(1) the achievements of Angela Raish and her more than 21 years of service to the Senate and Senator Domenici be honored and celebrated;

(2) the love and affection that Angela's friends and colleagues share for her be recognized; and

(3) Angela's pride in work and home be recognized as the standard to which all should aspire.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we have just adopted a resolution paying our respects, without any doubt in my mind, to one of the most wonderful women who has worked in the Senate, Angela Raish. She has worked in my office for 21 years. Many hundreds of people in the Senate and many thousands out in my State and around the Nation know her as one of the best women who has ever served in this institution. She served this Senator well, but in doing that, she also has helped literally hundreds of people who none of us are even aware of. We are going to pay tribute to her later in the week with an event here in the Senate, and there will be a lot of people who will come to say thank you to Angela.

I wanted to take with us to that event this resolution where the Senate recognized her 21-year effort. The resolution accurately depicts much about her life and what she has accomplished, the many outstanding jobs she has held, and obviously the longest tenure in my office working for the Senate. I thank the Senate for passing this resolution.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 513, S. Res. 193.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 193) designating September 13, 1998, as ''National Children's Memorial Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD at the appropriate place as if read.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) with its preamble reads as follows:

S. RES. 193

Whereas approximately 79,000 infants, children, teenagers, and young adults die each year in the United States;

Whereas the death of a child is one of the greatest tragedies suffered by a family; and

Whereas support and understanding are critical to the healing process of a bereaved family; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates December 13, 1998, as ''National Children's Memorial Day''; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation designating December 13, 1998, as ''National Children's Memorial Day'' and calls on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in remembrance of infants, children, teenagers, and young adults who have died.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senate. I yield the floor. 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. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate Calendar No. 440, S. 2237, the fiscal year 1999 Interior appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2237) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent that Bruce Evans, Ginny James, Anne McInerney, Leif Fonnesbeck, Kevin Johnson, Kurt Dodd, and Carole Geagley of the Appropriations Committee staff; Chuck Berwick and Kari Vander Stoep of my personal staff; and Hank Kashdan, Mary Ellen Mueller, and Craig Leff, detailees with the Appropriations Committee, be granted privileges of the floor during consideration of S. 2237.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to bring before the Senate the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999. The bill provides $13.4 billion in discretionary budget authority for agencies and programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction, an increase of $265 million above the FY 98 freeze level, but $660 million less than the President's budget request.

As always, putting this bill together has been a great challenge. The subcommittee received more than 2,000 individual requests from Senators regarding particular projects or programs, the majority of which were requests for additions to the President's budget request, which I have already mentioned is well in excess of the amounts available to the Subcommittee. While Senator STEVENS has been as generous with the Interior Subcommittee as I could reasonably expect him to be given the constraints of the discretionary spending caps, the subcommittee's allocation is such that the FY 1999 bill in large part continues programs at or near the current year level. There are significant, but modest, increases for a handful of high priority programs, but for the most part there are few surprises or dramatic new funding initiatives.

As Members consider whether particular programs in this bill have been treated fairly within the constraints of the subcommittee's allocation, I hope they will consider two factors. First, for the first time since Fiscal Year 1995, this bill does not mandate a sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to pay for the costs of operating the reserve. An oil sale at current price levels would be unwise to say the least. But the fact that this bill does not include an oil sale means that the Subcommittee had to find $155 million for operation of the Reserve that was not included in last year's base. As a consequence, the increase in the Subcommittee's allocation is effectively only $110 million above the freeze level.

The second factor of which I want my colleagues to be aware when evaluating this bill is the impact of increases in Federal pay, benefits and other fixed costs. The Interior bill as a whole is one of the most personnel-intensive of the appropriations bills, supporting tens of thousands of park rangers, foresters, Indian health professionals and other Federal workers. Each year the agencies funded in this bill must accommodate increases in pay and benefits for these workers, and similar cost increases over which the Subcommittee has no direct control. In FY 1999, these ''uncontrollable costs'' will amount to more than $200 million.

Lest any of my colleagues feel these costs are attributable to a bloated bureaucracy, I note that Department of the Interior staffing in Washington, D.C. is 17% below its 1993 base—despite a significant expansion since that time in the number of parks, refuges, and other Interior programs, most of which have been authorized by Congress. This 17% reduction is the second greatest among all civilian cabinet agencies. While the Subcommittee continues to seek efficiencies and to terminate wasteful programs, yearly increases in pay and related costs for core Federal employees continue to consume most or all of any increases that the Subcommittee may receive in its allocation.

Having noted two of the major factors impacting funding levels in this year's bill, I want to highlight some priority programs where we were able to provide modest—but significant—increases. The bill includes a $55 million increase for operation of the national park system, including increases over the current year level of $18 million for park maintenance, $15 million for special need parks, and $10 million for an

across-the-board increase in park operations. These increases will benefit all parks, but particularly those units with severe operational shortfalls and critical deficiencies in maintenance funding. The bill also provides a $10.6 million increase in refuge operations and maintenance, which follows a $41 million increase provided in last year's bill.

For the Forest Service, this bill places a heavy emphasis on improving accountability within the agency. A number of General Accounting Office reports and various Congressional hearings have clearly demonstrated that the Forest Service lacks the fundamental ability to account for its expenditures, and has shown a growing level of overhead and indirect expenses that corresponds with a decline in on-the-ground accomplishment. I am disturbed by these problems, but at the same time am wary of overreacting by mandating controls that may be counterproductive. I do see indications that the agency is determined to address its accountability problem.

With these considerations in mind, I have included language in the bill to require increased accountability by eliminating the general administration line item, and requiring the Forest Service to display clearly the source of funds that go to overhead and other indirect expenses. We have also consolidated three budget line items, where maintenance functions are performed along with other work, into two distinct line items where only maintenance, reconstruction and construction activities occur. I hope that actions such as this, along with commitment from top Forest Service officials, will help the agency to institute proper management controls and clean up its accountability mess.

The other major Forest Service initiative in this bill deals with the amount of timber the Forest Service will be expected to offer for sale. In 1990, the Forest Service offered for sale approximately 11 billion board feet of timber. In fiscal year 1999, the Administration proposes to offer only 3.4 billion board feet. That's a 69% reduction. Many of my colleagues know first hand the devastating effect that this reduced timber program has had on timber dependent communities. With timber growth rates far in excess of 10 billion board feet per year, it is unconscionable that the administration proposes a timber offer level of less than one-third of that amount. Accordingly, the Committee has provided additional funding, and expects the Forest Service to sell approximately 3.6 billion board feet of timber in fiscal year 1999. This amount is 200 million board feet more than proposed by the administration, but about 200 million board feet less than the fiscal year 1998 level. I also want to note that this 3.6 billion board feet figure is a correction of the 3.784 billion board feet figure incorrectly included in the Committee report.

The bill also includes $10 million for the administration's Millennium initiative for historic preservation projects of national importance. Due to the constraints of the Subcommittee's allocation and a general aversion to beginning new programs, I had not intended to provide funds for the Millennium program. But I found the Millennium program's primary advocate —the First Lady—to be very persuasive when she called me at the urging of Senator BUMPERS. I look forward to working with her to define better how these funds might be used. To balance the increase provided for historic preservation projects on a national level, the bill also includes a 20 percent $6 million increase for the existing grants-to-States program in the Historic Preservation Fund account.

The bill also includes funds for a number of specific historic preservation projects, including $3 million for the Smithsonian Institution for rehabilitation of the Star Spangled Banner. This appropriation will complement non-federal funds that have been pledged for this project by the Pew Charitable Trusts, and most recently by Ralph Lauren. The bill also provides funds to continue construction of the National Museum of the American Indian on the Mall, and to continue renovation of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

For the agency that receives perhaps more attention than any other in this bill—the National Endowment for the Arts—the bill provides just over $100 million. This is precisely the same funding level as was approved by the Senate last year, but a slight increase over the final appropriation. I also note that the bill continues the several reforms that were agreed to during deliberations on the fiscal year 1998 bill, including restrictions on individual grants, subgrants, and seasonal support; limitations on total grants to any one State, and increased emphasis on arts education and programs for under served populations. With the House having voted by a substantial margin to provide level funding for the NEA, the gap to be bridged in conference will be far narrower than it was last year. The National Endowment for the Humanities is funded at $110.7 million in the Senate bill, the same as the fiscal year 1998 level.

For the Indian Programs that comprise approximately 30 percent of the Interior bill, the biggest challenge for the Committee was to attempt to fill the gaping hole left by the administration's budget request for the Indian Health Service. Facing the challenges of a deteriorating infrastructure, increasing service population growth, and a relatively high rate of inflation in the medical services sector, the Indian Health Service was nevertheless the only major Interior bill agency that did not share in the bounty of the administration's inflated budget request.

The Committee has provided a $53 million increase for the Indian Health Service, $34 million more than the budget request. This includes more than $16 million to staff newly completed health facilities—an item for which the administration inexplicably did not request funding. The amount provided also includes funds to cover a modest portion of IHS's fixed cost increases, which the administration also did not include in its budget.

To some extent the increase provided for the Indian Health Service comes at the expense of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Although the bill does provide a $15 million increase for the Operation of Indian Programs account, the overall BIA budget is essentially flat. But even if the resources available to the Subcommittee were less constrained, I think it would be imprudent to provide a significant increase for the largest of BIA programs—Tribal Priority Allocations—until we develop a more rational means of allocating TPA funds. As it stands, some $757 million in TPA funds are distributed in a manner that ignores the relative financial health and needs of the recipient Tribes.

Though its history is difficult to trace, the current allocation system seems to have been developed piecemeal over a period of decades through a combination of departmental, tribal and congressional actions. Each of these individual actions may have made perfect sense at the time at which it was taken. But their cumulative effect has been to create a system in which a number of quite wealthy tribes receive far greater per capita TPA allocations than some of the most destitute tribes. While I cannot imagine that such a system would ever be seen as appropriate, it is almost offensive in a time when Federal appropriations are severely constrained by balanced budget requirements, and when a number of tribes are profiting quite handsomely from business ventures such as gaming.

The bill before the Senate attempts to address this inequity by mandating that the BIA identify the top 10 percent of tribes in terms of per capita tribal revenue, and directing the BIA to distribute half of the TPA payments that would have gone to those tribes to the 20 percent of tribes with the lowest per capita tribal revenue. The bill also directs BIA to develop possible formulas for the future distribution of TPA funds, and gives the Bureau authority to collect the information required to develop such formulas.

I recognize, that this is not a perfect solution. Many have expressed concerns about the manner in which funds are proposed for distribution in FY 1999, the extent to which BIA should be authorized to collect financial information from the tribes, and the degree to which tribes themselves should be involved in the reallocation process. But few, if any, have argued that the current distribution system is either just or a wise use of taxpayer dollars. I have had extensive discussions about this issue with the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Mr. Kevin Gover, as

well as with Senator CAMPBELL, Senator INOUYE and other interested colleagues. I am pleased that these discussions have resulted in alternative language that I believe will have widespread support and can be adopted as an amendment to this bill. The new language permits the wealthiest tribes to return voluntarily Tribal Priority Allocations to the BIA for redistribution to the neediest. However, the substitute language does not diminish the Federal Government's trust responsibilities or that tribe's ability to access future appropriations. In addition, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is directed to develop, within Congressionally mandated obligations, a new method for distributing TPA funds by April 1, 1999. Finally, the substitute language excludes from the redistribution plan payments made by the Federal Government in settlement of claims and judgments and income derived from lands, natural resources, or funds held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, in this bill there are a number of other legislative provisions and limitations on the use of funds about which my colleagues may have heard. The administration and its advisors in the environmental community have evidently decided to attack these provisions en masse, arguing that they represent ''stealth'' or ''dark of night'' attacks on the environment by Republicans. This tells me three things. First, the administration is reluctant to argue any one of these issues on its merits. Second, the administration has not been paying attention in any of the dozens of Congressional hearings that have been held on these issues, the vast majority of which included administration witnesses. And third, the administration is either unaware of, or is choosing to ignore, the historic oversight role of the Appropriations Committee under the leadership of both Democrats and Republicans.

There are indeed several legislative provisions and limitations on the use of funds in this year's Interior bill. There are a few more such provisions than were in the Senate version of the bill last year, but fewer than in the final FY 1997 Act. Some of the provisions have been inserted at the request of fellow Republicans. Some, such as the mining patent moratorium and the moratoria on offshore oil and gas development, are included at the request of the administration or my Democratic colleagues. These provisions are inserted in appropriations bills for one of several reasons, Mr. President. Some are included to address critical health and safety issues that require immediate attention. The King Cove road provision falls into this category. Other provisions are included because they are an integral part of the Committee's fiscal oversight role. The provision regarding distribution of TPA funds falls into this category, as does a provision in the bill that provides for the orderly termination of the overpriced and out of control Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project.

But perhaps the single most common reason that legislative provisions and limitations on the use of funds are included in this bill is the overzealous use of regulatory powers by the executive branch without the adequate involvement of Congress or the public. This is the dynamic that has prompted any number of such provisions, from the moratoria on offshore oil and gas development that are included in this bill year after year, to the provision in this year's bill that requires a comprehensive study of regulations governing mining on public lands. If it seems that there are more limitations on the use of funds in this bill than there have been in the past, it is very likely because this administration has made a conscious decision not to engage Congress in a constructive dialogue on a whole array of critically needed reforms to insensitive land management decisions, and has instead decided to press the top-down, Washington, D.C.-knows-best agenda of its extremist environmental allies through the use of Executive orders and over broad regulatory actions that in some cases are downright insulting to me as a member of the legislative branch.

In about every case, these riders have the support of all—or a vast majority of—the members of the House and Senate in the districts and States to which they apply. Generally speaking, Members of both bodies defer to judgment of the Members affected by regional policies and issues. This administration, however, constantly demands the right to override the views of Members immediately affected, and their constituents, with a constant and pervasive ''DC knows best'' attitude. In any debate over these issues, I ask my colleagues to listen with care and sympathy to the Members whose constituents lives are so often arrogantly ignored by unelected bureaucrats.

If the administration or any Member of the Senate wishes to discuss or debate the merits of any individual provision in this bill, I am willing to do so. But I find it ludicrous—if not offensive—for the Administration simply to lump every provision it finds the least bit inconvenient onto one list of so-called ''objectionable riders,'' condemn the use of such provisions as some new and nefarious practice, and to demand that all such provisions be removed under threat of a veto. I fully anticipate some give and take with the administration as this bill moves through conference, but it is not the job of the Senate simply to approve administration requests for funding and trust that it will be spent wisely and in accordance with the intent of Congress. We have plenty of experience to the contrary, both with the current and previous administrations.

Finally, I want to address an issue about which I am asked persistently, and that is the disposition of the $699 million 'special' appropriation for land acquisition included in the FY 1998 bill. My colleagues may recall that $362 million of those funds remain to be allocated to specific projects. That allocation will be made by agreement of the House and Senate committees, and will be transmitted to the administration by letter. I have had several discussions with Chairman Regula about this issue, and hope that we—together with Senator BYRD and Congressman YATES—can agree on an allocation of at least half of these funds in the very near future. I unfortunately cannot now say exactly when this allocation will be finalized, but I am confident that it will be soon, and that we will do our best to balance the priorities of the Senate, the House and the administration.

On a personal level, I want to say one final thank you—for the record—to Sue Masica, who has for years been Senator BYRD's clerk for the Interior Subcommittee. Sue has been a tremendous resource for me and my staff, and I can say with great confidence has also been of assistance at one time or another to just about every Member in this Chamber, whether that Member knew it or not. Sue is now the Associate Director of Administration for the National Park Service, a position in which I know she will excel. I wish her the very best. I also want to recognize Sue's replacement—Kurt Dodd—and welcome him to the Committee staff.

On my personal staff, I thank Chuck Berwick, Kari Vander Stoep, and Todd Young for their many contributions to this bill. I also thank Bruce Evans, Ginny James, Anne McInerney, Hank Kashdan, Leif Fonnesbeck, Kevin Johnson, and our detailee Mary Ellen Mueller for their hard work and long hours spent on this bill. I also thank Carole Geagley and Craig Leff of Senator BYRD's staff, and Steve Cortese, Jim English and Jay Kimmitt of the full committee staff for their many courtesies and willing assistance given to me and my staff.

With that, I look forward to hearing from my friend and colleague, the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies. I speak in support of the fiscal year 1999 interior appropriations bill. This is an important bill which provides for the management of our Nation's natural resources and funds research critical to our energy future. It supports the well-being of our Indian populations and protects the historical and cultural heritage of our country. I hope the Senate will move swiftly through the bill.

It has been my privilege, Mr. President, to serve as the Ranking Member for this bill at the side of our very able Chairman, the senior Senator from Washington. Senator GORTON has done

an outstanding job in crafting the bill and balancing its many competing interests, and crafting the Interior bill is not an easy task. The Interior bill remains one of the most popular appropriation bills, funding a diverse set of very worthy programs and projects. The bill is full of thousands of relatively small, yet very meaningful details. Our Chairman is a master of the complexities of the bill, and it is a pleasure to work on this appropriations bill with Senator GORTON. He has treated Senators fairly and openly. This bill was put together in a bipartisan manner, and it reflects priorities identified by many Senators, by the public, and by the agencies that are charged with carrying out the programs and projects funded in the bill.

The breadth of the activities covered by the Interior bill is vast—ranging from museums to parks to hospitals to resources to research—with most of the funds being spent far away from the Capitol and far away from Washington. This bill funds hundreds of national parks, wildlife refuges, national forests, and other land management units. The bill supports more than 400 Indian hospitals and clinics and thousands of Indian students. A wide variety of natural science and energy research and technology development is funded through this bill, providing immediate and far-reaching benefits to all parts of our country and to our society as a whole.

This bill makes its presence known in every State—from the rocky coasts of Maine to the mountains of California, from the coral reefs of Florida to the farflung island territories of the Pacific, from the Aleutian Islands in Alaska to the Outer Banks of North Carolina. And the number of requests that Senator GORTON and I have received from Senators for project funding in the Interior bill numbers more than 1,400—1,400 requests for specific items. This reflects its broad impact. While it is impossible to include every request, Senator GORTON has done an admirable job of accommodating high-priority items within the allocation, an allocation that is $660 million below the President's budget request and $290 million below last year's enacted level in new spending authority. Since the bill is at its allocation, any additional funding sought by Senators will need to be offset.

Mr. President, highlights of this bill include:

A total of $233 million for land acquisition, which is $37 million below the President's request and $38 million below the level of funding included in title I and title II of last year's bill for land acquisition.

A continuing emphasis on operating and protecting our national parks. Park operation funds are increased by $55 million, including $15 million targeted for the special operations initiative, $10 million for an across-the-board increase for all parks, and $14 million for maintenance.

A total of $10 million for the President's Millennium initiative, ''Save America's Treasures.'' In addition, specific funding for critical historical and cultural resources is contained in the normal funding categories—items such as restoration of the Star Spangled Banner at the Smithsonian Institution, presevation of Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia, protection of buildings at the Edison National Historic Site, and stabilization and protection of the Longfellow National Historic Site.

A continuing focus on the maintenance backlog needs of the land management agencies. Specific increases include: +$6 million for BLM facilities maintenance; +$10 million for FWS refuge operations and maintenance; +$18 million for NPS maintenance; and +$13 million for Forest Service road maintenance.

A total of $155 million for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, allowing operation of the reserve without selling any of its oil.

An increase of $45 million above the President's request for the Indian Health Services program to help cover fixed costs. The administration's budget gave no consideration to these needs for IHS.

A net increase of $35 million for energy conservation programs—including increases for weatherization assistance, the building equipment and materials program, the industry sector programs, and the transportation programs.

Mr. President, while this bill provides needed resources for protecting some of our Nation's most valuable treasures, we still have a long way to go. The agencies funded through this bill are starting to make progress towards addressing their backlog maintenance issues, thanks in great measure to the leadership of the Congress, the expansion of private-public partnerships, and the development of innovative user fees.

But we are by no means out of the woods. Many deplorable conditions remain; many important resource and research needs are unmet. We must continue our vigilance towards unnecessary new initiatives as well as unwise decreases, our support for the basic programs that provide the foundation of the Interior bill, and our careful stewardship of the resources and assets placed in our trust.

Mr. President, the chairman and manager of the bill has already stated for the record many of the salient points that are covered in the bill, many of the items, many of the programs and projects. There is no need for my repeating them here.

Lastly, Mr. President, I extend a warm word of appreciation to the staff that have assisted the chairman and myself in our work on this bill. They work as a team and serve both of us, as well as all Senators, in a very effective and dedicated manner. On the majority side, the staff members are Bruce Evans, Ginny James, Anne McInerney, Leif Fonnesbeck, Mary Ellen Mueller, and Kevin Johnson. On my staff, Sue Masica, Kurt Dodd, Craig Leff, and Carole Geagley have worked on the Interior bill this year. This team works under the tutelage of the staff directors of the full committee—Steve Cortese for the majority and Jim English for the minority.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to share my deep appreciation for the wonderful words that members of the subcommittee and full committee have spoken about Sue Masica, the minority clerk for the bill, who recently accepted a position with the National Park Service. Sue was the best of the best. She will be sorely missed by myself and by the other Senators. Her dedication, acumen, and team spirit epitomize the Senate and the appropriations process.

Mr. President, this is a good bill, and I urge the Senate to complete its action promptly. And I urge all Senators to support the bill in its final passage.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3541

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], for Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. TORRICELLI, proposes an amendment numbered 3541.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

''SEC. . Up to $10 million of funds available in fiscal years 1998 and 1999 shall be available for matching grants, not covering more than 50 percent of the total cost of any acquisition to be made with such funds, to States and local communities for purposes of acquiring lands or interests in lands to preserve and protect Civil War battlefield sites identified in the July 1993 Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields prepared by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission. Lands or interests in lands acquired pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements of paragraph 6(f)(3) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–8(f)(3)).''

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last year about this time during the debate on this bill, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. TORRICELLI, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, proposed an amendment to earmark certain amounts of money for the preservation and protection of Civil War battlefield sites. At that point, while as a Civil War buff I greatly sympathize with them, we didn't know where the earmark would come from. It is now possible in this bill to meet the most worthy goals of that pair of bipartisan Senators.

This amendment earmarks up to $10 million of both fiscal year 1998 and 1999 money—$10 million total—for matching grants for up to 50 percent of the total cost of any such acquisition with

States and local communities and private entities based on a July 1993 report of the Nation's Civil War battlefields prepared by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission. So it means that there will be more leverage for the acquisition of various Civil War battle sites, mostly, I think, on secondary battles.

It is a highly worthy proposal. I very much favor it. At the same time, the majority leader, feeling that the Senate absolutely needs to do its business, and because as is usual and customary, unfortunately, at the beginning of debate over appropriations bills, we don't get people down here to offer their amendments, he has asked me to move to table the amendment and to take a vote on that. Therefore, Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the moment there is not a sufficient second.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for the moment, one of the sponsors being here, I withdraw the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Motion withdrawn.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment and against the motion to table. This amendment was worked on by many of us who sincerely believe that the future of this Nation must rely, to a certain extent, on our good understanding of the past and of history and of the battles that this Nation fought in its infancy—basically, the Civil War battlefields.

As we approach the next millennium, many of these battlefields are very critical in understanding the history of the Civil War. And in understanding the sacrifices made by so many Americans, Senator TORRICELLI, myself and others, with the great cooperation of the Senator from Washington, worked out a plan where we could raise a sufficient amount of money to really work with States and local governments to be able to take care of and preserve those battlefields that are so important in understanding the history of the Civil War.

So I have opposed the motion to table and support very strongly the underlying amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 3541. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. KEMPTHORNE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 83, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Leg.]

NAYS—83

Abraham	Durbin	Mack
Akaka	Enzi	McCain
Allard	Faircloth	McConnell
Ashcroft	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moynihan
Bennett	Frist	Murkowski
Bingaman	Glenn	Nickles
Bond	Gorton	Reed
Boxer	Graham	Reid
Breaux	Gramm	Robb
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Bryan	Hagel	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Harkin	Roth
Burns	Hatch	Sarbanes
Byrd	Helms	Sessions
Campbell	Hutchinson	Shelby
Cleland	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Coats	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Jeffords	Snowe
Collins	Johnson	Specter
Conrad	Kerrey	Stevens
Coverdell	Kerry	Thomas
Craig	Kohl	Thompson
D'Amato	Kyl	Thurmond
Daschle	Levin	Torricelli
DeWine	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lott	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—17

Biden	Hollings	Leahy
Chafee	Hutchison	Moseley-Braun
Dodd	Kempthorne	Murray
Feinstein	Kennedy	Santorum
Grams	Landrieu	Wyden
Gregg	Lautenberg	

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3541) was rejected.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as I said, this was in the nature of a vote that was appropriate for a Tuesday afternoon. I am very much in favor of this amendment. I do not believe there is any further debate on the amendment. I trust the President will put the question.

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

The amendment (No. 3541) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments that we may be able to deal with soon, none of which will be particularly controversial. The Senator from Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON, does have a different subject to which he would like to speak shortly. I intend to defer to him on that.

But the important message to all of our colleagues, the message in effect given by this last vote, is this is an important appropriations bill. It is, in fact, controversial. We have a list of perhaps 60 amendments that are likely to come up on it at one point or another. Members should, I hope, be prepared to come to the floor of the Senate with those amendments and have them considered in an orderly fashion under which there is a reasonable amount of time for debate rather than to crowd them up against the end of the debate on this bill.

It may very well be that later on in the afternoon we will have an amendment on this bill on an entirely different and very controversial subject, which will then essentially take us off of the Interior bill. Before that takes place, however, the managers of the bill would be very pleased to deal with amendments that relate to the bill itself. I ask Members to come to the floor with those amendments.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMPSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 2445 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I hope within a few minutes to have a few corrective amendments to offer to the bill, but seeing no one with an amendment on the floor at the present time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have spoken to the subcommittee Chair who is managing the appropriations bill that is now on the floor and have asked him if it is all right if I speak in morning business for a few minutes. If someone comes to the floor with an amendment on this bill, if he will signal to

me, I will certainly discontinue so he may continue making progress on the bill.

I want to speak about the agriculture crisis briefly, and I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as if in morning business.

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

AGRICULTURE CRISIS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have a number of things to complete and to discuss and debate in the coming 5 or 6 weeks before this Congress finishes its work. Many of them are very important. The work of the Appropriations Committee in getting the appropriations bills done on a timely basis is critically important. All of us understand that. I am here today to talk about one specific issue that must be addressed. It is an issue that must be addressed on an urgent basis by this Congress before it completes its work in the 105th Congress. The issue is the farm crisis that exists in rural America.

I come from a rural State, the State of North Dakota, which is the size of 10 Massachusetts in landmass. It has 640,000 residents, and 40 to 50 percent of our State's economy comes from agriculture, and our system of family farming. I have spoken on the floor at some length about the problems and challenges we face these days.

In the last year, family farmers in our State suffered a 98-percent drop in net farm income. Yes, I said a 98-percent loss of their net income. Now, these are families who have elected, for a variety of reasons, to populate rural America. They own a farm. They raise livestock. They till the soil and produce grain. They produce America's foodstuffs. They take enormous risks, often with very few rewards. They live out in the country and they turn that yard light on at night, and that illuminates a family out there somewhere living on the land trying to make a living.

What is happening these days in the Farm Belt is that grain prices have collapsed, and livestock prices are way down. These family farmers who have risked everything they have and invested it in their hopes and dreams in making this family farm work, are now all too often standing with tears in their eyes as their farm is being sold at an auction sale.

This country will lose something important if it loses its family farmers. I suppose we could farm America from California to Maine with giant agrifactories. We could have big corporate farms and a farming system where nobody lives on the land and there are no yard lights because nobody is there at night. Do we want corporate agrifactories farming America? This country will have lost something very important in its culture and in its economy if we lose our family farmers. And, we will lose them if we don't decide as a Congress to take action soon.

Congress needs to tell farmers that this nation wants to help them through these troubled time. We need to build a bridge across these price valleys, when grain prices, cattle prices and hog prices collapse. We want to help. But, if we don't do that soon, we won't have many farmers left.

This isn't about Democrats and Republicans, or conservatives and liberals; it is about values and whether we in this Congress believe that family farming contributes to this country. I consider myself a Jeffersonian kind of Democrat. A Jeffersonian Democrat is somebody who really believes in broad-based economic ownership in this country, and who believes that the political freedoms we enjoy in this country could not exist without economic freedom. Such freedom comes only with broad-based economic ownership. It does not come with concentration, nor with big corporations, but with broad-based ownership in which the men and women of America are out there investing in farms and small businesses. Nowhere is that broad-based economic ownership more important and more apparent to the economic health of this country than on America's farms and ranches.

I was in a Quonset building a couple of days ago in North Dakota. It was in the evening and there was a picnic out on the farmstead. Farmers from all around the county came. About 100 folks gathered there. This young fellow who owned this farm hadn't finished taking off his grain. He had been trying hard, but he hadn't gotten it all off the field yet. As we were in this Quonset hut at this picnic, the clouds began to form out in the west. First they were blue and then almost black. Those clouds came in as part of a vicious, vicious storm. It came with a vengeance with wind, hail, rain. Inside that Quonset, it sounded almost like war as the huge hailstones were hitting that steel roof, making a loud, echoing sound together with the pelting rain.

I watched those farmers in that Quonset building look at those clouds. I started to understand what that storm meant when tears welled up in their eyes and they were shaking their heads. Some of these farmers knew that storm was probably wiping them out, destroying their crop, and probably destroying their hope to get something off of those fields and get it to the market and pay some bills.

Those are the risks our farmers face. Two years ago, the Congress passed the farm bill. I didn't vote for it. I didn't think it was a good farm bill. In the last 2 years, wheat prices have dropped 57 percent, right off the table. This is critical to us because wheat is the largest cash crop in North Dakota that the family farmers raise. In addition to wheat prices collapsing on us, we have also had the worst crop disease in the century. The most damaging is known as fusarium head blight or scab. So we have had crop diseases, together with the wet cycle that has fostered these diseases, a collapse in prices, and we have had auction sales all across the State. Family farmers are wondering whether they can continue. Their lenders are saying, ''I don't think you can continue because the farm bill Congress passed has decreasing support prices in the out years, and it doesn't look good. Maybe you ought to get out now and save whatever little equity you can.'' That is the position farmers now find themselves in too often in rural America.

So the question for us is what should we do about it? In July this Senate passed a bill that included $500 million in what is called an indemnification program. Senator CONRAD and I authored that, along with Senator CRAIG and others. That bill is now going into conference committee with the House. We need to get that bill through to try to get some short-term help to family farmers. The indemnification program will have to be increased because of other disaster situations. The Texas cotton crop was devastated. Louisiana, Oklahoma, and other States now face an increasing crisis in family farming and in agriculture.

In addition to that bill, it seems to me the Congress has a responsibility now to reach out to family farmers and say: ''We made a mistake a couple years ago. We need to build back some sort of price support program for you. We don't want to tell you when to plant, or how to plant, or what to plant. We don't want to do that. But we want to say that you matter and we care about family farmers, and we want to provide some basic kind of price bridge to get you over these price valleys.''

We only have a couple of weeks to do that. I find it disturbing that in our economic system that almost everyone who touches something that a farmer grows or produces is making money with it. Farmers buy the seed and they buy the equipment to plant the seed. They put the fertilizer in the ground. They hope it doesn't hail, and that the insects don't come. They hope it doesn't rain too much. And, they hope it rains enough. Then maybe they get a crop. When they harvest the crop, they hope when they put it in the truck and drive it to the elevator, they will get a decent price for it. Any problem along the way may mean they are gone, broke, and out of business.

Let's assume that farmer gets through the year and harvests the grain and gets a dismal price for it. That is what is happening right now. What happens to this harvest? Somebody puts it on a train and they put it on those tracks and down the tracks it goes. And guess what? The railroads are making money. Do you think they aren't making money off that wheat? The farmer who planted and harvested it didn't, but the railroads are making money, I suspect record profits. Then it goes to a miller. The millers are doing fine. They are making money. Then it goes to some plant someplace where