reds named him as their manager.

It quickly became apparent that managing suited Mr. Anderson well. Not only did it provide him with the opportunity to utilize his immense knowledge of the game of baseball, it also highlighted his ability to relate to and motivate players. Hall of Famer Joe Morgan, a member of the Reds during Mr. Anderson's years there and now a wonderful and respected baseball commentator, once said, “Sparky had a way of making everybody look in the mirror at themselves. As far as I'm concerned, that's the key to being a good manager.”

Under Mr. Anderson's guidance, the Reds became the dominant team of the 1970's. The team became known as The Big Red Machine for its ability to produce runs, led by such great offensive players as Morgan, Pete Rose, Johnny Bench, Tony Perez and Ken Griffey, Sr. Mr. Anderson earned the nickname “Captain Hook” for his innovative employment of relief pitchers, which was not the common practice of the time. This combination of offense and strategic wizardry proved to be lethal for opponents. In his first year with the team, the Reds won 102 games and the National League Pennant. From 1972-76, the Reds averaged more than one hundred wins per season, won three more National League pennants, and won back-to-back World Series Championships in 1975 and 1976.

After nine years in Cincinnati, Mr. Anderson came to the Detroit Tigers in 1979. The Tigers were struggling at the time, but possessed a core of young, talented players, including Jack Morris, Lou Whitaker, Alan Trammell and

Lance Parrish. Mr. Anderson molded this group of unique personalities into a team of champions. In 1984, just five years after his arrival, the team started 35-5—still the best 40-game start in the history of Major League Baseball—and never stopped their winning ways, ultimately bringing the Detroit Tigers their first World Series Championship since 1968. Very few people in the City of Detroit have forgotten Kirk Gibson's home run off the San Diego Padres' Goose Gossage in the eighth inning of Game 5, the hit which sewed up the series for the Tigers.

Mr. Anderson retired from managing the Tigers in 1995, having led the team to one more pennant win in 1987. Ultimately, in his 26 seasons as a Major League manager, nine with the Reds and 17 with the Tigers, his teams won 2,194 games, placing him third all-time, behind just Connie Mack and John McGraw. He was named Manager of the Year three times, twice in the National League and once in the American League. He is the only manager in the history of the game to win a World Series in both the American and National Leagues; he is the only manager to win 100 games in one season in both leagues; and he is the only manager to have over six hundred career victories in each league. His 34-21 mark in the postseason remains the best winning percentage for a manager in Major League history.

During his seventeen years in Detroit, Mr. Anderson became an important member of the community, and not because his position as Manager of the Detroit Tigers. His involvement with many charitable organizations led him to found his own in 1987. The organization is called CATCH, Caring Athletes Team for Children's & Henry Ford Hospitals, but is better known as "Sparky Anderson's Charity for Children." The mission of CATCH is to improve the quality of life of pediatric patients at Children's & Henry Ford Hospitals in the State of Michigan. Since its inception, CATCH has issued grants to Children's Hospital of Michigan and Henry Ford Hospital of Detroit for approximately \$1.4 million. In addition, the charitable organization has built an endowment of \$4.5 million. When he founded CATCH, Mr. Anderson said "there is nothing in this world that you will ever do that's better than helping a child." The growth of this endowment will allow "Sparky Anderson's Charity for Children" to continue helping children long into the future.

I thank Mr. Anderson for all that he has done for the City of Detroit and the State of Michigan. He spent his life in baseball quite simply because he loved the game, and he has never stopped believing that he is indebted to the game for the doors it opened for him, and the life it afforded him. Perhaps his greatest accomplishment, then, is having successfully given back to the game of baseball more than it gave to him, because he certainly has done this. He stands out as one of the best ambas-

sadors for baseball in the history of the game, a sports figure who managed to give as much to his community as he did to his team. I know that he is loved and revered in the State of Michigan not only because of the World Series championship he helped bring to the City of Detroit in 1984, but also because of the manner in which he handled himself over the course of his seventeen years there. He became an important part of the Detroit community—his place there transcended wins and losses.

I am sure that Mr. Anderson will enjoy this special occasion with his wife, Carol, who has been with him through the entire journey, and their family. On behalf of the entire United States Senate, I congratulate Mr. Sparky Anderson on his induction into the National Baseball Hall of Fame this weekend. Though he will enter the Hall wearing a Cincinnati Reds uniform, I know that the Detroit Tigers, the City of Detroit and the State of Michigan will always hold a special place in his heart, just as Sparky continues to hold a special place in the hearts of millions of Michiganders.●

#### 26TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge the 26th anniversary of the Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus. Twenty-six years ago today, Turkey seized on a period of political unrest in predominantly Greek Cyprus and invaded its shores. Landing on the north coast of Cyprus with 6,000 troops and 40 tanks, nearly 40 percent of the island was in Turkish control in less than a month, displacing 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes. Today, there are still more than 1,600 Greek Cypriots who remain unaccounted for, serving as silent reminders of the unlawful invasion. Turkey continues to defy the international community and United Nations' Resolutions with its policy towards Cyprus, keeping more than 30,000 troops in the north of the island.

I believe that if we want to see future progress in resolving the injustices of a divided Cyprus, the United States, European and international organizations must put further pressure on the government in Ankara. It is Turkey's military and financial backing that provides the leverage for the Turkish Cypriot leadership and its unwillingness to make any compromises. Late last year, the European Union accepted Turkey as a candidate for admission into the 15-nation economic bloc. The EU has indicated that resolution on the Cyprus matter is a key condition to Turkey's membership, and it has outlined specific economic and humanitarian standards that must be accomplished. One such condition is an end to restrictions on the human rights of Greek Cypriots living in the occupied northern region. I was pleased to cosponsor my colleague Senator Snowe's Concurrent

Resolution 9 to bring attention to this issue.

Greece and Turkey are critical members of the NATO alliance and have both been key allies to the United States, supporting our operations in the Balkans and no-fly zones over Iraq. We know the two nations can work together in times of crisis. Last fall, following a massive earthquake in Turkey, Greece was among the first to send aid. Greek rescue teams helped pull Turkish victims from the rubble. Then Greece endured its own deadly quake and Turkey was quick to respond, saving many Greek lives. These examples of bilateral cooperation should also be employed by Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders to demilitarize the island and establish a unified Cyprus with constitutional guarantees for all Cypriots regardless of ethnicity.

A new round of proximity talks began on July 5, 2000 between Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders in Geneva, Switzerland. These talks recessed on July 12 but will resume again in early August. Little information has been available due to the mutual observance of a press blackout. However, I hope that these talks will initiate commitments by both sides to come to an agreement.

In the past few years we have seen remarkable progress on seemingly intractable international conflicts. Northern Ireland is closer to peace than any time in history and whatever the outcome of the current Middle East Summit, just the fact that Prime Minister Barak and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat have been talking for nine days is of great historic significance. I believe the people of Cyprus want and deserve the same opportunity. This year, the Senate version of the FY01 Foreign Operations Bill again appropriates \$15 million to reduce tensions, promote peace and cooperation between the two communities. However, I think we can do more. It is my hope that my colleagues and the Administration will commit to actively assisting the parties in resolving the situation in Cyprus. Then we can commemorate the reunification rather than the division of this Nation.●

#### SPECIAL OLYMPICS ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Special Olympics on the anniversary of their first games, held in Chicago on July 20, 1968. With the motto "Let me win, but if I cannot win let me be brave in the attempt," Special Olympics has for more than 20 years been providing challenges and opportunities for individuals with mental retardation.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the numerous ways Special Olympics helps not only the athletes who participate, but also their families and friends and the many volunteers who have made the program such a success.

Special Olympics plays an important role in the lives of many of the mentally challenged throughout the world, including my home state of Minnesota. Since the start of Special Olympics, the organization has grown to include more than 1.7 million athletes worldwide, with 3,300 in Minnesota.

Special Olympians compete in a variety of events at all skill levels. Competitions in events such as basketball, golf, figure skating, and gymnastics enhance the lives of all participants and the families who root for them from the stands. These athletes start training as early as age six, with some participants in Minnesota competing into their sixties. Special Olympics athletes can compete in as many events as they choose.

Not only does Special Olympics hold annual competitions, but the organization helps participants train year round for their events. This encourages Special Olympic participants to develop physical fitness and generally helps improve their quality of life.

The Special Olympics would not be possible without the devoted volunteers who lend their time and effort to this worthwhile cause. There are over 1,700 volunteers in Minnesota who serve as coaches, officials, teachers, and in other capacities. I want to thank all who take time out of their schedule to volunteer through Special Olympics.

Mr. President, it is an honor to be able to recognize the accomplishments of the Minnesotans involved in Special Olympics. This organization deserves recognition for all they do and the positive impact they have on the lives of our Special Olympians.●

#### BREAST CANCER RESEARCH STAMP

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to submit for the RECORD letters from two young children in support of the Breast Cancer Research Stamp. These children, Brendon Fisher, age 6 and a half, and Paige Fisher, age 8 and a half, are the nephew and niece of Betsy Mullen, Chairperson of the Women's Information Network—Against Breast Cancer. These letters eloquently state why it is so important to continue this program.

The letters follow.

JULY 16, 2000.

Dear Congress, I think it's very important to keep the stamp because if we don't every girl is going to worry about it or maybe get breast cancer. But if we keep it we will get money to cure to stop it. My Aunt Betsey risked her life on it and I'm proud of her. If you think about it no one likes it because you can die from it. I think, and a lot of other people agree with me, that it would be best to keep the stamp and then things will go perfect. Hope my letter makes a difference because not just me is counting on this.

By Paige Fisher, 8½ years old.

Dear Congress, girls and boys can get breast cancer and I don't want girls and boys and the president and his wife, cat and dog to get sick. Keep the stamp going.

From Brendon Fisher.●

#### THE DEATH OF TOM MALONEY

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the passing of Tom Maloney.

Tom was the former mayor of Wilmington—Delaware's largest city.

I am deeply saddened by the death of my friend, Tom. I talked to Tom just last week. During his long battle with cancer, his spirit remained unbroken. To the very end, Tom was full of life and bullish on the future.

Tom was a loving husband and father, as well as a committed public servant. His care and concern for the residents of his city of Wilmington, and for the people of Delaware, were unmatched. As mayor, Tom led the effort to bring more people, more jobs, and more development to Wilmington. In many ways, Tom was the originator of the downtown renaissance that continues today.

Tom was my opponent in the 1976 race for the U.S. Senate. He was a worthy adversary, but an even better friend. In that unique Delaware tradition of Return Day, Tom and I "buried the hatchet" and forged a friendship that flourished for the next 25 years. Tom and I continued to work together on projects and issues important to Wilmington and to all Delawareans. The people of the First State owe Tom Maloney a debt of thanks for all he has done.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Linda, and the rest of the Maloney family.●

#### NECESSARILY ABSENT

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, due to important family obligations, I was necessarily absent this evening during votes on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriation bill for fiscal year 2001.

Mr. President, were I present, I would have voted for Senator WELLSTONE's amendment, number 3919.

Further, were I present, I would have voted for Senator SPECTER's amendment, number 3958. I am a cosponsor of the amendment. It corrects an inadvertent error in the 1997 Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 that prevents Amtrak from leasing automobiles from the General Services Administration. The amendment will enable Amtrak to continue leasing such vehicles until 2003.

Further, were I present, I would have voted to find Senator DURBIN's amendment, number 3980, germane. I am a cosponsor of the amendment. The Agriculture Appropriation bill includes a rider that would block efforts to reform the hardrock mining industry, which has caused and continues to cause substantial environmental damage to public lands. Senator DURBIN's amendment would have allowed needed reforms to proceed. I have submitted

an additional statement on this issue into the RECORD.

Finally, were I present, I would have voted for final passage of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriation bill for fiscal year 2001.●

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator REID for requesting a leave of absence for me for the duration of this week. I am traveling home today to attend and speak at tomorrow's memorial service for Mr. Bernie Whitebear, of Seattle, Washington, who passed away at the age of 62 on Sunday, July 16, 2000.

Earlier in the week, I did have a statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about Bernie Whitebear and his many contributions to Washington state. He was a special man to my constituents. He was a special man to me. Bernie helped me understand Native American cultures from the inside as a participant not as someone sitting on the sidelines. On many occasions, Bernie exposed me to the sense of community and respect that he was always so proud of. Washington state will miss this great man and clearly, it is appropriate for me to be with my constituents tomorrow to celebrate Bernie Whitebear.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration and courtesies and I will have a longer statement next week to discuss Senate floor votes.●

#### HONORING JOSEPH M. GATT

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a distinguished citizen of Nevada, Joseph M. Gatt. Mr. Gatt's vision and innovation paved the way for millions of Americans to be able to secure a comfortable retirement. Nearly twenty-five years ago, he was instrumental in developing the prototype that was used for what ultimately became the 401(k) pension program.

Mr. Gatt has been a resident of Las Vegas, Nevada for almost forty years and was a pioneer in the field of financial planning. He worked as the Las Vegas agent for the Hartford Insurance Company when he initiated the new pension program for the benefits of the employees of the then MGM Grand Hotel in Las Vegas. The key to the program was the utilization of an existing IRA program on a joint funding basis; that is, with contributions from both the employer and the employees, which had never been done before. The incentive to the employee to contribute to the program was, of course, that the contribution was tax deductible. The Hartford program was so unique that it was necessary for the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to approve it. On August 25, 1976, the IRS gave final approval for the Hartford program, and it went into effect immediately. Features of this pension plan included portability, 100 percent vesting whether or not the employees remained at MGM Grand, and

generous company contributions. Indeed, Mr. Gatt and the MGM Grand were ahead of their time.

The Las Vegas resorts of Caesar's Place and Circus Circus Hotels soon followed suit. Today, 401(k) plans are an almost standard part of benefit packages for employees. According to Cerrulli & Associates, a marketing and research firm, there were 330,000 401(k) plans in the United States during the last quarter of 1999 in which \$2.7 trillion were invested. The creation of this now universally accepted and acclaimed program is a considerable credit to the State of Nevada, the gaming industry for being the first employer participants, and Joe Gatt for his insight and vision. On behalf of the citizens of Nevada and all Americans, I congratulate Mr. Gatt on this achievement and wish him continued success. ●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

##### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### REPORT ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET REQUEST ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 121

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with section 202(c) of the District of Columbia Financial Management and Responsibility Assistance Act of 1995 and section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Governmental Reorganization Act as amended in 1989, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request Act.

The proposed FY 2001 Budget reflects the major programmatic objectives of the Mayor, the Council of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. For FY 2001, the District estimates revenue of \$5.718 billion and total expenditures of \$5.714 billion, resulting in a budget surplus of \$4.128 million.

My transmittal of the District of Columbia's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 20, 2000.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1102. An act to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4118. An act to prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. OBEY, Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, as the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

At 1:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated.

H.R. 4118. An act to prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operation at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-9834. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives:

Airbus Model 300-600 Series Airplanes; docket no. 98-NM-164 [6-19/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0341)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9835. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: SAAB Model SAAB SF340A and 340B Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-25 [6-19/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0342)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9836. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-78 [6-19/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0343)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9837. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes; docket no. 99-NM-182 [6-19/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0344)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9838. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Dassault Model Falcon 2000 Mystere-Falcon 900 Falcon 900EX Fan Jet Falcon Mystere series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-56 [6-15/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0336)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9839. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Saab Model SAAB SF340A and 340B Series Airplanes; docket no. 99-NM-51 [6-15/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0337)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9840. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-64 [6-15/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0338)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9841. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: P & W PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines; docket no. 98-ANE-66 [6-15/6-22]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0339)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9842. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Fireworks Display, Pier 54, Hudson River New York (CGD01-00-145)" (RIN2115-AA97 (2000-0032)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9843. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Arrival of Sailing Vessel AMISTAD, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut (CGD01-00-166)" (RIN2115-AA97 (2000-0033)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9844. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Chickahominy River, VA (CGD05-00-016)" (RIN2115-AA97 (2000-0034)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9845. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; LAKE ERIE, Ottawa River, Washington Township, Ohio (CGD09-00-014)" (RIN2115-AA97 (2000-0035)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9846. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations SAIL BOSTON 2000, Port of Boston, MA (CGD01-99-191)" (RIN2115-AA97 (2000-0036)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9847. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; York River, VA (CGD05-00-019)" (RIN2115-AA97 (2000-0037)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9848. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Atlantic Ocean, Virginia Beach, VA (CGD05-00-015)" (RIN2115-AA97 (2000-0038)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9849. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Anchorage Areas/Anchorage Grounds Regulations; OPSAIL 2000, Port of New London, Connecticut (CGD01-99-203)" (RIN2115-AA98 (2000-0005)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9850. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Regulations; Wappoo Creek (ICW), Charleston, SC (CGDS07-00-054)" (RIN2115-AE47 (2000-0034)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9851. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regatta Regulations; Maryland Swim for Life, Chester River, Chestertown, MD (CGD05-00-022)" (RIN2115-AE46 (2000-0005)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9852. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Regulations; Columbia River, OR (CGD13-00-008)" (RIN2115-AE47 (2000-0032)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9853. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Regulations; Acushnet River, Annisquam River, Fore River and Taunton River, MA (CGD01-00-135)" (RIN2115-AE47 (2000-0033)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9854. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Response Plans For Marine Transportation-Related Facilities Handling Non-Petroleum Oils (USCG-1999-5149)" (RIN2115-AF79 (2000-0001)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9855. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil Pollution Act of 1990 Phase-out Requirements for Single Hull Tank Vessels (USCG-1999-6164)" (RIN2115-AF86 (2000-0001)) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9856. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(B), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Winslow, Camp Verde, Mayer and Sun city West, Arizona)" (MMDocket No. 99-246; RM-9593; RM-9770) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9857. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(B), Table of FM Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations Ebro, Florida" (MMDocket No. 00-43) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9858. A communication from the Chief of the General and International Law Division, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appeal Procedures for Determinations Concerning Compliance with Service Obligations, Deferments, and Waivers" (RIN2133-AB41) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9859. A communication from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "36 CFR Part 1253—Location of NARA Facilities and Hours of Use" (RIN3095-AA98) received on June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9860. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Domestic Fisheries Division, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested

for Maine" received on June 30, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9861. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska—Modification of a Closure for Rockfish and Pacific Ocean Perch in the Central and Eastern Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" received on June 30, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9862. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Framework 13 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan and Framework 34 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan" (RIN0648-AN49) received on June 30, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9863. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9864. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of FM Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations LaBelle, Estero and Key West, Florida" (MM Docket No. 97-116) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9865. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Saratoga, Green River, Big Piney and LaBarge, Wyoming)" (MM Docket No. 98-130, 99-56; RM-9297, RM-9655, RM-9459) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9866. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Douglas, Guernsey, Wyoming)" (MM Docket No. 98-151; RM-9320, RM-9653) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9867. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Arnoldsburg, West Virginia)" (MM Docket No. 98-216) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9868. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations, Whitefield and Northumberland, NH" (MM Docket No. 99-42, RM-9467, RM-9618) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9869. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass

Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (North Tunica, Friars Point, Mississippi, Kennett, Missouri, Munford, Tennessee, Marianna, Arkansas)" (MM Docket Nos. 99-140, 99-146; RM-9723, RM-9724, RM-9725, RM-9490) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9870. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of FM Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations Camp Wood and Rocksprings, TX" (MM Docket No. 99-214) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9871. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Greeley and Broomfield, Colorado)" (MM Docket No. 99-279; RM-9716) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9872. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations Carney, Michigan" (MM Docket No. 99-334) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9873. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of FM Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations Gwinn, Michigan" (MM Docket No. 99-341) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9874. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Eldorado, Beeville, Colorado City, Cotulla, Cuero, Kerrville, Mason, McQueeney and San Angelo, Texas)" (MM Docket No. 99-357) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9875. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bycatch Rate Standards for the Second Half of 2000" received on June 29, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9876. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Emergency Interim Rules to Implement the American Fisheries Act; Extension of Expiration Dates" (RIN0648-AM83) received on June 29, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9877. A communication from the Deputy Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report entitled "Update on the Status of Splash and Spray Suppression Technology for Large Trucks"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9878. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to export vessels for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9879. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Model EC 135 Helicopters; docket no. 98-SW-74 [7/5-7/6]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0354) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9880. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747-400 Series Airplanes Equipped with P&W PW 4000 Engines; docket no. 99-NM-66 [6-23/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0355) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9881. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-77 [6-23/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0356) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9882. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes; docket no. 99-NM-330 [6-23/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0357) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9883. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Industrie Model A300, A400-600, and A310 Series Airplanes; docket no. 99-NM-240 [6-23/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0358) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9884. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76A Helicopters; docket no. 99-SW-37 [6-23/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0359) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9885. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes; request for comments; docket no. 99-NM-121" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0361) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9886. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Pratt & Whitney JT9D Series Turbofan; docket no. 94-ANE-54 [5-46-99/7-6-00]"

(RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0362) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9887. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures: Miscellaneous Amendments (49); Amdt. No. 1997 [6-28/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA65 (2000-0035) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9888. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures: Miscellaneous Amendments (45); Amdt. No. 1999 [6-28/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA65 (2000-0036) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9889. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Minneapolis, Flying Cloud Airport, MN; docket no. 00-AGL-08 [6-28/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0154) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9890. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Minneapolis, Anoka County-Blaine Airport, MN; docket no. 00-AGL-09 [6-28/7-6]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0156) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9891. A communication from the Chief of General and International Law, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Putting Customers First in the Title XI Program: Ship Financing Guarantees" (RIN 2133-AB32) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9892. A communication from the Trial Attorney of the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Joint Statement of Safety Policy for Shared Use of General Railroad System Trackage by Conventional Railroad and Rail Transit Trains" (RIN2130-AB33) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9893. A communication from the Chief of the Division of General and International Law, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligibility of U.S.-Flag Vessels of 100 Feet or Greater in Registered Length to Obtain a Fishery Endorsement to the Vessel's Documentation" (RIN2133-AB38) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9894. A communication from the Trial Attorney of the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FRA Statement of Safety Policy for Shared Use of General Railroad System Trackage by Conventional Railroad and Rail Transit Trains" (RIN2130-AB33 (2000-0002)) received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9895. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, a report relative to tar, nicotine, and carbon monoxide for calendar year



1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9896. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule to Implement Mackerel Catch Specifications for the South Atlantic Region under the Fishery Management Plan for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Region" (RIN0648-AN07) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9897. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustments" received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9898. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of the ending date of the annual closure of the shrimp fishery in the EEZ off Texas" received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9899. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Crustacean Fisheries; Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Lobster Fishery; Closure of the Year 2000 Fishery" (RIN0648-A006) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9900. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of Fishery for Loligo Squid" received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9901. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship, National Sea Grant College Program" received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9902. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Regulations Governing Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing" (RIN2130-AB26) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9903. A communication from the Attorney Advisor of the Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service: Promoting Deployment and Subscribership in Unserved and Underserved Areas, Including Tribal and Insular Areas; Petitions for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier and for Related Waivers to Provide Universal Service, CC

Docket No. 96-45, 12th Report and Order Memorandum Opinion and Order" (FCC00-208, CC Doc. 96-45) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9904. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Saab Model AAB SF340A and 340B Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-25 [6-19/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0348)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9905. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-78 [6-19/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0349)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9906. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes; docket no. 99-NM-182 [6-19-26]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0350)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9907. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes; docket no. 99-NM-25 [6-14/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0351)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9908. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Foker Model F27 Mark 050, 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 Series Airplanes and Model F28 Mark 0070, 0100, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-06 [6-14/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA64 (2000-0352)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9909. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Dunlap, IN; docket no. 00-ASO-14 [6-19/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0142)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9910. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Livingston, TN; docket no. 00-ASO-11 [6-19/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0143)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9911. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Copperhill, TN; docket no. 00-ASO-13 [6-16/6-21]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0144)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9912. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; Holland, MI; docket no. 00-AGL-06 [6-16/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0145)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9913. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Sheldon, IA; docket no. 00-ACE-08 [6-22/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0146)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9914. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Pratt, KS; docket no. 00-ACE-14 [6-22/6-26]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0147)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9915. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Fort Payne, AL; docket no. 00-ASO-17 [6-23/6-29]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0149)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9916. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Jasper, TN; docket no. 00-ASO-16 [6-23/6-29]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0150)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9917. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Scottsboro, AL; Docket No 00-ASO-15 [6-23/6-29]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0151)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9918. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Smithville, TN; Docket No. 00-ASO-18 [6-23/6-29]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0152)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9919. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Realignment and establishment of VOR Federal Airways; DY and TN; docket no. 97-ASO-18 [7-5/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0164)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9920. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Realignment of Jet Route; TX; docket no. 99-ASW-33 [7-5/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0165)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9921. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wadena, MN; docket no. 00-AGL-07; [6-26/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0155)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9922. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; Marquette, MI; revocation of Class E Airspace; Swayer, MI, and K. I., Sawyer, MI; docket no. 99-AGL-42 [6-28/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0157)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9923. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Realignment of Federal Airways; docket no. 99-AGL-57 [7/6-6/10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0158)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9924. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class D and Class E5 Airspace; Greenwood, MS; docket no. 00-ASO-9 [6-23/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0159)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9925. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class D Airspace; Stuart, FL; docket no. 00-ASO-12 [6-30/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0160)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9926. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Minneapolis, Crystal Airport, MN; docket no. 00-AGL-10 [6-28/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0161)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9927. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tullahoma, TN; docket no. 00-ASO-19; [6-23/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0162)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9928. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 777-200 and -300 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-108; [6-28/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0363)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9929. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica Model EMB-135 and -145 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-208 [6-27/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0364)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9930. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 Series Airplanes; docket no. 2000-NM-49 [6-27/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0365)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9931. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Ad-

ministration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Rolls Royce Ltd, Dart 511, 511-E, 514-7, 528, 528-7E, 529-7E, 532-7, 532-7L, 532-7N, 532-7R, 551-R, and 552-7R Turboprop Engines; docket no. 99-NE-50 [6-23/7-10]" (RIN2120-AA66 (2000-0366)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9932. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Passenger Equipment Safety Standards—Final Rule; Response to Petitions for Reconsideration" (RIN2130-AA95 (2000-0001)) received on July 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9933. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska—Closes Directed Pacific Ocean Perch Fishing in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9934. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the reports of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Prohibited Species Catch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands" received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9935. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska—Closes Pollock Open Access Sector for Inshore Processing in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9936. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Prohibited Shark Species; Large Coastal Shark Species; Commercial Fishery Closure Change" (I.D. 052500B) received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2001" (Report No. 106-350).

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2901: An original bill to authorize appropriations to carry out security assistance for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-351).

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, with amendments:

S. 2089: A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to modify procedures relating to orders for surveillance and searches for foreign intelligence purposes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-352).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 133: A resolution supporting religious tolerance toward Muslims.

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, with amendments:

S. 1902: A bill to require disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act regarding certain persons and records of the Japanese Imperial Army in a manner that does not impair any investigation or prosecution conducted by the Department of Justice or certain intelligence matters, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2516: A bill to fund task forces to locate and apprehend fugitives in Federal, State, and local felony criminal cases and give administrative subpoena authority to the United States Marshals Service

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2812: A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities.

By Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 2900: An original bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Order of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. J. Res. 48: A joint resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title and with an amended preamble:

S. Con. Res. 53: A concurrent resolution condemning all prejudice against individuals of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry in the United States and supporting political and civic participation by such individuals throughout the United States.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Frank Henry Cruz, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2006. (Reappointment)

Ernest J. Wilson III, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2004.

Debbie D. Branson, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Aviation Management Advisory Council for a term of three years. (New Position)

Katherine Milner Anderson, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2006. (Reappointment)

Francisco J. Sanchez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

Kenneth Y. Tomlinson, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2006.

Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Commerce.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I report favorably a nomination list which was printed in the RECORD of the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Coast Guard nomination of Elizabeth A. Ashburn, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 18, 2000.

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on the Judiciary.

David W. Ogden, of Virginia, to be Assistant Attorney General.

Johnnie B. Rawlinson, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Daniel Marcus, of Maryland, to be Associate Attorney General.

Dennis M. Cavanaugh, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Glenn A. Fine, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Justice.

John E. Steele, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Gregory A. Presnell, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

James S. Moody, Jr., of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KERREY (for himself and Mr. HAGEL):

S. 2895. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3030 Meredith Avenue in Omaha, Nebraska, as the "Reverend J.C. Wade Post Office", to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2896. A bill to normalize trade relations with Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the use of completed contract method of accounting in the case of certain long-term naval vessel construction contracts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2898. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the disclosure of electronic monitoring of employee communications and computer usage in the workplace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. INOUE):

S. 2899. A bill to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States' relationship with Native Hawaiians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2900. An original bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 2901. An original bill to authorize appropriations to carry out security assistance for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BROWNBACK:

S. 2902. A bill to revise the definition of advanced service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2896. A bill to normalize trade relations with Cuba, and for other purposes.

#### THE UNITED STATES-CUBA TRADE ACT OF 2000

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the outdated U.S. embargo on Cuba.

Last weekend I traveled to Havana along with my distinguished colleagues Senator ROBERTS and Senator AKAKA. It was a brief trip. But it gave U.S. an opportunity to meet with a wide range of people and to assess Cuba first-hand. We met with Cuban cabinet ministers and dissidents, with the head of the largest NGO in Cuba, with foreign ambassadors and with Fidel Castro.

I left those meetings more convinced than ever that it is time to finally end our Cold War with Cuba policy. We should have normal trade relations with Cuba. Let me explain why.

First, this is a unilateral sanctions policy. Nobody else in the world supports it. Not even our closest allies. I have long opposed unilateral economic sanctions, unless our national security is at stake. Forty years ago Cuba threatened our national security. The Soviet Union planted nuclear missiles in Cuba and aimed them at the United States. Twenty years ago, Cuba was still acting as a force to destabilize Central America.

Those days are gone. The missiles are gone. The Soviet Union is gone. Cuban military and guerilla forces are gone from Central America. The security threat is gone. But the embargo remains.

My reason for my opposing unilateral sanctions is entirely pragmatic. They don't work. They never worked in the past and they will not work in the future. Whenever we stop our farmers and business people from exporting, our Japanese, European, and Canadian competitors rush in to fill the gap. Unilateral sanctions are a hopelessly ineffective tool, except that they hurt Americans.

The second reason for ending the embargo is that the U.S. embargo actually helps Castro.

How does it help Castro? I saw it for myself in Havana. The Cuban economy is in shambles. The people's rights are repressed. Fidel Castro uses the embargo as the scapegoat for Cuba's misery.

As absurd as it sounds, Castro blames the United States for his failed economic policies. Without the embargo, he would have no one to blame except himself.

Mr. President, for the past ten years I have worked towards normalizing our trade with China. My operating guideline has been "Engagement Without Illusions." Trade rules don't automatically and instantly yield trade results. We have to push hard every day to see that countries follow the rules. That's certainly the case with China.

I have the same attitude towards Cuba. Yes, we should lift the embargo. We should do it without preconditions and without demanding any quid pro quo from Cuba. We should engage them economically. But we should do so without illusions. Once we lift the embargo, Cuba will not become a major buyer of our farm goods or manufactured products overnight.

We need to be realistic. With Cuba's failed economy and low income, ending the embargo won't cause a huge surge of U.S. products to Cuba. Instead, it will start sales of some goods, such as food, medicine, some manufactures, and some telecom and Internet services. Right now, Cuba's imports are primarily from Europe and Asia. With the embargo lifted, U.S. products and agriculture will replace some of those sales. U.S. exporters will have the advantage of lower transportation costs and easier logistics. It will be a start.

In addition, ending the embargo will increase Cuban exposure to the United States. It will result in more travel by tourists, businessmen, students, and scholars. It will bring U.S. into closer contact with those who will be part of the post-Castro Cuba. It will spur more investment in Cuba's tourist infrastructure, helping, even if only a little, to further develop a private sector in the economy.

Mr. President, in May of this year, I introduced bipartisan legislation that would repeal all of the Cuba-specific statutes that create the embargo. That includes the 1992 Cuban Democracy Act and the 1996 Helms-Burton Act.

Today I am introducing further legislation to eliminate impediments to a normal trade relationship with Cuba. I am joined in this effort by my colleagues, Senators LINCOLN and MURRAY. My great friend, Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL, has introduced a companion bill in the House.

This bill, the U.S.-Cuba Trade Act of 2000, would do two things. First, it would remove Cuba from coverage under the Jackson-Vanik amendment. This is the part of the 1974 Trade Act which was enacted to address Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union.

Today, it the legal provision which causes an annual review of normal trade relations with countries such as China. It is a Cold War law which is no longer relevant to our 21st century world.

In addition, the U.S.-Cuba Trade Act would eliminate a technical provision that prevents Cuba from obtaining normal WTO tariff rates.

Mr. President, the world has changed since the United States started this embargo forty years ago. Our policy has to change with it. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this effort to put in place a responsible economic policy toward Cuba.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the use of completed contract method of accounting in the case of certain long-term naval vessel construction contracts; to the Committee on Finance.

COMPLETED SHIP DELIVERY METHOD OF ACCOUNTING

• Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce this legislation today with Senators BREAUX, LANDRIEU, SNOWE, and WARNER. This legislation is an important step towards supporting and maintaining a 300 ship Navy to defend our Nation's shores and waters. By allowing military ship builders to go back to the Completed Ship Delivery Method of accounting, more resources will be available for research and development which will ultimately lead to better naval vessels made more inexpensively. Ultimately, this is a win-win situation.

Prior to 1982, ship builders calculated and paid their tax liabilities when they had completed building the vessel. Due to concerns over abuses, this accounting method was changed and military ship builders were required to pay taxes each year based on an approximation of what eventual profits might be. Military ships can take from three to seven years to build. During this period there can be wide fluctuations in various cost factors such as supplies and labor. Accordingly, it is very hard to predict what the eventual profits will be until the last rivet has been put in place. On the flip side, because even the most protracted ship building project will be completed in no more than seven years, the ability to game the system is limited. To minimize the ability of anyone to abuse this provision, this legislation requires that only ships that take at least two years to build are eligible for this treatment.

It is time to correct this unfair tax treatment. By allowing military ship builders to use the Completed Ship Delivery Method of accounting, the ship builders will continue to pay the same amount of tax and receive the same treatment as non-military ship builders. The only difference is that they will be allowed to pay it when they have an accurate idea of the actual

profits on that specific vessel. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this matter.●

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2898. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the disclosure of electronic monitoring of employee communications and computer usage in the workplace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC MONITORING ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Notice of Electronic Monitoring Act ("NEMA"), which will end the practice of unjustified secret electronic monitoring of workers by their employers. Companion legislation is also being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives CANADY and BARR.

With the revolutionary changes that technology and the Internet are bringing to society, come new threats to individual privacy. One of those is electronic employee monitoring. A lot of people don't know this yet, but, for all intents and purposes, the computer you use at work can watch your every move.

Over the course of the past year, new software has been developed that makes it easy and cheap for employers to automatically record an employees' e-mail, web activities, even an employees' every key stroke.

For example, one software product claims that it reviews more than 50,000 e-mail messages per hour, silently, discretely, and continuously auditing e-mail content moving in and out of a company. This product can be run from any workstation, and can be set up and running in minutes. After a free 30-day trial of the software, an employer can buy it for a mere \$400.

My point is not that such software products are per se bad. Indeed, electronic monitoring can sometimes be helpful in protecting corporate trade secrets or preventing employee harassment. My point is that new technologies that allow any employer to monitor employees without their knowledge is becoming ubiquitous, cheap, and simple to install and use.

And it is becoming a problem. The number of employers who monitor employee e-mail has doubled in the last two years. A recent survey indicates that as of last year, nearly three quarters of large American companies actively record and review either e-mail, Internet usage, computer files, or phone usage.

NEMA puts a check on business that is reasonable and fair. It gives employees the right to know whether, when, and how their employer is watching. We would never stand for it if an employer steamed open an employees' mail, read it, and put it back without her knowledge. It should be the same with email.

Employees are going to occasionally write personal emails like a message to a spouse about a financial problem, or use the Internet to do a personal

search for a medical question they have. All employees should know before doing a search or sending an email, whether they have privacy or not.

NEMA requires employers to notify their employees of any monitoring of communications or computer usage. It covers reading or scanning of employee e-mail, keystroke monitoring, or programs that monitor employee web use, as well as monitoring of telephone conversations.

Importantly, NEMA does not prohibit any monitoring techniques, it merely requires employers to give clear and conspicuous notice annually and whenever policies change. And if the employer has good reason to believe that an employee is causing significant harm to the employer or any other person, the employer can monitor that person without any notice at all.

If an employer secretly monitors in violation of the Act, they are subject to suit by the employee for at most \$20,000 in damages. However, I believe that such lawsuits will be few and far between because employers will simply abide by the modest terms of the Act and give annual notice.

New technology has made it cheap and easy for employers to secretly monitor everything an employee does on line. This legislation provides workers a first line of defense against a practice that can sometimes amount to nothing more than a blatant invasion of privacy. NEMA is a moderate and fair step that addresses an important threat to employee privacy that is quietly but quickly spreading to most workplaces.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. INOUE):

S. 2899. A bill to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States' relationship with Native Hawaiians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

UNITED STATES' RELATIONSHIP WITH NATIVE HAWAIIANS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I stand before you today to introduce a bill on behalf of myself and my dear friend and colleague, Senator INOUE, that is of great significance to the indigenous peoples of Hawaii—the Native Hawaiians. This measure clarifies the political relationship between Native Hawaiians and the United States. For years, Congress has legislated on behalf of Native Hawaiians as the aboriginal, indigenous, native peoples of Hawaii. This measure clarifies that political relationship and provides a process for Native Hawaiians to form a Native Hawaiian governing body to engage in a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

The United States has declared a special responsibility for the welfare of the Native peoples of the United States, including Native Hawaiians. This relationship has been acknowledged by the United States since the

inception of Hawaii's status as a territory. This relationship was most explicitly affirmed by the enactment of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, which set aside 200,000 acres of land in Hawaii for homesteading by Native Hawaiians. Legislative history clearly shows that in addressing this situation, Congress based this action and subsequent legislation on the constitutional precedent in programs enacted for the benefit of American Indians.

Since Hawaii's admission into the Union, Congress has continued to legislate on behalf of Native Hawaiians as indigenous peoples. Native Hawaiians have been included as Native Americans in a number of federal statutes which have addressed the conditions of Native Hawaiians. This political relationship has been discussed within the Native Hawaiian community for many, many years. A large portion of the discussion has centered around the history of Hawaii's indigenous peoples and the United States' role in that history.

In 1993, Congress passed P.L. 103-150, the Apology Resolution, which extended an apology on behalf of the United States to the Native people of Hawaii for the United States' role in the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii. The Apology Resolution also expressed the commitment of Congress and the President to acknowledge the ramifications of the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii and to support reconciliation efforts between the United States and Native Hawaiians. The process of reconciliation is ongoing.

Mr. President, this legislation is important not only to Native Hawaiians, but also to all people in Hawaii. This measure provides the process to begin resolving many longstanding issues facing Hawaii's indigenous peoples and the State of Hawaii. In addressing these issues, we have begun a process of healing, a process of reconciliation not only with the United States but within the State of Hawaii. The essence of Hawaii is characterized not by the beauty of its islands, but by the beauty of its people. The State of Hawaii has recognized, acknowledged and acted upon the need to preserve the culture, tradition, language and heritage of Hawaii's indigenous peoples. This measure furthers these actions.

Mr. President, the clarification of the political relationship between Native Hawaiians and the United States is one that has been long in coming and is well-deserved. The history and the timing of Hawaii's admission to the United States, unfortunately, did not provide the appropriate structure for a government-to-government relationship between Hawaii's indigenous native peoples and the United States. The time has come to correct this injustice.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of this measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2899

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) the Constitution vests Congress with the authority to address the conditions of the indigenous, native people of the United States;

(2) Native Hawaiians, the native people of the State of Hawaii are indigenous, native people of the United States;

(3) the United States has a special trust relationship to promote the welfare of the native people of the United States, including Native Hawaiians;

(4) under the treaty-making power of the United States, Congress exercised its constitutional authority to confirm a treaty between the United States and the government that represented the Hawaiian people, and from 1826 until 1893, the United States recognized the independence of the Kingdom of Hawaii, extended full diplomatic recognition to the Hawaiian Government, and entered into treaties and conventions with the Hawaiian monarchs to govern commerce and navigation in 1826, 1842, 1849, 1875, and 1887;

(5) pursuant to the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 108, chapter 42), the United States set aside 200,000 acres of land in the Federal territory that later became the State of Hawaii in order to establish a homeland for the native people of Hawaii, Native Hawaiians;

(6) by setting aside 200,000 acres of land for Native Hawaiian homesteads and farms, the Act assists the Native Hawaiian community in maintaining distinct native settlements throughout the State of Hawaii;

(7) approximately 6,800 Native Hawaiian lessees and their family members reside on Hawaiian Home Lands and approximately 18,000 Native Hawaiians who are eligible to reside on the Home Lands are on a waiting list to receive assignments of land;

(8) the Hawaiian Home Lands continue to provide an important foundation for the ability of the Native Hawaiian community to maintain the practice of Native Hawaiian culture, language, and traditions, and Native Hawaiians have maintained other distinctly native areas in Hawaii;

(9) on November 23, 1993, Public Law 103-150 (107 Stat. 1510) (commonly known as the Apology Resolution) was enacted into law, extending an apology on behalf of the United States to the Native people of Hawaii for the United States' role in the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii;

(10) the Apology Resolution acknowledges that the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii occurred with the active participation of agents and citizens of the United States and further acknowledges that the Native Hawaiian people never directly relinquished their claims to their inherent sovereignty as a people over their national lands to the United States, either through their monarchy or through a plebiscite or referendum;

(11) the Apology Resolution expresses the commitment of Congress and the President to acknowledge the ramifications of the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii and to support reconciliation efforts between the United States and Native Hawaiians; and to have Congress and the President, through the President's designated officials, consult with Native Hawaiians on the reconciliation process as called for under the Apology Resolution;

(12) despite the overthrow of the Hawaiian government, Native Hawaiians have continued to maintain their separate identity as a distinct native community through the formation of cultural, social, and political in-

stitutions, and to give expression to their rights as native people to self-determination and self-governance as evidenced through their participation in the Office of Hawaiian Affairs;

(13) Native Hawaiians also maintain a distinct Native Hawaiian community through the provision of governmental services to Native Hawaiians, including the provision of health care services, educational programs, employment and training programs, children's services, conservation programs, fish and wildlife protection, agricultural programs, native language immersion programs and native language immersion schools from kindergarten through high school, as well as college and master's degree programs in native language immersion instruction, and traditional justice programs, and by continuing their efforts to enhance Native Hawaiian self-determination and local control;

(14) Native Hawaiians are actively engaged in Native Hawaiian cultural practices, traditional agricultural methods, fishing and subsistence practices, maintenance of cultural use areas and sacred sites, protection of burial sites, and the exercise of their traditional rights to gather medicinal plants and herbs, and food sources;

(15) the Native Hawaiian people wish to preserve, develop, and transmit to future Native Hawaiian generations their ancestral lands and Native Hawaiian political and cultural identity in accordance with their traditions, beliefs, customs and practices, language, and social and political institutions, and to achieve greater self-determination over their own affairs;

(16) this Act responds to the desire of the Native Hawaiian people for enhanced self-determination by establishing a process within the framework of Federal law for the Native Hawaiian people to exercise their inherent rights as a distinct aboriginal, indigenous, native community to reorganize a Native Hawaiian governing body for the purpose of giving expression to their rights as native people to self-determination and self-governance;

(17) the United States has declared that—

(A) the United States has a special responsibility for the welfare of the native peoples of the United States, including Native Hawaiians;

(B) Congress has identified Native Hawaiians as a distinct indigenous group within the scope of its Indian affairs power, and has enacted dozens of statutes on their behalf pursuant to its recognized trust responsibility; and

(C) Congress has also delegated broad authority to administer a portion of the federal trust responsibility to the State of Hawaii;

(18) the United States has recognized and reaffirmed the special trust relationship with the Native Hawaiian people through—

(A) the enactment of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union", approved March 18, 1959 (Public Law 86-3; 73 Stat. 4) by—

(i) ceding to the State of Hawaii title to the public lands formerly held by the United States, and mandating that those lands be held in public trust for the betterment of the conditions of Native Hawaiians; and

(ii) transferring the United States' responsibility for the administration of the Hawaiian Home Lands to the State of Hawaii, but retaining the authority to enforce the trust, including the exclusive right of the United States to consent to any actions affecting the lands which comprise the corpus of the trust and any amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 108, chapter 42) that are enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii affecting the beneficiaries under the Act;

(19) the United States continually has recognized and reaffirmed that—

(A) Native Hawaiians have a cultural, historic, and land-based link to the aboriginal, native people who exercised sovereignty over the Hawaiian Islands;

(B) Native Hawaiians have never relinquished their claims to sovereignty or their sovereign lands;

(C) the United States extends services to Native Hawaiians because of their unique status as the aboriginal, native people of a once sovereign nation with whom the United States has a political and legal relationship; and

(D) the special trust relationship of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians to the United States arises out of their status as aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States.

## SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ABORIGINAL, INDIGENOUS, NATIVE PEOPLE.**—The term “aboriginal, indigenous, native people” means those people whom Congress has recognized as the original inhabitants of the lands and who exercised sovereignty prior to European contact in the areas that later became part of the United States;

(2) **ADULT MEMBERS.**—The term “adult members” means those Native Hawaiians who have attained the age of 18 at the time the Secretary publishes the initial roll in the Federal Register, as provided in section 7(a)(4) of this Act.

(3) **APOLOGY RESOLUTION.**—The term “Apology Resolution” means Public Law 103-150 (107 Stat. 1510), a joint resolution offering an apology to Native Hawaiians on behalf of the United States for the participation of agents of the United States in the January 17, 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii.

(4) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the commission established in section 7 of this Act to certify that the adult members of the Native Hawaiian community contained on the roll developed under that section meet the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in paragraph (6)(A).

(5) **INDIGENOUS, NATIVE PEOPLE.**—The term “indigenous, native people” means the lineal descendants of the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States.

(6) **NATIVE HAWAIIAN.**—

(A) Prior to the recognition by the United States of a Native Hawaiian governing body under the authority of section 7(d) of this Act, the term “Native Hawaiian” means the indigenous, native people of Hawaii who are the lineal descendants of the aboriginal, indigenous, native people who resided in the islands that now comprise the State of Hawaii on January 1, 1893, and who occupied and exercised sovereignty in the Hawaiian archipelago, including the area that now constitutes the State of Hawaii, as evidenced by (but not limited to)—

(i) genealogical records;

(ii) Native Hawaiian kupuna (elders) verification or affidavits;

(iii) church or census records; or

(iv) government birth or death certificates or other vital statistics records;

(B) Following the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing body under section 7(d) of this Act, the term “Native Hawaiian” shall have the meaning given to such term in the organic governing documents of the Native Hawaiian governing body.

(7) **NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNING BODY.**—The term “Native Hawaiian governing body” means the adult members of the governing body of the Native Hawaiian people that is recognized by the United States under the authority of section 7(d) of this Act.

(8) **NATIVE HAWAIIAN INTERIM GOVERNING COUNCIL.**—The term “Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council” means the interim governing council that is authorized to exercise the powers and authorities recognized in section 7(b) of this Act.

(9) **ROLL.**—The term “roll” means the roll that is developed under the authority of section 7(a) of this Act.

(10) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

(11) **TASK FORCE.**—The term “Task Force” means the Native Hawaiian Interagency Task Force established under the authority of section 6 of this Act.

## SEC. 3. UNITED STATES POLICY.

The United States reaffirms that—

(1) Native Hawaiians are a unique and distinct aboriginal, indigenous, native people, with whom the United States has a political and legal relationship;

(2) the United States has a special trust relationship to promote the welfare of Native Hawaiians;

(3) Congress possesses the authority under the Constitution to enact legislation to address the conditions of Native Hawaiians and has exercised this authority through the enactment of—

(A) the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 108, chapter 42);

(B) the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union”, approved March 18, 1959 (Public Law 86-3; 73 Stat. 4); and

(C) more than 150 other Federal laws addressing the conditions of Native Hawaiians;

(4) Native Hawaiians have—

(A) an inherent right to autonomy in their internal affairs;

(B) an inherent right of self-determination and self-governance; and

(C) the right to reorganize a Native Hawaiian governing body; and

(5) the United States shall continue to engage in a process of reconciliation and political relations with the Native Hawaiian people.

## SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR NATIVE HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior the Office of Special Trustee for Native Hawaiian Affairs.

(b) **DUTIES OF THE OFFICE.**—The Office of Special Trustee for Native Hawaiian Affairs shall—

(1) effectuate and coordinate the special trust relationship between the Native Hawaiian people and the United States through the Secretary, and with all other Federal agencies;

(2) upon the recognition of the Native Hawaiian governing body by the United States as provided for in section 7(d) of this Act, effectuate and coordinate the special trust relationship between the Native Hawaiian governing body and the United States through the Secretary, and with all other Federal agencies;

(3) fully integrate the principle and practice of meaningful, regular, and appropriate consultation with the Native Hawaiian people by providing timely notice to, and consulting with the Native Hawaiian people prior to taking any actions that may have the potential to significantly or uniquely affect Native Hawaiian resources, rights, or lands, and upon the recognition of the Native Hawaiian governing body as provided for in section 7(d) of this Act, fully integrate the principle and practice of meaningful, regular, and appropriate consultation with the Native Hawaiian governing body by providing timely notice to, and consulting with

the Native Hawaiian people prior to taking any actions that may have the potential to significantly affect Native Hawaiian resources, rights, or lands;

(4) consult with the Native Hawaiian Interagency Task Force, other Federal agencies, and with relevant agencies of the State of Hawaii on policies, practices, and proposed actions affecting Native Hawaiian resources, rights, or lands;

(5) be responsible for the preparation and submittal to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives of an annual report detailing the activities of the Interagency Task Force established under section 6 of this Act that are undertaken with respect to the continuing process of reconciliation and to effect meaningful consultation with the Native Hawaiian people and the Native Hawaiian governing body and providing recommendations for any necessary changes to existing Federal statutes or regulations promulgated under the authority of Federal law;

(6) be responsible for continuing the process of reconciliation with the Native Hawaiian people, and upon the recognition of the Native Hawaiian governing body by the United States as provided for in section 7(d) of this Act, be responsible for continuing the process of reconciliation with the Native Hawaiian governing body; and

(7) assist the Native Hawaiian people in facilitating a process for self-determination, including but not limited to the provision of technical assistance in the development of the roll under section 7(a) of this Act, the organization of the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council as provided for in section 7(b) of this Act, and the reorganization of the Native Hawaiian governing body as provided for in section 7(c) of this Act.

## SEC. 5. DESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPRESENTATIVE.

The Attorney General shall designate an appropriate official within the Department of Justice to assist the Office of the Special Trustee for Native Hawaiian Affairs in the implementation and protection of the rights of Native Hawaiians and their political and legal relationship with the United States, and upon the recognition of the Native Hawaiian governing body as provided for in section 7(d) of this Act, in the implementation and protection of the rights of the Native Hawaiian governing body and its political and legal relationship with the United States.

## SEC. 6. NATIVE HAWAIIAN INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an interagency task force to be known as the “Native Hawaiian Interagency Task Force”.

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—The Task Force shall be composed of officials, to be appointed by the President, from—

(1) each Federal agency that establishes or implements policies that affect Native Hawaiians or whose actions may significantly or uniquely impact on Native Hawaiian resources, rights, or lands;

(2) the Office of the Special Trustee for Native Hawaiian Affairs established under section 4 of this Act; and

(3) the Executive Office of the President.

(c) **LEAD AGENCIES.**—The Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice shall serve as the lead agencies of the Task Force, and meetings of the Task Force shall be convened at the request of the lead agencies.

(d) **CO-CHAIRS.**—The Task Force representative of the Office of Special Trustee for Native Hawaiian Affairs established under the

authority of section 4 of this Act and the Attorney General's designee under the authority of section 5 of this Act shall serve as co-chairs of the Task Force.

(e) DUTIES.—The primary responsibilities of the Task Force shall be—

(1) the coordination of Federal policies that affect Native Hawaiians or actions by any agency or agencies of the Federal Government which may significantly or uniquely impact on Native Hawaiian resources, rights, or lands;

(2) to assure that each Federal agency develops a policy on consultation with the Native Hawaiian people, and upon recognition of the Native Hawaiian governing body by the United States as provided in section 7(d) of this Act, consultation with the Native Hawaiian governing body; and

(3) to assure the participation of each Federal agency in the development of the report to Congress authorized in section 4(b)(5) of this Act.

**SEC. 7. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A ROLL FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF A NATIVE HAWAIIAN INTERIM GOVERNING COUNCIL, FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF A NATIVE HAWAIIAN INTERIM GOVERNING COUNCIL AND A NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNING BODY, AND FOR THE RECOGNITION OF THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNING BODY.**

(a) ROLL.—

(1) PREPARATION OF ROLL.—The adult members of the Native Hawaiian community who wish to participate in the reorganization of a Native Hawaiian governing body shall prepare a roll for the purpose of the organization of a Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council. The roll shall include the names of—

(A) the adult members of the Native Hawaiian community who wish to become members of a Native Hawaiian governing body and who are the lineal descendants of the aboriginal, indigenous, native people who resided in the islands that now comprise the State of Hawaii on January 1, 1893, and who occupied and exercised sovereignty in the Hawaiian archipelago, including the area that now constitutes the State of Hawaii, as evidenced by (but not limited to)—

- (i) genealogical records;
- (ii) Native Hawaiian kupuna (elders) verification or affidavits;
- (iii) church or census records; or
- (iv) government birth or death certificates or other vital statistics records; and

(B) the children of the adult members listed on the roll prepared under this subsection.

(2) CERTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—

(A) COMMISSION.—There is authorized to be established a Commission to be composed of 9 members for the purpose of certifying that the adult members of the Native Hawaiian community on the roll meet the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act. The members of the Commission shall have expertise in the certification of Native Hawaiian ancestry.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—The Commission shall certify to the Secretary that the individuals listed on the roll developed under the authority of this subsection are Native Hawaiians, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act, and shall submit such roll to the Secretary.

(3) NOTIFICATION.—The Commission shall promptly provide notice to the Secretary if any of the individuals listed on the roll should be removed from the roll on account of death.

(4) PUBLICATION.—Within 45 days of the receipt by the Secretary of the roll developed under the authority of this subsection and certified by the Commission under the authority of paragraph (2), the Secretary shall certify that the roll is consistent with appli-

cable Federal law by publishing the roll in the Federal Register.

(5) EFFECT OF PUBLICATION.—The publication of the roll developed under the authority of this subsection shall be for the purpose of providing any member of the public with an opportunity to—

(A) petition the Secretary to add to the roll the name of an individual who meets the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act, and who is not listed on the roll; or

(B) petition the Secretary to remove from the roll the name of an individual who does not meet such definition.

(6) DEADLINE FOR PETITIONS.—Any petition described in paragraph (5) shall be filed with the Secretary within 90 days of the date of the publication of the roll in the Federal Register, as authorized under paragraph (4).

(7) CERTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL NATIVE HAWAIIANS FOR INCLUSION ON THE ROLL.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—Within 30 days of receiving a petition to add the name of an individual to the roll, the Secretary shall submit the name of each individual who is the subject of a petition to add his or her name to the roll to the Commission for certification that the individual meets the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—Within 30 days of receiving a petition from the Secretary to have a name added to or removed from the roll, the Commission shall certify to the Secretary that—

(i) the individual meets the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act; or

(ii) the individual does not meet the definition of Native Hawaiian, as so defined.

Upon such certification, the Secretary shall add or remove the name of the individual on the roll, as appropriate.

(8) HEARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a hearing on the record within 45 days of the receipt by the Secretary of—

(i) a certification by the Commission that an individual does not meet the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act; or

(ii) a petition to remove the name of any individual listed on the roll submitted to the Secretary by the Commission.

(B) TESTIMONY.—At the hearing conducted in accordance with this paragraph, the Secretary may receive testimony from the petitioner, a representative of the Commission, the individual whose name is the subject of the petition, and any other individuals who may have the necessary expertise to provide the Secretary with relevant information regarding whether the individual whose name is the subject of a petition meets the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act.

(C) FINAL DETERMINATION.—Within 30 days of the date of the conclusion of the hearing conducted in accordance with this paragraph, the Secretary shall make a determination regarding whether the individual whose name is the subject of a petition meets the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act. Such a determination shall be a final determination for purposes of judicial review.

(9) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(A) FINAL JUDGMENT.—The United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall have jurisdiction to review the record of the decision developed by the Secretary and the Secretary's final determination under paragraph (8) and shall make a final judgment regarding such determination.

(B) NOTICE.—If the district court determines that an individual's name should be added to the roll because that individual

meets the definition of Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 2(6)(A) of this Act, or that an individual's name should be removed from the roll because that individual does not meet such definition, the district court shall so advise the Secretary and the Secretary shall add or remove the individual's name from the roll, consistent with the instructions of the district court.

(10) PUBLICATION OF FINAL ROLL.—Except for those petitions which remain the subject of judicial review under the authority of paragraph (9), the Secretary shall—

(A) publish a final roll in the Federal Register within 290 days of the receipt by the Secretary of the roll prepared under the authority of paragraph (1); and

(B) subsequently publish in the Federal Register the names of any individuals that the district court directs be added or removed from the roll.

(11) EFFECT OF PUBLICATION.—The publication of the final roll shall serve as the basis for the eligibility of adult members listed on the roll to participate in all referenda and elections associated with the organization of a Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council.

(b) ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN INTERIM GOVERNING COUNCIL.—

(1) ORGANIZATION.—

(A) DATE OF GENERAL MEETING.—Within 90 days of the date of the publication of the final roll in the Federal Register, the Secretary shall announce the date of a general meeting of the adult members of those listed on the roll to nominate candidates from among the adult members listed on the roll for election to the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council. The criteria for candidates to serve on the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council shall be developed by the adult members listed on the roll at the general meeting. The general meeting may consist of meetings on each island or at such sites as to secure the maximum participation of the adult members listed on the roll. Such general meeting (or meetings) shall be held within 30 days of the Secretary's announcement.

(B) ELECTION.—Within 45 days of the general meeting (or meetings), the Secretary shall assist the Native Hawaiian community in holding an election by secret ballot (absentee and mail balloting permitted), to elect the membership of the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council from among the nominees submitted to the Secretary from the general meeting. The ballots shall provide for write-in votes.

(C) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council elected pursuant to this subsection if the requirements of this section relating to the nominating and election process have been met.

(2) POWERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council shall represent those on the roll in the implementation of this Act and shall have no powers other than those given to it in accordance with this Act.

(B) TERMINATION.—The Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council shall have no power or authority under this Act after the time which the duly elected officers of the Native Hawaiian governing body take office.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) REFERENDUM.—The Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council shall conduct a referendum of the adult members listed on the roll for the purpose of determining (but not limited to) the following:

(i) The proposed elements of the organic governing documents of a Native Hawaiian governing body.

(ii) The proposed powers and authorities to be exercised by a Native Hawaiian governing

body, as well as the proposed privileges and immunities of a Native Hawaiian governing body.

(iii) The proposed civil rights and protection of such rights of the members of a Native Hawaiian governing body and all persons subject to the authority of a Native Hawaiian governing body.

(B) DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANIC GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.—Based upon the referendum authorized in subparagraph (A), the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council shall develop proposed organic governing documents for a Native Hawaiian governing body.

(C) DISTRIBUTION.—The Council shall distribute to all adult members of those listed on the roll, a copy of the proposed organic governing documents, as drafted by the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council, along with a brief impartial description of the proposed organic governing documents.

(D) CONSULTATION.—The Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council shall freely consult with those listed on the roll concerning the text and description of the proposed organic governing documents.

(4) ELECTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council, the Secretary shall hold an election for the purpose of ratifying the proposed organic governing documents. If the Secretary fails to act within 45 days of the request by the Council, the Council is authorized to conduct the election.

(B) FAILURE TO ADOPT GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.—If the proposed organic governing documents are not adopted by a majority vote of the adult members listed on the roll, the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council shall consult with the adult members listed on the roll to determine which elements of the proposed organic governing documents were found to be unacceptable, and based upon such consultation, the Council shall propose changes to the proposed organic governing documents.

(C) ELECTION.—Upon the request of the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council, the Secretary shall hold a second election for the purpose of ratifying the proposed organic governing documents. If the Secretary fails to act within 45 days of the request by the Council, the Council is authorized to conduct the second election.

(c) ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNING BODY.—

(1) RECOGNITION OF RIGHTS.—The right of the Native Hawaiian governing body of the indigenous, native people of Hawaii to organize for its common welfare, and to adopt appropriate organic governing documents is hereby recognized by the United States.

(2) RATIFICATION.—The organic governing documents of the Native Hawaiian governing body shall become effective when ratified by a majority vote of the adult members listed on the roll, and approved by the Secretary upon the Secretary's determination that the organic governing documents are consistent with applicable Federal law and the special trust relationship between the United States and its native people. If the Secretary fails to make such a determination within 45 days of the ratification of the organic governing documents by the adult members listed on the roll, the organic governing documents shall be deemed to have been approved by the Secretary.

(3) ELECTION OF GOVERNING OFFICERS.—Within 45 days after the Secretary has approved the organic governing documents or the organic governing documents are deemed approved, the Secretary shall assist the Native Hawaiian Interim Governing Council in holding an election by secret ballot for the purpose of determining the individuals who

will serve as governing body officers as provided in the organic governing documents.

(4) VOTING ELIGIBILITY.—For the purpose of this initial election and notwithstanding any provision in the organic governing documents to the contrary, absentee balloting shall be permitted and all adult members of the Native Hawaiian governing body shall be entitled to vote in the election.

(5) FUTURE ELECTIONS.—All further elections of governing body officers shall be conducted as provided for in the organic governing documents and ordinances adopted in accordance with this Act.

(6) REVOCATION; RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—When ratified by a majority vote of the adult members of those listed on the roll, the organic governing documents shall be revocable by an election open to the adult members of the Native Hawaiian governing body, and amendments to the organic governing documents may be ratified by the same process.

(7) ADDITIONAL RIGHTS AND POWERS.—In addition to all powers vested in the Native Hawaiian governing body by the duly ratified organic governing documents, the organic governing documents shall also vest in the Native Hawaiian governing body the rights and powers to—

(A) exercise those governmental authorities that are recognized by the United States as the powers and authorities that are exercised by other governments representing the indigenous, native people of the United States;

(B) provide for the protection of the civil rights of the members of the Native Hawaiian governing body and all persons subject to the authority of the Native Hawaiian governing body, and to assure that the Native Hawaiian governing body exercises its authority consistent with the requirements of section 202 of the Act of April 11, 1968 (25 U.S.C. 1302);

(C) prevent the sale, disposition, lease, or encumbrance of lands, interests in lands, or other assets of the Native Hawaiian governing body without the consent of the Native Hawaiian governing body;

(D) determine the membership in the Native Hawaiian governing body; and

(E) negotiate with Federal, State, and local governments, and other entities.

(d) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) RECOGNITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the approval by the Secretary of the organic governing documents of the Native Hawaiian governing body and the election of officers of the Native Hawaiian governing body, Federal recognition is hereby extended to the Native Hawaiian governing body as the representative governing body of the Native Hawaiian people.

(2) NO DIMINISHMENT OF RIGHTS OR PRIVILEGES.—Nothing contained in this Act shall diminish, alter, or amend any existing rights or privileges enjoyed by the Native Hawaiian people which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

(e) INCORPORATION OF THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNING BODY.—

(1) CHARTER OF INCORPORATION.—Upon petition of the Native Hawaiian governing body, the Secretary may issue a charter of incorporation to the Native Hawaiian governing body. Upon the issuance of such charter of incorporation, the Native Hawaiian governing body shall have the same status under Federal law when acting in its corporate capacity as the status of Indian tribes that have been issued a charter of incorporation under the authority of section 17 of the Indian Reorganization Act (25 U.S.C. 477).

(2) ENUMERATED POWERS.—Such charter may authorize the incorporated Native Hawaiian governing body to exercise the power

to purchase, take by gift, bequest, or otherwise, own, hold, manage, operate, and dispose of property of every description, real and personal, including the power to purchase lands and to issue an exchange of interests in corporate property, and such further powers as may be incidental to the conduct of corporate business, and that are not inconsistent with law.

**SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the activities authorized in sections 4, 6, and 7 of this Act.

**SEC. 9. REAFFIRMATION OF DELEGATION OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY; NEGOTIATIONS.**

(a) REAFFIRMATION.—The delegation by the United States of authority to the State of Hawaii to address the conditions of Native Hawaiians contained in the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union" approved March 18, 1959 (Public Law 86-3; 73 Stat. 5) is hereby reaffirmed.

(b) NEGOTIATIONS.—Upon the Federal recognition of the Native Hawaiian governing body pursuant to section 7(d) of this Act, the United States is authorized to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of Hawaii and the Native Hawaiian governing body regarding the transfer of lands, resources, and assets dedicated to Native Hawaiian use under existing law as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act to the Native Hawaiian governing body.

**SEC. 10. DISCLAIMER.**

Nothing in this Act is intended to serve as a settlement of any claims against the United States.

**SEC. 11. REGULATIONS.**

The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

**SEC. 12. SEVERABILITY.**

In the event that any section or provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act is held invalid, it is the intent of Congress that the remaining sections or provisions of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall continue in full force and effect.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to support and cosponsor a bill, introduced by my dear friend and colleague Senator DANIEL AKAKA, which formally expresses the policy of the United States with regard to its relationship with Native Hawaiians.

Mr. President, I have had the honor of serving as the Senator from Hawai'i since 1962. And for twenty of those years I have been privileged to sit on the Committee on Indian Affairs where I have been a staunch supporter of rights for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. The bill reaffirms that the United States has not only a legal and political relationship with the native people of Hawai'i, but a special trust relationship to promote the welfare of the Native Hawaiian people.

The Constitution empowers the Congress to direct the United States' relationship with American Indians as aboriginal, indigenous, native people. As territory was added to the United States, it came to be understood that Congress also has the authority to address the conditions of the native people of those areas that have become



part of the United States, namely Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians. Although the three groups of native people are ethnically and culturally unique and distinct from one another, the United States recognizes that it has a special trust relationship with each group. This special relationship allows Congress to treat native people differently than its other citizens.

Over the course of the last 80 years, the Congress has enacted over 150 public laws that recognize and affect Native Hawaiians as native people. And most recently, the United States filed an amicus curiae brief in the United States Supreme Court that clearly established that the United States has a political and legal relationship with Native Hawaiians. The United States, through the actions of its legislative and executive branches, has viewed and treated Native Hawaiians as aboriginal, indigenous, native people.

This bill clarifies that the United States has a legal and political relationship with Native Hawaiians as the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of Hawai'i and reaffirms the Constitutional authority of the Congress to address the conditions of Native Hawaiians through legislation. The bill also reaffirms the policy of the United States that Native Hawaiians have the inherent right to self-determination, self-governance, and the right to autonomy in their internal affairs. Most importantly this bill establishes a process by which Native Hawaiians can reorganize their governing body.

Mr. President, since I have served in the Congress, the United States' policy toward its native people has been one of self-determination. We now deal with American Indian Tribes and Alaska Natives Villages on a sovereign-to-sovereign basis. I think that this is the appropriate policy. Unfortunately, Native Hawaiians have not had the opportunity to fully enjoy this self-determination policy because we have failed to establish the framework for a government-to-government relationship. This bill would provide that framework. This bill is just, right, and long overdue.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 309

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a member of the uniformed services shall be treated as using a principal residence while away from home on qualified official extended duty in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of such residence.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the

expansion, intensification, and coordination of the activities of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to research on autism.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to provide for the location of the National Museum of the United States Army.

S. 1155

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a new prospective payment system for Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics.

S. 1898

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1898, a bill to provide protection against the risks to the public that are inherent in the interstate transportation of violent prisoners.

S. 1902

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1902, a bill to require disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act regarding certain persons and records of the Japanese Imperial Army in a manner that does not impair any investigation or prosecution conducted by the Department of Justice or certain intelligence matters, and for other purposes.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2274, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) were added as cosponsors of S. 2408, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the

Navajo Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2419

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2419, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the annual determination of the rate of the basic benefit of active duty educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill, and for other purposes.

S. 2476

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2476, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to prohibit any regulatory impediments to completely and accurately fulfilling the sufficiency of support mandates of the national statutory policy of universal service, and for other purposes.

S. 2516

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2516, a bill to fund task forces to locate and apprehend fugitives in Federal, State, and local felony criminal cases and give administrative subpoena authority to the United States Marshals Service.

S. 2645

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2645, a bill to provide for the application of certain measures to the People's Republic of China in response to the illegal sale, transfer, or misuse of certain controlled goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

S. 2729

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2729, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to restore stability and equity to the financing of the United Mine Workers of America Combines Benefit Fund by eliminating the liability of reachback operations, to provide additional sources of revenue to the Fund, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SMITH of Oregon, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2729, supra.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to provide for the preservation of assisted housing for low income elderly persons, disabled persons, and other families.

S. 2781

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2781, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor.

S. 2787

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2787, a bill to reauthorize the Federal programs to prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 2793

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2793, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen the limitation on holding and transfer of broadcast licenses to foreign persons, and to apply a similar limitation to holding and transfer of other telecommunications media by or to foreign governments.

S. 2825

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2825, a bill to strengthen the effectiveness of the earned income tax credit in reducing child poverty and promoting work.

S. 2868

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2868, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to children's health.

S. CON. RES. 130

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 130, concurrent resolution establishing a special task force to recommend an appropriate recognition for the slave laborers who worked on the construction of the United States Capitol.

S. J. RES. 50

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 50, a joint resolution to disapprove a final rule promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency concerning water pollution.

S. RES. 133

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 133, a resolution supporting religious tolerance toward Muslims.

S. RES. 304

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 304, a resolution expressing

the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as "National Veterans Awareness Week" for the presentation of such educational programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 3917

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3917 proposed to H.R. 4461, a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3922

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3922 proposed to H.R. 4461, a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

EDWARDS AMENDMENT NO. 3954

(Ordered to lie on the Table.)

Mr. EDWARDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 40, line 17, after the period, insert the following:

"For an additional amount for the rural community advancement program under subtitle E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009 et seq.), \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide loans under the community facility direct and guaranteed loans program and grants under the community facilities grant program under paragraphs (1) and (19), respectively, of section 306(a) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926 (a)) with respect to areas in the State of North Carolina subject to a declaration of a major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5125 et seq.) as a result of Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: *Provided*, That the \$50,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emer-

gency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) *Provided further*, That the \$50,000,000 is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balance Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A))."

COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 3955

Mr. COCHRAN proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3938 proposed by Mr. HARKIN to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 2 of the amendment: Strike "established by the Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof: "Promulgated with the advice of the National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods and that are shown to be adulterated".

TORRICELLI (AND REED)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3956

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 50, line 6, before the period, insert the following: "": *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall be made available for sites participating in the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children to—

"(1) determine whether a child eligible to participate in the program has received a blood lead screening test, using a test that is appropriate for age and risk factors, upon the enrollment of the child in the program.

HATCH (AND OTHERS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3957

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 56, line 9, strike "\$313,143,000" and insert "\$315,143,000".

On page 57, line 2, strike "\$78,589,000" and insert "\$76,589,000".

SPECTER (AND OTHERS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3958

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of chapter 6 of title II of division B, add the following:

SEC. 2607. Amtrak is authorized to obtain services from the Administrator of General Services, and the Administrator is authorized to provide services to Amtrak, under sections 201(b) and 211(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481(b) and 491(b)) for fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter until the fiscal year that Amtrak operates without Federal operating grant funds appropriated for its benefit, as required by sections

24101(d) and 24104(a) of title 49, United States Code.

DASCHLE AMENDMENTS NOS. 3959–3960

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DASCHLE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3959

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 740. GOOD FAITH RELIANCE.—The Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 1230 (16 U.S.C. 3830) the following:

“SEC. 1230A. GOOD FAITH RELIANCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Secretary shall provide equitable relief to an owner or operator that has entered into a contract under this chapter, and that is subsequently determined to be in violation of the contract, if the owner or operator in attempting to comply with the terms of the contract and enrollment requirements took actions in good faith reliance on the action or advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary.

“(b) TYPES OF RELIEF.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) to the extent the Secretary determines that an owner or operator has been injured by good faith reliance described in subsection (a), allow the owner or operator—

“(A) to retain payments received under the contract;

“(B) to continue to receive payments under the contract;

“(C) to keep all or part of the land covered by the contract enrolled in the applicable program under this chapter; or

“(D) to reenroll all or part of the land covered by the contract in the applicable program under this chapter; and

“(2) require the owner or operator to take such actions as are necessary to remedy any failure to comply with the contract.

“(c) RELATION TO OTHER LAW.—The authority to provide relief under this section shall be in addition to any other authority provided in this or any other Act.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to a pattern of conduct in which an authorized representative of the Secretary takes actions or provides advice with respect to an owner or operator that the representative and the owner or operator know are inconsistent with applicable law (including regulations).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3960

On page 13, line 13, strike “\$62,207,000” and insert “\$62,457,000”.

On page 13, line 16, strike “\$121,350,000” and insert “\$121,100,000”.

LEVIN AMENDMENTS NOS. 3961–3962

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. LEVIN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3961

On page 89, after line 19, add the following:

SEC. 1111. TREE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Agriculture may use \$9,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide assistance to producers to replace or rehabilitate trees (other than trees used for pulp or timber) and vineyards damaged by natural disasters or fireblight during the 2000 calendar year: *Provided*, That the

Secretary shall promulgate regulations to implement this section without regard to the provisions described in the second sentence of section 263(a) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note; Public Law 106-224): *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3962

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

Sec. 7\_\_\_\_. BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, should—

(1) declare an emergency regarding bovine tuberculosis; and

(2) make available funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for eradication of bovine tuberculosis.

DORGAN (AND OTHERS)

AMENDMENT NO. 3963

Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. REED, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BREAUX proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of chapter 1 of title I of division B, add the following:

SEC. 1108. CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use such sums as are necessary of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation (not to exceed \$900,000,000) to make emergency financial assistance available to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 2000 crop due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall make assistance available under this section in the same manner as provided under section 1102 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note; Public Law 105-277), including using the same loss thresholds as were used in administering that section.

(c) QUALIFYING LOSSES.—Assistance under this section may be made available for losses due to damaging weather or related condition (including losses due to scab, sclerotinia, aflatoxin, and other crop diseases) associated with crops that are, as determined by the Secretary—

(1) quantity losses (including quantity losses as a result of quality losses);

(2) quality losses; or

(3) severe economic losses.

(d) CROPS COVERED.—Assistance under this section shall be applicable to losses for all crops, as determined by the Secretary, due to disasters.

(e) CROP INSURANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall not discriminate against or penalize producers on a farm that have purchased crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(f) LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may use such sums as are necessary of funds made available under this section to make livestock indemnity payments to producers on a farm that have incurred losses during calendar year 2000 for of livestock losses due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(g) HAY LOSSES.—The Secretary may use such sums as are necessary of funds made available under this section to make payments to producers on a farm that have incurred losses of hay stock during calendar year 2000 due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(h) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

SEC. 1109. SPECIALTY CROPS.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use such sums as are necessary of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make emergency financial assistance available to producers of fruits, vegetables, and other specialty crops, as determined by the Secretary, that incurred losses during the 1999 crop year due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) QUALIFYING LOSSES.—Assistance under this section may be made available for losses due to a disaster associated with specialty crops that are, as determined by the Secretary—

(1) quantity losses;

(2) quality losses; or

(3) severe economic losses.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—Assistance under this section shall be applicable to losses for all specialty crops, as determined by the Secretary, due to disasters.

(d) CROP INSURANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall not discriminate against or penalize producers on a farm that have purchased crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(e) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 3964

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 76, after line 18, of Division B, as modified, insert:

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE  
WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION  
OPERATIONS

“For an additional amount for “Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations,” to repair

damages to the waterways and watersheds, including the purchase of floodplain easements, resulting from natural disasters, \$70,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds shall be used for activities identified by July 18, 2000: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$70,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act."

GRAHAM (AND MACK)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3965

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MACK)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 85, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_.—In using amounts made available under section 801(a) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note; Public Law 106-78), or under the matter under the heading "CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE" under the heading "COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND" of H.R. 3425 of the 106th Congress, as enacted by section 1001(a)(5) of Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1536, 1501A-289), to provide emergency financial assistance to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 1999 crop due to a disaster, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider nursery stock losses caused by Hurricane Irene on October 16 and 17, 1999, to be losses to the 1999 crop of nursery stock: *Provided*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

LOTT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT  
NO. 3966

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. KOHL)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 85, after line 8 of Division B, as modified, add the following:

Sec. Notwithstanding section 1237(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837(b)(1)), the Secretary of Agriculture may permit the enrollment of not to exceed 1,075.00 acres in the wetlands reserve program: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i), such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, shall be provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 2000 for technical assistance activities performed by an agency of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out this section: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official

budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

LEAHY (AND JEFFORDS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3967

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself, and Mr. JEFFORDS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 25, after line 8 of Division B as modified, insert:

SEC. . In addition to other compensation paid by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary shall compensate or otherwise seek to make whole, from funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, not to exceed \$4,000,000, the owners of all sheep destroyed from flocks under the Secretary's declarations of July 14, 2000 for lost income, or other business interruption losses, due to actions of the Secretary with respect to such sheep: *Provided*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

HARKIN (AND BOND) AMENDMENT  
NO. 3968

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. HARKIN (for himself, and Mr. BOND)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 76, after line 18, of Division B, as modified, insert the following:

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS  
ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, \$600,000 for completion of a biotechnology reference facility: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$600,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act.

GRAHAM (AND MACK)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3969

Mr. COCHRAN. (for Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MACK)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 83, line 5, strike the following: "; and (e) compensate commercial producers for losses due to citrus canker".

On page 85, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the Federal

Grants and Cooperative Agreements Act) the Secretary of Agriculture shall use not more than \$40,000,000 of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for a cooperative program with the state of Florida to replace commercial trees removed to control citrus canker and to compensate for lost production: *Provided*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 3970

Mr. COCHRAN proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 76, strike lines 6 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof:

"For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$59,400,000 to be available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That this amount shall be used for the Boll weevil eradication program for cost share purposes or for debt retirement for active eradication zones: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$59,400,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act."

THURMOND (AND HOLLINGS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3971

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

At the appropriate place in chapter 1 of title I of division B, insert the following:

For an additional amount for the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance to the State of South Carolina in capitalizing the South Carolina Grain Dealers Guaranty Fund, \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That these funds shall only be available if the State of South Carolina provides an equal amount to the South Carolina Grain Dealers Guaranty Fund: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 3972

Mr. COCHRAN proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 85, after line 8, of Division B, as modified, add the following:

SEC. (a). None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to carry out section 211 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 3830 note; Public Law 106-224) unless—

(1) the Secretary permits funds made available under section 211(b) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 to be used to provide financial or technical assistance to farmers and ranchers for the purposes described in section 211(b) of that Act; and

(2) notwithstanding section 387(c) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 3836a(c)), the Secretary permits funds made available under section 211 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 3830 note; Public Law 106-224) to be used to provide additional funding for the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program established under that section 387 in such sums as the Secretary considers necessary to carry out that Program.

(b) The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

#### SESSIONS AMENDMENT NO. 3973

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. SESSIONS) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

In section 1107, after the first proviso insert "*Provided further*, That of the \$450,000,000 amount, the Secretary shall use not less than \$5,000,000 to provide assistance for emergency haying and feed operations in the State of Alabama:".

#### EDWARDS AMENDMENT NO. 3974

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 40, line 17, after the period, insert the following:

"For an additional amount for the rural community advancement program under subtitle E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009 et seq.), \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide loans under the community facility direct and guaranteed loans program and grants under the community facilities grant program under paragraphs (1) and (19), respectively, of section 306(a) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)) with respect to areas in the State of North Carolina subject to a declaration of a major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) as a result of Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: *Provided*, That the \$50,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) *Provided further*, That the \$50,000,000 is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251 (b)(2)(A) of the Balance Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901 (b)(2)(A)).

#### DORGAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3975

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. REED, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BREAUX)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of chapter 1 of title I of division B, add the following:

SEC. 1108. CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use such sums as are necessary of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation (not to exceed \$900,000,000) to make emergency financial assistance available to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 2000 crop due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall make assistance available under this section in the same manner as provided under section 1102 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note; Public Law 105-277), including using the same loss thresholds as were used in administering that section.

(c) QUALIFYING LOSSES.—Assistance under this section may be made available for losses due to damaging weather or related condition (including losses due to scab, sclerotinia, aflatoxin, and other crop diseases) associated with crops that are, as determined by the Secretary—

(1) quantity losses (including quantity losses as a result of quality losses);

(2) quality losses; or

(3) severe economic losses.

(d) CROPS COVERED.—Assistance under this section shall be applicable to losses for all crops, as determined by the Secretary, due to disasters.

(e) CROP INSURANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall not discriminate against or penalize producers on a farm that have purchased crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(f) LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may use such sums as are necessary of funds made available under this section to make livestock indemnity payments to producers on a farm that have incurred losses during calendar year 2000 for of livestock losses due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(g) HAY LOSSES.—The Secretary may use such sums as are necessary of funds made available under this section to make payments to producers on a farm that have incurred losses of hay stock during calendar year 2000 due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(h) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

SEC. 1109. SPECIALTY CROPS.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use such sums as are necessary of funds of

the Commodity Credit Corporation to make emergency financial assistance available to producers of fruits, vegetables, and other specialty crops, as determined by the Secretary, that incurred losses during the 1999 crop year due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) QUALIFYING LOSSES.—Assistance under this section may be made available for losses due to a disaster associated with specialty crops that are, as determined by the Secretary—

(1) quantity losses;

(2) quality losses; or

(3) severe economic losses.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—Assistance under this section shall be applicable to losses for all specialty crops, as determined by the Secretary, due to disasters.

(d) CROP INSURANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall not discriminate against or penalize producers on a farm that have purchased crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(e) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

#### INOUYE AMENDMENT NO. 3976

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. INOUYE) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

On page 85 after line 8 of Division B, as modified, insert:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a payment in the amount of \$7,200,000 to the State of Hawaii from the Commodity Credit Corporation for assistance to an agricultural transportation cooperative in Hawaii, the members of which are eligible to participate in the Farm Service Agency administered Commodity Loan Program and have suffered extraordinary market losses due to unprecedented low prices.

#### GRAMM AMENDMENT NO. 3977

Mr. GRAMM proposed an amendment to the Cochran motion to waive the Congressional Budget Act relative to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

Strike all after the first word, and insert the following:

"I move to waive section 205 of the budget resolution for consideration of the Harkin Amendment."

#### COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 3978

Mr. COCHRAN proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3977 proposed by Mr. GRAMM to the motion to waive the Congressional Budget Act relative to the bill, H.R. 4461, *supra*; as follows:

Strike the word "waive" in the pending amendment and insert the following:

Section 205(c) of H. Con. Res. 290 with respect to all emergency designations in this bill and all amendments filed at the desk at this time to this bill other than Amendment No. 3918.

SMITH OF OREGON (AND WYDEN)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3979

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST SUFFERING FROM DUSKY CANADA GOOSE DEPREDATION.—(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, of the funds made available by this Act, \$250,000 shall be available to the Wildlife Services division of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for use in assisting farmers in the Pacific Northwest that are suffering losses due to dusky Canada Goose depredation.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount made available under subsection (a) shall be derived by transfer of a proportionate amount from each other account from which this Act makes funds available for travel, supplies, and printing expenses.

DURBIN (AND OTHERS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3980

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. HARKIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, as follows:

In section 3102, after the first sentence insert the following: "This section does not limit the authority of the Secretary to promulgate final rules or to revise or amend subpart 3809 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to require full financial assurance of reclamation of mining sites to protect the taxpayers from the actions of hardrock mining operations that cause damage to or destruction of public land; to prevent environmental destruction that unduly threatens fish or wildlife habitat; and to prevent toxic pollution that threatens public health or the environment."

## BAUCUS AMENDMENT NO. 3981

Mr. BAUCUS proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

Strike section 3104 and insert the following:

## SEC. 3104. STUDY OF OREGON INLET, NORTH CAROLINA, NAVIGATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army, shall have conducted, and submitted to Congress, a restudy of the project for navigation, Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, North Carolina, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1818), to evaluate all reasonable alternatives, including nonstructural alternatives, to the authorized inlet stabilization project at Oregon Inlet.

(b) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army, shall—

(1) take into account the views of affected interests; and

(2)(A) take into account objectives in addition to navigation, including—

(i) complying with the policies of the State of North Carolina regarding construction of structural measures along State shores; and

(ii) avoiding or minimizing adverse impacts to, or benefiting, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge; and

(B) develop options that meet those objectives.

## SMITH OF NEW HAMPSHIRE (AND BOXER) AMENDMENT NO. 3982

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself and Mrs. BOXER)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 20, line 8, strike the "." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "": *Provided further*, That no less than \$1 million of the funds available under this heading made available for wildlife services methods development, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct pilot projects in no less than four states representative of wildlife predation of livestock in connection with farming operations for direct assistance in the application of non-lethal predation control methods: *Provided further*, That the General Accounting Office shall report to the Committee on Appropriations by November 30, 2001, on the Department's compliance with this provision and on the effectiveness of the non-lethal measures."

BOXER (AND MCCONNELL)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3983

Mr. KOHL (for Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. . Section 211(a)(3) of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 651(a)(3)) is amended by adding after sulfites, 'except in the production of wine, .'"

## GRAMS AMENDMENT NO. 3984

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. GRAMS) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 75, after line 16 insert the following, "SEC. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require an office of the Farm Service Agency that is using FINPACK on May 17, 1999, for financial planning and credit analysis, to discontinue use of FINPACK for six months from the date of enactment of this Act."

HOLLINGS (AND THURMOND)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3985

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. THURMOND)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 93 of division B, as modified, after line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Sea Island Health Clinic located on Johns Island, South Carolina, shall remain eligible for assistance and funding from the Rural Development community facilities programs administered by the Department of Agriculture until such time new population data is available from the 2000 Census."

REED (AND CHAFEE) AMENDMENT  
NO. 3986

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. REED (for himself, and Mr. L. CHAFEE)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 34, line 23, before the period at the end, insert the following: "": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for watershed and flood prevention activities, \$500,000 shall be available for a study to be conducted

by the Natural Resources Conservation Service in cooperation with the town of Johnston, Rhode Island, on floodplain management for the Pocasset River, Rhode Island".

BINGAMAN (AND LEAHY)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3987

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 36, lines 20 through 25, strike "including grants for drinking and waste disposal systems pursuant to Section 306C of such Act: *Provided further*, That the Federally Recognized Native American Tribes are not eligible for any other rural utilities program set aside under Rural Community Advancement Program:" and insert "of which (1) \$1,000,000 shall be available for rural business opportunity grants under section 306(a)(11) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11)), (2) \$5,000,000 shall be available for community facilities grants for tribal college improvements under section 306(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)), (3) \$15,000,000 shall be available for grants for drinking water and waste disposal systems under section 306C of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926c) to federally recognized Native American Tribes that are not eligible to receive funds under any other rural utilities program set-aside under the rural community advancement program, and (4) \$3,000,000 shall be available for rural business enterprise grants under section 310B(c) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(c)):"

## BYRD AMENDMENT NO. 3988

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 84, line 23 after "section", insert "": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this section, up to \$40,000,000 may be used to carry out the Pasture Recovery Program: *Provided further*, That the payments to a producer made available through the Pasture Recovery Program shall be no less than 65 percent of the average cost of re-seeding".

DODD (AND LIEBERMAN)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3989

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 95, after line 22, add the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act or in any other Act may be used to recover part or all of any payment erroneously made to any oyster fisherman in the State of Connecticut for oyster losses under the program established under section 1102(b) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(a) of Division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)), and the regulations issued pursuant to such section 1102(b).

## WYDEN AMENDMENT NO. 3990

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 17, line 1 strike "": and" and insert "": and for the Oregon State University Agriculture Extension Service, \$176,000 for the

Food Electronically and Effectively Distributed (FEED) website demonstration project; and"; line 8, strike "\$12,107,000" and insert "\$12,283,000" and strike "\$426,504,000" and insert "\$426,680,000"; on line 19, strike "\$43,541,000" and insert "\$43,365,000"; on line 25, strike "6,000,000" and insert "\$5,824,000".

BYRD (AND COCHRAN)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3991

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. . Hereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider any borrower whose income does not exceed 115 percent of the median family income of the United States as meeting the eligibility requirements for a borrower contained in section 502(h)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472(h)(2)).

KOHL AMENDMENT NO. 3992

Mr. KOHL proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

In Division B, strike section 1106 and insert the following new section:

"SEC. 1106. The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make and administer supplemental payments to dairy producers who received a payment under section 805 of Public Law 106-78 in an amount equal to thirty-five percent of the reduction in market value of milk production in 2000, as determined by the Secretary, based on price estimates as of the date of enactment of this Act, from the previous five-year average and on the base production of the producer used to make a payment under section 805 of Public Law 106-78: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available until September 30, 2001: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make payments to producers under this section in a manner consistent with and subject to the same limitations on payments and eligible production as, the payments to dairy producers under section 805 of Public Law 106-78: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make provisions for making payments, in addition, to new producers: *Provided further*, That for any producers, including new producers, whose base production was less than twelve months for purposes of section 805 of Public Law 106-78, the producer's base production for the purposes of payments under this section may be, at the producer's option, the production of that producer in the twelve months preceding the enactment of this section or the producer's base production under the program operated under section 805 of Public Law 106-78 subject to such limitations as apply to other producers: *Provided further*, That the entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act."

HUTCHINSON (AND OTHERS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3993

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. CLELAND, and Mrs.

LINCOLN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. —Section 321(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) LOANS TO POULTRY FARMERS.—  
"(A) INABILITY TO OBTAIN INSURANCE.—  
"(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer did not have hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if the farmer—

"(I) applied for, but was unable, to obtain hazard insurance for the chicken house;

"(II) uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with industry standards in effect on the date the farmer submits an application for the loan (referred to in this paragraph as 'current industry standards');

"(III) obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

"(IV) meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle.

"(ii) AMOUNT.—Subject to the limitation contained in §324(a)(2) the amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be an amount that will allow the farmer to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards.

"(B) LOANS TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer had hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if—

"(I) the amount of the hazard insurance is less than the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

"(II) the farmer uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

"(III) the farmer obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

"(IV) the farmer meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle.

"(ii) AMOUNT.—Subject to the limitation contained in §324(a)(2) the amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be the difference between—

"(I) the amount of the hazard insurance obtained by the farmer; and

"(II) the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards."

TORRICELLI AMENDMENT NO. 3994

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. TORRICELLI) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PREFERENCE FOR ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture, in selecting public agencies and nonprofit organizations to provide transitional housing under section 592(c) of subtitle G of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11408a(c)), should consider preferences for agencies and organizations that provide transitional housing for individuals and families who are homeless as a result of domestic violence.

TORRICELLI (AND REED)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3995

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself and Mr. REED)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 50, line 6, before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall be made available for sites participating in the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children to—

"(I) determine whether a child eligible to participate in the program has received a blood lead screening test, using a test that is appropriate for age and risk factors, upon the enrollment of the child in the program.

HATCH (AND OTHERS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3996

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. DURBIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 56, line 9, strike "\$313,143,000" and insert "\$315,143,000".

On page 57, line 2, strike "\$78,589,000" and insert "\$76,589,000".

HARKIN (AND OTHERS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 3997

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. NICKLES)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 96 of the modified division B, after line 2, insert the following:

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION  
(DOMESTIC ENHANCEMENTS)

METHAMPHETAMINE LAB CLEANUP ASSISTANCE  
FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

For an additional amount for drug enforcement administration, \$5,000,000 for the Drug Enforcement Agency to assist in State and local methamphetamine lab cleanup (including reimbursement for costs incurred by State and local governments for lab cleanup since March 2000): *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$5,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

LANDRIEU AMENDMENT NO. 3998

Mr. KOHL (for Ms. LANDRIEU) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 4, line 12, before the period at the end of the line, insert "*Provided*, that the Chief Financial Officer shall actively market cross-servicing activities of the National Finance Center".

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 3999

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 13, line 13, strike "\$62,207,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$63,157,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike "\$121,350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,400,000".

#### CAMPBELL AMENDMENT NO. 4000

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. CAMPBELL) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 93 of division-B, as modified, after line 21 insert the following:

##### "GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

"SEC. . In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in Public Law 106-58 to the Department of the Treasury, Department-wide Systems and Capital Investments Programs, \$123,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, for maintaining and operating the current Customs Service Automated Commercial System: *Provided*, That the funds shall not be obligated until the Customs Service has submitted to the Committees on Appropriations an expenditure plan which has been approved by the Treasury Investment Review Board, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That none of the funds may be obligated to change the functionality of the Automated Commercial System itself: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$123,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount made available under this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended."

#### KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 4001

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 57, line 2, strike "\$78,589,000" and insert "\$72,589,000".

On page 57, line 10, insert before the period the following: "*Provided further*, That in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this heading to the Food and Drug Administration, an additional \$6,000,000 shall be made available of which \$5,000,000 shall be made available for the Centers for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs, and \$1,000,000 shall be made available to the National Center for Toxicological Research".

#### NICKLES (AND INOUE) AMENDMENT NO. 4002

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. NICKLES (for himself and Mr. INOUE)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 71, line 3, strike the comma and insert the following: "prior to July 1, 2001,".

#### FEINGOLD (AND JEFFORDS) AMENDMENT NO. 4003

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 740. NATURAL CHEESE STANDARD.—(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 401 of the Federal

Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) by striking "Whenever" and inserting "(a) Whenever"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) The Commissioner may not use any Federal funds to amend section 133.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling), to include dry ultra-filtered milk or casein in the definition of the term 'milk' or 'nonfat milk', as specified in the standards of identity for cheese and cheese products published at part 133 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling)."

(b) IMPORTATION STUDY.—Not later than \_\_\_ days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study to determine—

(A) the quantity of ultra-filtered milk that is imported annually into the United States; and

(B) the end use of that imported milk; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study.

#### SESSIONS AMENDMENT NO. 4004

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. SESSIONS) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 13, line 13, strike "\$62,207,000" and insert "\$62,707,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike "\$121,350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,850,000".

#### BOXER AMENDMENT NO. 4005

Mr. KOHL (for Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in Title VII, insert the following: "None of the funds appropriated by this act to the U.S. Department of Agriculture may be used to implement or administer the final rule issued in Docket number 97-110, at 65 Federal Register 37608-37669 until such time as USDA completes an independent peer review of the rule and the risk assessment underlying the rule."

#### LEAHY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 4006

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. KOHL)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. . DAIRY EXPORT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—Section 153(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (15 U.S.C. 713a-14(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5)(A) any award entered into under the program that is canceled or voided after June 30, 1995, is made available for reassignment under the program as long as a World Trade Organization violation is not incurred; and

"(B) any reassignment under subparagraph (A) is not reported as a new award when reporting the use of the reassigned tonnage to the World Trade Organization."

On page 36, line 9, strike "\$79,284,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$79,284,000"; on page 36, line 12 strike "\$634,360,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$644,360,000".

#### CAMPBELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 4007

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. DOMENICI)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 50, line 22, before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That, of funds made available under this heading and not already appropriated to the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) established under section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)), (1) an additional amount not to exceed \$7,300,000 shall be used to purchase bison for the FDPIR and to provide a mechanism for the purchases from Native American producers and cooperative organizations".

#### WARNER AMENDMENT NO. 4008

Mr. COCHRAN (for Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 13, line 13, strike "\$62,207,000" and insert "\$62,707,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike "\$121,350,000" and insert \* \* \*.

#### WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 4009

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 47, line 8, after "areas," insert the following: "of which not more than \$3,000,000 may be used to make grants to rural entities to promote employment of rural residents through teleworking, including to provide employment-related services, such as outreach to employers, training, and job placement, and to pay expenses relating to providing high-speed communications services, and".

#### JOHNSON AMENDMENT NO. 4010

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 740. STATE AGRICULTURAL MEDIATION PROGRAMS.—(a) ELIGIBLE PERSON; MEDIATION SERVICES.—Section 501 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5101) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

"(1) ISSUES COVERED.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—To be certified as a qualifying State, the mediation program of the State must provide mediation services to persons described in paragraph (2) that are involved in agricultural loans (regardless of whether the loans are made or guaranteed by the Secretary or made by a third party).

"(B) OTHER ISSUES.—The mediation program of a qualifying State may provide mediation services to persons described in paragraph (2) that are involved in 1 or more of the following issues under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture:

"(i) Wetlands determinations.

"(ii) Compliance with farm programs, including conservation programs.

"(iii) Agricultural credit.

"(iv) Rural water loan programs.

"(v) Grazing on National Forest System land.

"(vi) Pesticides.

"(vii) Such other issues as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(2) PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR MEDIATION.—The persons referred to in paragraph (1) include—



“(A) agricultural producers;  
“(B) creditors of producers (as applicable);  
and

“(C) persons directly affected by actions of the Department of Agriculture.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) DEFINITION OF MEDIATION SERVICES.—In this section, the term ‘mediation services’, with respect to mediation or a request for mediation, may include all activities related to—

“(1) the intake and scheduling of cases;

“(2) the provision of background and selected information regarding the mediation process;

“(3) financial advisory and counseling services (as appropriate) performed by a person other than a State mediation program mediator; and

“(4) the mediation session.”.

(b) USE OF MEDIATION GRANTS.—Section 502(c) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5102(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Each” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each”; and

“(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), operation and administration expenses for which a grant may be used include—

“(A) salaries;

“(B) reasonable fees and costs of mediators;

“(C) office rent and expenses, such as utilities and equipment rental;

“(D) office supplies;

“(E) administrative costs, such as workers’ compensation, liability insurance, the employer’s share of Social Security, and necessary travel;

“(F) education and training;

“(G) security systems necessary to ensure the confidentiality of mediation sessions and records of mediation sessions;

“(H) costs associated with publicity and promotion of the mediation program;

“(I) preparation of the parties for mediation; and

“(J) financial advisory and counseling services for parties requesting mediation.”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 506 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5106) is amended by striking “2000” and inserting “2005”.

#### HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 4011

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 13, line 16, strike “\$121,350,000” and insert “\$120,650,000”.

On page 15, line 2, strike “\$494,744,000” and insert “\$494,044,000”.

On page 17, line 8, strike “\$426,504,000” and insert “\$427,204,000”.

#### DASCHLE AMENDMENT NO. 4012

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. DASCHLE) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 740. GOOD FAITH RELIANCE.—The Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 1230 (16 U.S.C. 3830) the following:

##### “SEC. 1230A. GOOD FAITH RELIANCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Secretary shall provide equitable relief to an owner or operator that has entered into a contract under this chapter, and that is sub-

sequently determined to be in violation of the contract, if the owner or operator in attempting to comply with the terms of the contract and enrollment requirements took actions in good faith reliance on the action or advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary.

“(b) TYPES OF RELIEF.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) to the extent the Secretary determines that an owner or operator has been injured by good faith reliance described in subsection (a), allow the owner or operator to do any one or more of the following—

“(A) to retain payments received under the contract;

“(B) to continue to receive payments under the contract;

“(C) to keep all or part of the land covered by the contract enrolled in the applicable program under this chapter;

“(D) to reenroll all or part of the land covered by the contract in the applicable program under this chapter;

“(E) or any other equitable relief the Secretary deems appropriate; and

“(2) require the owner or operator to take such actions as are necessary to remedy any failure to comply with the contract.

“(c) RELATION TO OTHER LAW.—The authority to provide relief under this section shall be in addition to any other authority provided in this or any other Act.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to a pattern of conduct in which an authorized representative of the Secretary takes actions or provides advice with respect to an owner or operator that the representative and the owner or operator know are inconsistent with applicable law (including regulations).”.

“(e) APPLICABILITY OF RELIEF.—Relief under this section shall be available for contracts in effect on January 1, 2000 and for a subsequent contracts.”.

#### FEINGOLD AMENDMENT NO. 4013

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 89, after line 19, add the following:

SEC. 1111. AVAILABILITY OF DATA ON IMPORTED HERBS.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall publish and otherwise make available (including through electronic media) data collected monthly by each Secretary on herbs imported into the United States.

#### ROBB AMENDMENT NO. 4014

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. ROBB) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 15, line 6, before the period, insert: “: Provided, That this paragraph should not apply to research on the medical, biotechnological, food, and industrial uses of tobacco”.

#### WARNER AMENDMENT NO. 4015

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 4461, supra; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 7\_\_\_ . COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING FOR TRAINING SERVICES.—(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1669 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5922) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITION PROVISION.—Any order or agreement entered into under that section shall continue in effect until the date of ter-

mination of the order or agreement but may not be renewed.

## NOTICES OF HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the oversight hearing originally scheduled for Thursday, July 20, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, has been rescheduled. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony from representatives of the U.S. General Accounting Office on their investigation of the Cerro Grande Fire in the State of New Mexico, and from Federal agencies on the Cerro Grande Fire and their fire policies in general.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, July 27, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, SD-364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O’Toole or Kevin Clark of the Committee staff at (202) 224-6969.

### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing scheduled for July 21, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., to receive testimony on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement implementing the October 1999 announcement by President Clinton to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest lands for increased protection, has been postponed until Wednesday, July 26, 2000, at 2:30 pm. The hearing will take place in lieu of the previously scheduled hearing to receive testimony on potential timber sale contract liability incurred by the government as a result of timber sale contract cancellations. The hearing will take place in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey at (202) 224-6170.

**PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to a member of my staff, Jay Smith, during the pendency of the Agriculture appropriations bill.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to James Dunn of my staff during the pendency of the Agriculture appropriations bill.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bruce Artim, a fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for this session of Congress.

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

# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Agriculture Appropriations bill.

The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 4810, Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act.

The House passed H.R. 4871 Treasury, Postal Appropriations.

House Committee ordered reported the District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal year 2001.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages S7303–S7408*

**Measures Introduced:** Eight bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2895–2902. **Page S7393**

**Measures Reported:** Reports were made as follows:

Special Report entitled “Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2001.” (S. Rept. No. 106–350)

S. 2901, to authorize appropriations to carry out security assistance for fiscal year 2001. (S. Rept. No. 106–351)

S. 2089, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to modify procedures relating to orders for surveillance and searches for foreign intelligence purposes, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 106–352)

S. Res. 133, supporting religious tolerance toward Muslims.

S. 1902, to require disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act regarding certain persons and records of the Japanese Imperial Army in a manner that does not impair any investigation or prosecution conducted by the Department of Justice or certain intelligence matters, with amendments.

S. 2516, to fund task forces to locate and apprehend fugitives in Federal, State, and local felony criminal cases and give administrative subpoena authority to the United States Marshals Service, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2812, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities.

S. 2900, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001.

S.J. Res. 48, calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

S. Con. Res. 53, condemning all prejudice against individuals of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry in the United States and supporting political and civic participation by such individuals throughout the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble.

**Page S7392**

### Measures Passed:

**Agriculture Appropriations:** By 79 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. 225), Senate passed H.R. 4461, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, as amended, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

**Pages S7303–08, S7310–79**

### Adopted:

By 90 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. 222), Wellstone Modified Amendment No. 3919, to require the use of certain funds transferred to the Economic Research Service to conduct a study of reasons for the decline in participation in the food stamp program and any problems that households with eligible children have experienced in obtaining food stamps.

**Pages S7334–37**

By 72 yeas to 24 nays (Vote No. 223), Specter Amendment No. 3958, to correct an unintended termination of the authority of Amtrak to lease motor vehicles from the General Services Administration that results from previously enacted legislation.

**Pages S7337-42**

Cochran (for Harkin) Amendment No. 3964, to provide the use of funds for the Emergency Watershed Program for emergency expenses for floodplain operations identified as of July 18, 2000.

**Pages S7344-48, S7351**

Cochran (for Levin/Collins) Amendment No. 3457, to provide market and quality loss assistance for certain commodities.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Abraham/Schumer/Levin) Amendment No. 3933 (to Amendment No. 3457), to provide relief for apple growers whose crops have suffered extensive crop damage as a result of fireblight.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Graham/Mack) Amendment No. 3965, to ensure that nursery stock producers receive emergency financial assistance for nursery stock losses caused by Hurricane Irene.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Lott/Cochran/Kohl) Amendment No. 3966, to permit the enrollment of an additional 100,000 acres in the wetlands reserve program.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Leahy/Jeffords) Amendment No. 3967, to provide that in addition to other compensation paid by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary shall compensate, or otherwise seek to make whole, from funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, not to exceed \$4,000,000, the owners of all sheep destroyed from flocks under the Secretary's declarations of July 14, 2000 for lost income, or other business interruption losses, due to actions of the Secretary with respect to such sheep.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Harkin/Bond) Amendment No. 3968, to provide emergency funding for the Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration for completion of a biotechnology reference facility.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Graham/Mack) Amendment No. 3969, to ensure that growers who experienced crop losses due to citrus canker receive appropriate compensation.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran Amendment No. 3970, to make certain funds available for the Boll weevil eradication program for cost share purposes or for debt retirement for active eradication zones.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Thurmond) Amendment No. 3971, to provide financial assistance to the State of South Carolina in capitalizing the South Carolina Grain Dealers Guaranty Fund.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran Amendment No. 3972, to restrict the use of funds to provide certain conservation assistance and authorize a transfer of funds for the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Sessions) Amendment No. 3973, to provide for assistance for emergency haying and feed operations in the State of Alabama.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Edwards) Amendment No. 3974, to provide emergency funding to the Department of Agriculture's Rural Community Facilities program.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 3975, to make emergency financial assistance available to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 2000 crop due to a disaster and to producers of specialty crops that incurred losses during the 1999 crop year due to a disaster.

**Pages S7351-56**

Cochran (for Inouye) Amendment No. 3976, to provide that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a payment in the amount of \$7,200,000 to the State of Hawaii from the Commodity Credit Corporation for assistance to an agricultural transportation cooperative in Hawaii, the members of which are eligible to participate in the Farm Service Agency administered Commodity Loan Program and have suffered extraordinary market losses due to unprecedented low prices.

**Pages S7351-56**

Baucus Amendment No. 3981, to direct the Secretary of the Army to conduct a restudy of the project for navigation, Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, North Carolina, to evaluate alternatives to the authorized inlet stabilization project at Oregon Inlet.

**Pages S7361-65**

Cochran (for Smith-NH/Boxer) Amendment No. 3982, to provide for an Animal and Plant Health Services wildlife services methods development study.

**Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Boxer/McConnell) Amendment No. 3983, to amend the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990, providing for an exception in the production of wine.

**Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Grams) Amendment No. 3984, to prohibit the use of appropriated funds to require offices of the Farm Services Agency to discontinue use of FINPACK for financial planning and credit analysis.

**Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Hollings/Thurmond) Amendment No. 3985, to provide that the Sea Island Health Clinic located on Johns Island, South Carolina, shall remain eligible for assistance and funding from the Rural Development community facilities programs administered by the Department of Agriculture until such time new population data is available from the 2000 Census.

**Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Reed/Chafee) Amendment No. 3986, to provide funds for a study on flood plain management for the Pocasset River, Rhode Island. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Bingaman/Leahy) Amendment No. 3987, to allocate funding made available by this Act for loans and grants to federally recognized Indian tribes under the rural community advance program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Byrd) Amendment No. 3988, to provide for a pasture recovery program. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Dodd/Lieberman) Amendment No. 3989, to prohibit the use of any funding to recover payments erroneously made to oyster fishermen in the State of Connecticut. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Wyden) Amendment No. 3990, to provide support for creative anti-hunger initiatives in Oregon. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Byrd) Amendment No. 3991, to increase the Section 502 Guaranteed Rural Housing income limits. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl Amendment No. 3992, to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall use the funds, facilities and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make and administer supplemental payments to dairy producers who received a payment under section 805 of Public Law 106-78 in an amount equal to thirty-five percent of the reduction in market value of milk production in 2000. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Hutchinson/Cleland/Lincoln) Amendment No. 3993, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide emergency loans to poultry producers to rebuild chicken houses destroyed by disasters. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 3994, to express the sense of the Senate regarding preference for assistance for victims of domestic violence. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 3995, to allocate appropriated funds for early detection and treatment concerning childhood lead poisoning at sites participating in the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Hatch) Amendment No. 3996, to increase funding for the Office of Generic Drugs in order to accelerate the review of generic drug applications. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Harkin) Amendment No. 3997, to provide funds for the cleanup of methamphetamine labs by State and local law enforcement. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Landrieu) Amendment No. 3998, to provide that the Chief Financial Officer shall actively market cross-servicing activities of the National Finance Center. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Nickles) Amendment No. 3999, to fund biomass-based energy research. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Campbell) Amendment No. 4000, to provide fiscal year 2000 supplemental contingent emergency funding to the Department of the Treasury for the Customs Service Automated Commercial System. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 4001, to fully fund the Food and Drug Administration's food safety initiative activities. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Nickles) Amendment No. 4002, of a clarifying nature. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (Feingold/Jeffords) Amendment No. 4003, to prohibit products that contain dry ultra-filtered milk products or casein from being labeled as domestic natural cheese. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Sessions) Amendment No. 4004, to increase and limit certain funding. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Boxer) Amendment No. 4005, to provide that none of the funds appropriated by this Act to the U.S. Department of Agriculture may be used to implement or administer the final rule issued in Docket number 97-110, at 65 Federal Register 37608-37669 until such time as USDA completes an independent peer review of the rule and the risk assessment underlying the rule. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Leahy) Amendment No. 4006, to require that any award entered into under the dairy export incentive program that is canceled or voided is made available for reassignment under the program. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Campbell) Amendment No. 4007, to require the use of a certain amount of appropriated funds to carry out the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations. **Pages S7365-70**

Cochran (for Warner) Amendment No. 4008, to increase and limit certain funding. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Wellstone) Amendment No. 4009, to set aside funding for the distance learning and telemedicine program to promote employment of rural residents through teleworking. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Johnson) Amendment No. 4010, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants for State mediation programs dealing with agricultural issues. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Harkin) Amendment No. 4011, to provide increased funding for the Extension farm safety program, including funding at a level of \$3,055,000 for the AgrAbility project. **Pages S7365-70**

Kohl (for Daschle) Amendment No. 4012, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide equitable relief to an owner or operator that has entered into and violated a contract under the environmental conservation acreage reserve program if the owner or operator took actions in good faith reliance on the

action or advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary. **Pages S7365–70**

Kohl (for Feingold) Amendment No. 4013, to require the publication of data collected on imported herbs. **Pages S7365–70**

Kohl (for Robb) Amendment No. 4014, to adjust the limitation to carry out research related to tobacco. **Pages S7365–70**

Rejected:

McCain Amendment No. 3917, to prohibit the use of appropriated funds for the sugar program. (By 65 yeas to 32 nays (Vote No. 219), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7314–25, S7328–29**

Wellstone Amendment No. 3922, to provide increased funding for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration for investigations of anticompetitive behavior, rapid response teams, the Hog Contract Library, examinations of the competitive structure of the poultry industry, civil rights activities, and information staff, with an offset. (By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 220), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7325, S7329**

By 48 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 221), Reid (for Harkin) Amendment No. 3938, to prohibit the use of appropriated funds to label, mark, stamp, or tag as “inspected and passed” meat, meat products, poultry, or poultry products that do not meet microbiological performance standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture. (By 49 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 218), Senate earlier failed to table the amendment.) **Pages S7303–08, S7310–14, S7331–34**

Withdrawn:

Cochran Modified Amendment No. 3955 (to Amendment No. 3938), to modify amendment relating to the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2001. **Pages S7303–08, S7310–14, S7331–34**

Dorgan Amendment No. 3963, to make emergency financial assistance available to producers on a farm that have incurred losses in a 2000 crop due to a disaster and to producers of specialty crops that incurred losses during the 1999 crop year due to a disaster. **Pages S7342–43**

Domenici point of order against Cochran (for Harkin) Amendment No. 3964 that the Amendment violates section 205(c) of H. Con. Res. 290, Congressional Budget Resolution, with respect to all emergency designations. **Page S7348**

Cochran motion to waive the point of order (listed above) pursuant to Section 205(c) of H. Con. Res. 290, Congressional Budget Resolution, with respect to all emergency designations in this bill and to all the amendments to the bill filed at this time. **Page S7348**

Gramm Amendment No. 3977 (to Cochran motion to waive), to waive section 205 of the budget resolution for consideration of the Cochran (for Harkin) Amendment No. 3964. **Page S7348**

Cochran Amendment No. 3978 (to Amendment No. 3977), to waive Section 205(c) of H. Con. Res. 290, Congressional Budget Resolution, with respect to all emergency designations in this bill and all amendments filed at the desk at this time to this bill other than Amendment No. 3918. **Page S7348**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

By 36 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 224), Senate failed to uphold the question of germaneness with respect to Durbin Amendment No. 3980, to clarify the effect of the provision prohibiting amendment of part 3809 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations. Subsequently, the Senate determined the amendment to be non-germane, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S7358–61**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached to provide that it not be in order in the Senate, for the remainder of the 106th Congress, to consider any bill, or amendment that raises the level of emergency spending for agriculture above the level contained in this bill as of the adoption of the above described amendments (Amendment Nos. 3457, 3933, and 3964 through 3976). **Page S7356**

Senate insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair was authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Cochran, Specter, Bond, Gorton, McConnell, Burns, Stevens, Kohl, Harkin, Dorgan, Feinstein, Durbin, and Byrd. **Page S7379**

**Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act Conference Report:** Senate began consideration of the conference report on H.R. 4810, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001. **Pages S7379–82**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the conference report on Friday, July 21, 2000. **Page S7379**

**Nominations—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of the nominations of Johnnie B. Rawlinson, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Dennis M. Cavanaugh, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, James S. Moody, Jr., Gregory A. Presnell, and John E. Steele, each to be a United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, on Friday, June 21, 2000. **Page S7379**

**Messages From the President:** Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs. (PM-121) **Page S7387**

**Nominations Confirmed:** Senate Confirmed the following nominations:

Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Commerce. **Page S7349**

**Nominations Received:** Senate received the following nominations:

Andrew Fois, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Miguel D. Lausell, of Puerto Rico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2000.

Miguel D. Lausell, of Puerto Rico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2003. (Reappointment)

7 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine list in the Air Force. **Page S7349**

**Messages From the President:** **Page S7388**

**Messages From the House:** **Page S7388**

**Measures Referred:** **Page S7388**

**Communications:** **Pages S7388-92**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** **Pages S7392-93**

**Statements on Introduced Bills:** **Pages S7393-99**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Page S7399-S7400**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Pages S7400-08**

**Notices of Hearings:** **Page S7408**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S7485-88**

**Privileges of the Floor:** **Page S7408**

**Record Votes:** Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—225)

**Pages S7307, S7328-29, S7334, S7337, S7342, S7361, S7379**

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 9:45 a.m., and adjourned at 10:24 p.m., until 9:00 a.m. Friday, July 21, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7349.)

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

### APPROPRIATIONS—TREASURY/POSTAL SERVICE

*Committee on Appropriations:* Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill (S. 2900) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001.

### ENERGY AND AGRICULTURE

*Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:* Committee concluded hearings to examine current energy policy and its implications on American energy security and environmental interests, including the role of energy in U.S. agriculture and the effects of this year's increases in energy prices on agriculture as both a user and a producer of energy, after receiving testimony from former Senator Johnston; Bill Richardson, Secretary of Energy; James Schlesinger, former Secretary of Defense and former Secretary of Energy; Keith Collins, Chief Economist, Department of Agriculture; Harry S. Baumes, WEFA Inc., Eddystone, Pennsylvania; Eric Vaughn, Renewable Fuels Association, and R. Skip Horvath, Natural Gas Supply Association, both of Washington, D.C.; James McCarthy, CITGO Petroleum Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma; and Don Hutchens, Nebraska Corn Board, Lincoln.

### IRAQ

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee held closed hearings to examine the situation in Iraq and United States military operations in and around Iraq, receiving testimony from Vice Adm. Scott A. Fry, USN, Director, Operations Directorate (J-3), and Rear Adm. Lowell E. Jacoby, USN, Director, Intelligence Directorate (J-2), both of the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Bruce Pease, Director, Office of Near Eastern, South Asian and African Analysis, Directorate of Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency.

Committee recessed subject to call.

### MONETARY POLICY

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee concluded hearings to examine the conduct of monetary policy and economic outlook by the Federal Reserve, after receiving testimony from

Alan Greenspan, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

#### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Commerce, Francisco J. Sanchez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, Debbie D. Branson, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Aviation Management Advisory Council, Department of Transportation, and Katherine Milner Anderson, of Virginia, Frank Henry Cruz, of California, Kenneth Y. Tomlinson, of Virginia, and Ernest J. Wilson III, of Maryland, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and a United States Coast Guard promotion list received in the Senate on July 18, 2000.

#### INTERNET AIRLINE TICKET SALES

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee concluded hearings to examine the Internet's role in the marketing of airline services, including whether or not it benefits consumers in purchasing airline tickets through the Internet, after receiving testimony from A. Bradley Mims, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, and Kenneth M. Mead, Inspector General, both of the Department of Transportation; Terrell B. Jones, Travelocity.com, Dallas, Texas; Jeffrey G. Katz, Orbitz, Chicago, Illinois; Mark Silbergeld, Consumers Union, Washington, D.C.; and Paul M. Ruden, American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., Alexandria, Virginia.

#### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Committee continued markup of H.R. 701, to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

#### TREATIES

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded hearings on Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles, with Annexes, done at Caracas December 1, 1996, (the "Convention"), which was signed by the United States, subject to ratification, on December 13, 1996 (Treaty Doc. 105-48); International Plant Protection

Convention (IPPC), adopted at the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations at Rome on November 17, 1997 (Treaty Doc. 106-23); Food Aid Convention 1999, which was opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, from May 1 through June 30, 1999. Convention was signed by the United States June 16, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106-14); Convention (No. 176) Concerning Safety and Health in Mines, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 82nd Session in Geneva on June 22, 1995 (Treaty Doc. 106-08); and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, with Annexes, adopted at Paris, June 17, 1994, and signed by the United States on October 14, 1994 (Treaty Doc. 104-29), after receiving testimony from David B. Sandalow, Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, and E. Anthony Wayne, Assistant Secretary for Economic and Business Affairs, both of the Department of State.

#### NOMINATION

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded hearings on Everett L. Mosley, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Agency for International Development, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

#### AFGHANISTAN AND THE TALIBAN

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs concluded hearings on issues relating to United States policy towards the government of Afghanistan and the militia that rules Afghanistan, known as the Taliban, after receiving testimony from Karl F. Inderfurth, Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs; Peter Tomsen, University of Nebraska, Omaha, former Ambassador and Special Envoy to the Afghan Resistance; Zieba Shorish-Shamley, Women's Alliance for Peace and Human Rights in Afghanistan, Washington, D.C.; and Hamid Karzai, Glenwood, Maryland.

#### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2812, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities;

S. Con. Res. 53, condemning all prejudice against individuals of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry in the United States and supporting political and civic participation by such individuals throughout the



United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2516, to fund task forces to locate and apprehend fugitives in Federal, State, and local felony criminal cases and give administrative subpoena authority to the United States Marshals Service, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 133, supporting religious tolerance toward Muslims;

S.J. Res. 48, calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act; and

The nominations of Johnnie B. Rawlinson, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Dennis M. Cavanaugh, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, James S. Moody, Jr., Gregory A. Presnell, and John E. Steele, each to be a United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Glenn A. Fine, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Daniel Marcus, of Maryland, to be Associate Attorney General, and David W. Ogden, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, all of the Department of Justice.

#### GENETIC INFORMATION IN THE WORKPLACE

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* Committee concluded hearings to examine issues relating to the development of federal policy governing the treatment of an individual's genetic information in the workplace in light of the recent Human Genome Project breakthroughs, after receiving testimony from Senator Daschle; Francis S. Collins, Director, National Human Genome Research Institute, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; Paul S. Miller, Commissioner, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; Susan R. Meisinger, Society for Human Resource Management, Alexandria, Virginia; and Harold P. Coxson, Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak, and Stewart, and Susannah Baruch, National Partnership for Women and Families, both of Washington, D.C.

#### SBA PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

*Committee on Small Business:* Committee held hearings on the General Accounting Office's performance and accountability review of the Small Business Administration, receiving testimony from David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, Stanley J. Czerwinski, Associate Director, Housing and Community Development Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, Joel C. Willemssen, Director, Civil Agencies Information Systems, Accounting and Information Management Division, and Michael Brostek, Associate Director,

Federal Management and Workforce Issues, General Government Division, all of the General Accounting Office; and Aida Alvarez, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

#### VA CLAIMS PROCESSING/VA BENEFITS/ CONSTRUCTION

*Committee on Veterans Affairs:* Committee concluded hearings to examine the Department of Veterans Affairs disability claims process, and a status report on the adjudication of these claims and efforts the Department has made to improve claims processing, and S. 1806, to authorize the payment of a gratuity to certain members of the Armed Forces who served at Bataan and Corregidor during World War II, or the surviving spouses of such members, S. 1810, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures, S. 2264, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish within the Veterans Health Administration the position of Advisor on Physician Assistants, S. 2544, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, S. 2637, to require a land conveyance, Miles City Veterans Administration Medical Complex, Miles City, Montana, S. 2827, to provide for the conveyance of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center at Ft. Lyon, Colorado, to the State of Colorado, proposed legislation providing for VA cost of living assistance, proposed Women Veterans' Equity Act, proposed Veterans Programs Enhancement Act, and proposed legislation authorizing the construction of certain VA facilities, after receiving testimony from Joseph Thompson, Under Secretary of Veteran Affairs for Benefits; Philip R. Wilkerson, American Legion, and Dennis Cullinan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, both of Washington, D.C.; James O'Brien, Tequesta, Florida; William R. Baker, Cincinnati, Ohio; William Kennedy, Tallahassee, Florida; and Clarence DeVaughn Moore, Hurricane, West Virginia.

#### NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PRESERVATION

*Committee on Indian Affairs:* Committee concluded hearings on S. 2688, to amend the Native American Languages Act to provide for the establishment of Native American Language Survival Schools, after receiving testimony from Michael Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education; Teresa L. McCarty, University of Arizona, Tucson, on behalf of the American Indian Language

Development Institute; Michael E. Krauss, University of Alaska, Alaska Native Language Center, Fairbanks; William G. Demmert, Jr., Western Washington University, Bellingham; Darrell R. Kipp, Piegan Institute, Browning, Montana; Genevieve Jackson, Navajo Nation, Window Rock, Arizona; Matthew Dick, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Nespelem, Washington; Rosita Worl, University of Alaska Southeast, Juneau, on behalf of the Sealaska Heritage Foundation and Alaska Federation of Natives; A. Brian Wallace, Washoe Tribe of

Nevada and California, Gardnerville, Nevada; and Kalena Silva and William H. Wilson, both of the University of Hawaii Ke'elikolani College of Hawaiian Language, and Namaka Rawlins, 'Aha Punana Leo, Inc., all of Hilo.

#### INTELLIGENCE

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to call.

## House of Representatives

### Chamber Action

**Bills Introduced:** 20 public bills, H.R. 4898–4917; 1 private bill, H.R. 4918; and 2 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 378 and H. Res. 561, were introduced.

Pages H6717–18, H6719

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows.

H.R. 4110, to amend title 44, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 (H. Rept. 106–768);

H.R. 4700, to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact (H. Rept. 106–769);

H.J. Res. 72, granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact, amended (H. Rept. 106–770);

H.R. 4419, to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for Internet gambling, amended, (H. Rept. 106–771, Pt. 1);

H.R. 4744, to require the General Accounting Office to report to Congress on economically significant rules of Federal agencies (H. Rept. 106–772).

H.R. 4585, to strengthen consumers' control over the use and disclosure of their health information by financial institutions, amended (H. Rept. 106–773, Pt. 1);

H.R. 1954, to regulate motor vehicle insurance activities to protect against retroactive regulatory and legal action and to create fairness in ultimate insurer laws and vicarious liability standards, amended, referred sequentially Committee on the Judiciary (H. Rept. 106–774, Pt. 1); and

H.R. 2580, to encourage the creation, development, and enhancement of State response programs for contaminated sites, removing existing Federal barriers to the cleanup of brownfield sites, and cleaning up and returning contaminated sites to economi-

cally productive or other beneficial uses, amended (H. Rept. 106–775, Pt. 1). **Page H6717**

**Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act:** The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 4810, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 by a yeas and nays vote of 271 yeas to 156 nays, Roll No. 418.

Pages H6609–18

H. Res. 559, the rule that waived points of order against the conference report was agreed to by yeas and nays vote of 279 yeas to 140 nays, roll No. 417.

Pages H6606–09

**Recess:** The House recessed at 12:54 p.m. and reconvened at 1:39 p.m. **Page H6618**

**Treasury, Postal Appropriations:** The House passed H.R. 4871, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 by a yeas and nays vote of 216 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 428. **Pages H6622–H6710**

Agreed to Kolbe unanimous consent request to insert language in the enacting clause. **Pages H6622–31**

Agreed To:

Vitter amendment that increases funding for high intensity drug trafficking areas program by \$25 million and decreases IRS administrative funding accordingly (agreed to by a recorded vote of 284 yeas to 134 nays, Roll No. 421); **Pages H6642–45**

Klink amendment that increases funding for the Customs Service by \$950,000 to purchase equipment to monitor the radioactivity of scrap metal imported into the United States and decreases Treasury Inspector General funding accordingly; **Pages H6645–52**

Inslee amendment that requires that all of the Inspector Generals funded under the act report to Congress on any activity taken to monitor individuals who access any Internet site of their agencies;

**Pages H7764–70**

Gilman amendment that requires that all existing and newly hired workers in any child care center located in an executive facility undergo a criminal history background check;

**Pages H6670–71**

Deutsch amendment No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record that prohibits any funding to be used to allow the importation of any product that is grown, produced, or manufactured in Iran;

**Pages H6671–72**

Davis of Virginia amendment that prohibits any funding to be used to implement the amendments to the Federal Acquisition Regulation contained in the proposed rule published by the Federal Acquisition Regulatory council relating to responsibility considerations of Federal contractors and the allowability of certain contractor costs (agreed to by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 423);

**Pages H6672–84**

Frelinghuysen amendment No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record that prohibits any funding to be used to collect information on individuals using a Federal Internet site;

**Pages H6684–85**

Morella amendment No. 12 printed in the Congressional Record that makes the pay of Administrative Appeals Judges comparable to the pay of Administrative Law Judges;

**Page H6688**

Traficant amendment that prohibits any funding to be used in contravention of the “Buy American Act;”

**Pages H6688–89**

Sanders amendment No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record that prohibits the IRS from taking any action in contravention of current age discrimination statutes;

**Pages H6689–92**

Sanford amendment No. 14 printed in the Congressional Record that removes travel restrictions to Cuba (agreed to a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 425);

**Pages H6694–98**

Maloney of New York amendment No. 9 printed in the Congressional Record that requires a study by OPM on the feasibility of providing paid parental leave to Federal employees; and

**Pages H6698–99**

Moran of Kansas amendment that prohibits funding to be used to implement sanctions on the sales of agricultural commodities, medicine, or medicinal supplies to Cuba (agreed to by a recorded vote of 301 ayes to 116 noes with 2 voting “present”, Roll No. 426).

**Pages H6699–H6703**

Rejected:

DeLauro amendment that sought to strike section 509 which prohibits any funding to pay for an abor-

tion (rejected by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 422);

**Pages H6658–63**

Rangel amendment that sought to prohibit any funding to be used by the Treasury Department to enforce the economic embargo of Cuba (rejected by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 424); and

**Pages H6685–88**

Hostettler amendment No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to prohibit any funding to be used to enforce, implement, or administer the provisions of the settlement document between Smith & Wesson and the Department of the Treasury (rejected by a recorded vote of 204 ayes to 214 noes, Roll No. 427).

**Pages H6703–05**

Withdrawn:

Kucinich amendment No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record was offered and withdrawn that sought to require a report by the IMF and World Bank on agreements with debtor countries which require privatization, lower barriers to imports, raise bank interest rates, eliminate regulations on the environment, and reform labor laws;

**Pages H6635–42**

Quinn amendment No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record was offered and withdrawn that sought to make available \$3.6 million for site acquisition and design of a courthouse in Buffalo, New York;

**Pages H6652–53**

Wynn amendment was offered and withdrawn that sought to make available \$101 million for the design and construction of the FDA Center for Drug Evaluation and Research at the White Oak Naval Surface Weapons Center site in Montgomery County, Maryland;

**Pages H6653–54**

Coburn amendment was offered and withdrawn that sought to strike section 640 which repeals a .5% increase that Federal employees made to their retirement system as a part of the Balanced Budget Act;

**Pages H6692–93**

Nadler amendment No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record was offered and withdrawn that sought to repeal section 9101 of the Balanced Budget Act which directed the sale of Governor’s Island, New York for \$500 million; and

**Pages H6693–94**

Sanford amendment No. 15 printed in the Congressional Record was offered and withdrawn that sought to limit the number of individuals employed in the Executive Office of the President who travel on presidential trips.

Points of order sustained against:

Section 517, dealing with the import of diamonds into the United States.

**Pages H6656–58**

H. Res. 560, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to by a recorded vote of 282 ayes to 141 noes, Roll No. 420. Agreed to

order the previous question by a yea and nay vote of 250 yeas to 173 nays, Roll No. 419.

**Pages H6618–22**

**Legislative Program:** Representative Dreier announced the Legislative Program for the week of July 24.

**Pages H6710–11**

**Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference:** The House disagreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 4516, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Chairman Young of Florida, Representatives Taylor of North Carolina, Wamp, Lewis of California, Granger, Peterson of Pennsylvania, Obey, Pastor, Murtha, and Hoyer.

**Page H6711**

Agreed to the Pastor motion to instruct conferees to insist on the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to providing \$384,867,000 for the General Accounting Office.

**Page H6711**

**Calendar Wednesday:** Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, July 26.

**Page H6711**

**Meeting Hour—Monday, July 17:** Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 on Monday, July 24 for morning-hour debates.

**Page H6712**

**Presidential Message—District of Columbia Budget Request:** Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted the District of Columbia's Fiscal year 2001 Budget Request Act—referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 106–271).

**Pages H6711–12**

**Senate Messages:** Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H6603.

**Referrals:** S. 2102 was referred to the Committee on Resources, S. 2712 was referred to the Committee on Government Reform, S. Con. Res. 57, S. Con. Res. 113, S. Con. Res. 122, and S. Con. Res. 126 were referred to the Committee on International Relations.

**Page H6712**

**Amendments:** Amendments ordered pursuant to the rule appear on page H6720.

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Four yea and nay votes and eight recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H6608–09, H6617–18, H6620–21, H6621, H6705, H6706, H6706–07, H6707–08, H6708, H6708–09, H6709, and H6710. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Ordered reported the District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal year 2001.

### HOUSING FINANCE REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT

*Committee on Banking and Financial Services,* Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises concluded hearings on Improving Regulation of Housing Government Sponsored Enterprises, focusing on H.R. 3703, Housing Finance Regulatory Improvement Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### PENTAGON FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

*Committee on the Budget:* Task Force on Defense and International Relations held hearing on Pentagon Financial Management, What's Broken, How to Fix It. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: William J. Lynn, III, Under Secretary, Comptroller and Chief Financial Officer; and Robert Lieberman, Assistant Inspector General; and Jeffrey C. Steinhoff, Acting Assistant Comptroller General, GAO.

### COMMODITY FUTURES MODERNIZATION ACT

*Committee on Commerce:* Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 4541, Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000.

### IMPROVING INSURANCE FOR CONSUMERS

*Committee on Commerce:* Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Material held a hearing on Improving Insurance for Consumers—Increasing Uniformity and Efficiency in Insurance Regulation. Testimony was heard from Julie L. Williams, First Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury; George Nichols, Commissioner, Department of Insurance, State of Kentucky; and Neil Breslin, member, Senate, State of New York.

### INDEPENDENT TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONSUMER ENHANCEMENT ACT

*Committee on Commerce:* Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing on H.R. 3850, Independent Telecommunications Consumer Enhancement Act of

2000. Testimony was heard from Carol Matthey, Deputy Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, FCC; and public witnesses.

#### **OSHA'S RECORDKEEPING STANDARD**

*Committee on Education and the Workforce:* Subcommittee on Workforce Protections hearing on OSHA's Recordkeeping Standard: Stakeholder: Views of the 1996 Proposal. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

#### **"HAS THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GIVEN PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT TO THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT?"**

*Committee on Government Reform:* Held a hearing on "Has the Department of Justice Given Preferential Treatment to the President and Vice President?" Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Justice: James Robinson, Assistant Attorney General and Alan Gershel, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, both with the Criminal Division; Robert Raben, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs; and Robert Conrad, Supervision Attorney, Campaign Finance Task Force.

#### **AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY**

*Committee on Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Census held a hearing on "The American Community Survey (A.C.S.)—A Replacement for the Census Long Form?" Testimony was heard from Representatives Collins and Emerson; Kenneth Prewitt, Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; John Spotila, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB; and public witnesses.

#### **GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT**

*Committee on Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing on "Seven Years of GPRA: Has the Results Act Provided Results?" Testimony was heard from Representatives Armey and Sessions; Joshua Gotbaum, Executive Associate Director and Controller and Acting Deputy Director, Management, OMB; and Christopher Mihm, Associate Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

#### **FEDERAL PROPERTY CAMPAIGN FUNDRAISING REFORM ACT**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Held a hearing on H.R. 4845, Federal Property Campaign Fundraising Reform Act of 2000. Testimony was heard from John C. Keeney, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

#### **BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION ACT**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on H.R. 4292, Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2000. Testimony was heard from Representative Jones; Kenneth Thomas, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

#### **PATENT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action H.R. 4870, Patent Technical Corrections Act of 1999.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Crime approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 3484, Child Sex Crimes Wiretapping Act of 1999; H.R. 4827, Enhanced Federal Security Act of 2000; and H.R. 3235, amended, National Police Athletic League Youth Enrichment Act of 1999.

#### **BATTERED IMMIGRANT WOMEN PROTECTION ACT**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims held a hearing on H.R. 3083, Battered Immigrant Women Protection Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Representative Schakowsky; Barbara Strack, Acting Executive Associate Commissioner, Policy and Planning, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

#### **POWDER RIVER BASIN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT ACT**

*Committee on Resources:* Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 4297, Powder River Basin Resource Development Act of 2000. Testimony was heard from Senator Enzi; Pete Culp, Assistant Director, Minerals, Realty and Resource Protection, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; HUNTING HERITAGE PROTECTION ACT.**

*Committee on Resources:* Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 2798, amended, Pacific Salmon Recovery Act of 1999; H.R. 3118, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act that authorize States to establish hunting seasons for double-crested cormorants; H.R. 4318, amended, Red River National Wildlife Refuge Act; and H.R. 4840, amended, Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Act.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on H.R. 4790, Hunting Heritage Protection Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Chambliss, Peterson of Minnesota and Pickering; Henri Bisson, Assistant Director, Renewable Resources and Planning, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

#### OVERSIGHT—ACCESS TO OUR NATIONAL PARKS

*Committee on Resources:* Subcommittee on National Parks, and Public Lands held an oversight hearing on general issues dealing with Access to our National Parks. Testimony was heard from Denis Galvin, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

#### DRY CLEANING ENVIRONMENTAL TAX CREDIT ACT

*Committee on Small Business:* Subcommittee on Tax, Finance and Imports held a hearing on H.R. 1303, Dry Cleaning Environmental Tax Credit Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Representatives Camp and Price of North Carolina; and public witnesses.

#### PORTABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICES—AIRCRAFT SAFETY HAZARD

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on Portable Electronic Devices: Do they really pose a safety hazard on aircraft? Testimony was heard from Thomas McSweeney, Associate Administrator, Regulation and Certification, FAA Department of Transportation; Dale N. Hatfield, Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, FCC; and public witnesses.

#### HAZARD MITIGATION SPENDING—COST EFFECTIVENESS

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Emergency Management held a hearing on Cost Effectiveness of Hazard Mitigation Spending. Testimony was heard from Michael Armstrong, Associate Director, Mitigation Directorate, FEMA.

#### VETERANS LEGISLATION

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs:* Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 4850, Veterans Benefits Act of 2000; H.R. 4864, amended, Veterans Claims Assistance Act of 2000; and H.R. 1982, to name the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic located at 125 Brookley Drive, Rome, New York as the "Donald J. Mitchell Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic."

#### FEDERAL CHILD PROTECTION FUNDS

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on Increasing State

Flexibility in Use of Federal Child Protection Funds. Testimony was heard from Cynthia M. Fagnoni, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, Health, Education and Human Services Division, GAO; Kathleen A. Kearney, Secretary, Department of Children and Families, State of Florida; Robert Wentworth, Director, Residential Services, Department of Social Services, State of Massachusetts; and public witnesses.

#### PRIVACY AND IDENTITY PROTECTION ACT

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Subcommittee on Social Security approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 4857, Privacy and Identity Protection Act of 2000.

### Joint Meetings

#### MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT

*Conferees,* on Wednesday, July 19, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 4810, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

---

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 21, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

##### Senate

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* to hold hearings on the nomination of Robert S. LaRussa, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade; and Marjory E. Searing, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, 10 a.m., SD-538.

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* business meeting to continue markup of H.R.701, to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, 9 a.m., SD-366.

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD-430.

##### House

*Committee on the Judiciary,* Subcommittee on the Constitution, to mark up H.R. 4292, Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

9 a.m., Friday, July 21

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Friday:** Senate will continue consideration of the Conference Report on H.R. 4810, Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act. Also, Senate may begin consideration of H.R. 4733, Energy and Water Development Appropriations.

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

12:30 p.m., Monday, July 24

## House Chamber

**Program for Monday:** To be announced.



# Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at [www.gdsys.gov](http://www.gdsys.gov), free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, [contactcenter@gpo.gov](mailto:contactcenter@gpo.gov). ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov). Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.