[From the Denver Post, Sept. 28, 1996]

CLINTON'S PARTISANSHIP THREATENS LANDS BILL

In an election, a certain number of power plays are expected. But the reasons President Clinton gave for threatening to veto an omnibus parks bill go beyond power politics to inject a dangerous level of partisanship into public lands policies.

A congressional conference committee already had stripped many of the most objectionable provisions from the bill, including an ill-advised grazing proposal. Most of the 126 projects that survived into the final version were noncontroversial.

Clinton, however, has labeled 45 of those remaining projects as unacceptable and threatened to veto the whole bill because of them. Of those, four are in Colorado.

Only one Colorado project had stirred much controversy previously; A deal would have let the U.S. Forest Service cede control of a reservoir whose water the city of Greeley wants, in exchange for Greeley giving the U.S. government some ranchland next to national forest property. Environmentalists feared the deal could let Greeley dry up streams near the reservoir. At the very least, the deal should wait until a pending study of the region's bypass flow issue has been completed.

But Clinton didn't cite only controversial projects as reasons for threatening to kill the bill. He also targeted mundane projects that enjoyed widespread bipartisan support.

For example, the bill would have funded construction of a new visitors center at the Fall River entrance of Rocky Mountain National Park, a project Clinton's own Interior Department had requested.

The president also objected to a deal that would have added 22,000 acres of wilderness to the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument and transformed it into a full-fledged national park. A series of lengthy public hearings already had resolved concerns about the national park designation.

Strangest of all, the White House spurned plans to protect a stretch of the Cache La Poudre River from development and to build a system of hiking, biking and horse-riding trails in the preserved open space. Environmental groups had joined the cities of Fort Collins and Greeley in support of the plan.

Now, the GOP is howling because the 45 projects on Clinton's hit list all happen to be sponsored by congressional Republicans Clinton thus handed his foes a whole box of political ammunition that they will shoot back at him from now until Election Day.

If Clinton decided to veto the bill based on policy concerns, he has been poorly advised on the merits of the projects. If he is simply opposing projects as an election-year ploy, however, he may have committed a serious blunder in the eyes of many Colorado voters.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, looking through it, there are several projects in Colorado that are objected to. It says:

> The President also objected to a deal that would have added 22,000 acres of wilderness to the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument and transformed it into a full-fledged national park. A series of lengthy public hearings already had resolved concerns about the national park designation.

That is just one. I know President Clinton stood outside of the Grand Canyon and had a big environmental picture day and talked about taking 1.8 million acres in Utah, without consulting the Utah delegation or the Utah Governor. But I am looking at their reluctance to cooperate with us on this package as being a lot more detrimental, because this package does lots of things in all States, from California to New Jersey, including Colorado.

I just think there are some real inconsistencies here. I hope our colleagues will join us in working together to see if we can't pass this bill later today.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JOYCE McCLUNEY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to say thank you, and express my appreciation, on behalf of all Senators for the outstanding work of Joyce McCluney who has served this Government for 29 years. She was with Senator Bob Dole during his tenure both as minority leader and as majority leader of this body. For 9 years, she served as his office manager and coordinated the Senator's support team, an endless challenge of organization and detail that I am witnessing first hand now. Along with her other responsibilities, she spent countless hours making the complicated arrangements for visiting heads of state and foreign parliamentary delegations meeting with the Republican leader.

These past 2 years, Joyce served as Deputy Sergeant at Arms with Sergeant at Arms Howard O. Greene, Jr. Time and again, she demonstrated her foresight and excellent administrative skills in administering the Senate's largest, most technologically complex office in the U.S. Senate and her unquestionable support to all Senators in this body has been exemplary. She has just done an outstanding job.

She raised three children while she was accumulating outstanding career credentials. Her impressive resume includes assignments with the Senate Finance Committee, the White House, the Commerce Department, the State Department, and the offices of the leader of the U.S. Senate.

Joyce is retiring from the Senate and from Government. She plans a brief interlude of well-deserved rest and recreation and I know that in the near future she will contribute her many talents to new and exciting endeavors. Joyce McCluney takes with her many, many accolades for her achievements and the gratitude of everyone who benefited from her dedication to this institution. She leaves a legacy of outstanding contributions and a legion of friends and admirers. I want to thank Joyce McCluney for all she has done for this institution and to wish the best of all good things in her future.

I extend best wishes to Joyce McCluney and express the appreciation of the Senate for her fine work.

THE Calendar

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed, en bloc, to the consideration of Calendar No. 579, which is H.R. 3660; Calendar No. 576, which is H.R. 1514; Calendar No. 476, which is H.R. 2967; and Calendar No. 475, which is H.R. 1823.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bills be deemed read a third time, and passed, en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bills appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

RECLAMATION RECYCLING AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1996

The bill (H.R. 3660) to make amendments to the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act, and for other purposes, and was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPANE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ACT OF 1996

The bill (H.R. 1514) to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance safety, training, research, and development, and safety education in the propane gas industry for the benefit of propane consumers and the public, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, Senator THOMPSON and I would like to enter into a brief colloquy with the sponsor of this bill, Senator DOMENICI. Some concerns were raised in the last Congress, with respect to a similar bill, that such legislation might adversely affect users of propane by interfering with propane markets or artificially stimulating the demand for propane. Does the bill before us address these concerns?

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank my colleague from Arkansas for his question. He is correct that such concerns were raised, but the bill before the Senate today addresses these concerns. This bill includes changes that make clear that the Propane Research and Education Council [PERC], which is created by this bill, is not a marketing and promotion agency, but rather a research and educational one. It also caps the level of funding that can be committed to motor fuel uses of propane, which is

arguably the application that might have the greatest impact on propane usage in this country. These changes were agreed to by parties representing propane producers and propane consumers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does this bill allow funds to be used for any marketing and promotional activities.

Mr. DOMENICI. The bill stipulates that the PERC may engage in education of consumers regarding propane. In fact, a specific provision of the bill, section 5(h), requires the PERC to give priority to research and development, safety, education, and training in the development of programs and projects.

Mr. BUMPERS. How will the PERC distinguish between education and market promotion? What might be some examples, of activities that are intended to be permitted under this bill, and activities that are not?

Mr. DOMENICI. Activities not intended under this bill would include efforts by the PERC, or efforts supported by PERC-provided funding but carried out by other organizations, that solicit individuals to switch from other fuels to propane, or that subsidize such fuel switching. Such activities would certainly not qualify as education under any definition. Another example of an activity not contemplated by this bill would be a general media campaign of 30-second television commercials to the effect that propane is a good fuel choice. This would not be considered education, since the amount of substantive information likely to be contained in such a commercial would not qualify it as a legitimate educational tool. However, builder/architect outreach efforts that disseminate information about propane home heating devices, so that consumers likely to consider propane heating could make informed choices, would be permitted under this bill. Similarly, efforts to educate propane consumers about new advances in technology, such as the development of a propane heat pump or the development of new flaming technologies for weed control in agriculture, would be permitted. While these types of activities could be considered marketing or promotion, they education consumers by making them aware of more efficient and therefore less costly appliances and practices, and thus are beneficial to consumers. Similarly, efforts to disseminate safety-related educational materials which will benefit consumers, are also contemplated, even though it might be argued that such materials are promotional. During our hearing on this bill earlier this year the Propane Consumers Coalition readily acknowledged that these types of activities were contemplated under this bill and I believe this strikes an appropriate balance.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are there other consumer protection provisions included in the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. The bill provides that if, in any year, the 5-year rolling prices index of propane exceeds by a specified level the 5-year rolling average price of a composite index of other home heating fuels, the activities of the PERC will be restricted to research and development, training, and safety programs. In addition, the bill requires certain studies and reports to ensure that the bill is having no adverse effect on consumers. Finally, three seats on the PERC are reserved for members representing the public. I firmly believe, and the Propane Consumers Coalition has testified before the Senate Energy Committee, that these provisions will ensure that this legislation will not have a negative effect on consumers.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator.

EXTENDING THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE URANIUM MILL TAILINGS RADIATION CONTROL ACT OF 1978

The bill (H.R. 2967) to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING THE CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACT

The bill (H.R. 1823) to amend the Central Utah Project Completion Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District dated December 28, 1965, and November 26, 1985, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING HYDROGEN RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS OF DOE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4138, received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4138) to authorize the hydrogen research, development, and demonstration programs of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 4138) was deemed read the third time and passed.

IRRIGATION PROJECT CONTRACT EXTENSION ACT OF 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 604, S. 1649.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1649) to extend contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and irrigation districts in Kansas and Nebraska, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 1649

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF CONTRACTS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall extend the **[**construction repayment**]** and water service contracts for the following projects, entered into by the Secretary of the Interior under **[**subsections (d) and**]** *subsections* (e) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h) and section 9(c) of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665), for a period of 4 additional years after the dates on which each of the contracts, respectively, would expire but for this section:

[(1) The Ainsworth Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, consisting of the project constructed and operated under the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665), the Act of August 21, 1954 (68 Stat. 757, chapter 781), and the Act of May 18, 1956 (70 Stat. 160, chapter 285), situated in Cherry County, Brown County, and Rock County, Nebraska.

[(2) The Almena Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, consisting of the project constructed and operated under the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665), and the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 641, chapter 596), as a component of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, situated in Norton County and Phillips County, Kansas.**]**

[(3)**]***(1)* The Bostwick Unit (Kansas portion), Missouri River Basin Project, consisting of the project constructed and operated under the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665), as a component of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, situated in Republic County, Jewell County, and Cloud County, Kansas.

[(4)**]***(2)* The Bostwick Unit (Nebraska portion), Missouri River Basin Project, consisting of the project constructed and operated under the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665), as a component of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, situated in Harlan County, Franklin County, Webster County, and Nuckolls County, Nebraska.

[(5)**]***(3)* The Farwell Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, consisting of the project constructed and operated under the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665), and