

single life in Kosovo and won, that militarily we might deal with other areas in the same way.

There are lots of different concerns people have now, watching what America has done in the last several years. So we have to be careful. We have to be prudent. To deny something that is normal and expected, that is, a normal trade relation with China, would be unsettling and would cause many more problems than it is going to solve.

I fully understand the points of the Senator from New Hampshire, but often there are different ways to skin a cat. The cat we are trying to skin is the effective way, not the ineffective way. It is my judgment that the effective way is to continue the dialogue, continue the engagement, and continue the engagement without illusions but continue it nevertheless. I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to discharge the petition.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. It is my understanding I have 1½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Montana, I know he understands, but he doesn't understand enough to let me have the opportunity to debate it. Under the rule of Jackson-Vanik, I have the right to have the 20 hours equally divided on the Senate floor. That is the time to do it so that it is not misdirected in morning business somewhere.

In response to Senator MCCAIN, yes, there are six out of seven Vietnam veterans in the Senate who support not debating this, who say the Jackson-Vanik waiver should be granted, but there are 3 million or so in the American Legion, at least represented by a letter from the American Legion, who think otherwise. I am not sure what the point is on that one.

We have to feel very confident the waiver has reduced bribery and corruption. Here is the law. It says to assure continued dedication to fundamental human rights, if these things happen, you should not grant the waiver. No. 1, does Vietnam deny its citizens the right to emigrate? Yes. I can prove it, but nobody wants to hear it. No. 2, does it impose more than a nominal tax on emigration and the other visas? Yes, and I have a stack of names of people, Vietnamese nationals, who have said yes.

The bottom line is, if the Senate won't give me the chance to debate it, then as far as I am concerned my colleagues do not want to hear the facts. I can't give them, as I said before, in 30 minutes.

I urge support of my resolution so that we have the opportunity to debate this on the Senate floor.

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

All time has expired.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to exceed 40 minutes, to be equally divided between the majority leader and the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

(The remarks of Senator BAUCUS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1395 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

THE CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted to engage in a colloquy now that will involve a number of other Senators but particularly Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana. I hesitate to even begin until she is present on the floor, but I presume she will be here momentarily.

In her absence, I will praise her for her work on this particular legislation, S. 25, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999. Her persistence, her willingness to work with all parties involved—I don't mean political parties; I mean those who are interested in this type legislation—has made it possible for us to have this bill put together and have it before the Energy Committee and have not only the cosponsorship of her colleague from Louisiana but also of the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI. It has a broad spectrum of support, and I think a lot of the credit goes to the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU.

I must say, it is a delicately balanced piece of legislation. If amendments start being added or changes start developing, then it could get out of control. And even though I am a cosponsor, I would have problems with that, even though clearly every piece of legislation can be improved as it goes forward.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues S. 25. The American public has an exciting opportunity for this Congress to enact landmark legislation that will make a long-term commitment to natural conservation initiatives. We have the opportunity to begin the next century with the same major commitment to conservation that the Nation had at the beginning of the century under the visionary leadership of President Teddy Roosevelt. I believe this legislation will serve our Nation

well for generations to come. I intend to be involved in its process through the committee and, hopefully, we will be able to bring it up for consideration in the full Senate before the year is out.

This legislation would dedicate a portion of the annual reserves received from the production of Federal oil and gas revenues on the Outer Continental Shelf to a variety of initiatives that will conserve and enhance our Nation's sustaining and renewable resources. I am pleased to be a sponsor, joining a broad spectrum of my colleagues. The legislation, which is modeled after the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, will reinvest 50 percent of the revenues from the Federal OCS oil and gas production annually in coastal impact assistance and coastal conservation, in funding national, State, and local parks and recreation opportunities, and in conserving our Nation's wildlife resources before those wildlife fall into threatened or endangered status under the Endangered Species Act.

It does have the support of various groups. I have felt for years that those of us who live along the coasts and who take whatever risks are associated with offshore oil and gas exploration should get some benefit from that activity and from the risks associated and that we should have the funds that are necessary to deal with such things as beach erosion, to preserve some of our delicate estuaries along the coastal areas. We have not been getting our fair share.

So for the first time, I think this bill would move us in that direction. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 701, introduced by Congressman DON YOUNG, chairman of the House Resources Committee, with the cosponsorship of Congressman DINGELL and Congressman TAUZIN and others. I believe they have some 80 cosponsors.

This important legislation will affect not just my State or not just the coastal regions but the whole Nation. We are facing a continuing shortage of funds in wildlife conservation initiatives, for State and local parks and recreation initiatives, for conservation initiatives with respect to the peculiar problems that confront our coastal regions, but also there are great concerns in the West and the areas that are a long way from the coast.

Under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, one-half of the revenue from Federal mineral resources that are developed in a State are shared with that State by the Federal Government. Unfortunately, a similar provision does not exist with regard to Federal oil and gas resources that are produced off the coast of a State, even though the adjacent coastal area could suffer impacts from that activity. Not until 1986 did the Federal Government share any of the Federal OCS oil and gas revenues

with the coastal States, and then only a small portion of that revenue from those offshore activities occurring in the first 3 miles of the OCS. The Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 will correct this inequity while also reinvesting a portion of the funds in conservation initiatives in all 50 States.

The concept of reinvesting a portion of the revenue from the Nation's non-renewable resources in renewable resources of the Nation has attracted the support of Governors, mayors, county governments, conservation groups, sports groups, and others around the Nation. The congressional hearings have created a record of great and broad support.

Some of the highlights of that testimony include Mr. Hurley Coleman, director of Wayne County, MI, Division of Parks. He testified:

You have the chance right now to take the place of the visionaries of the past and support a process that will provide for development, renovation and enhancement of critical recreation resources in important living spaces throughout the country.

He went on to say this was a moment of destiny. Obviously, he was very supportive of the bill.

Mr. Mark Van Putten, President and CEO of the National Wildlife Federation, testified that it presented an "historic opportunity to enact permanent and meaningful conservation funding that would benefit wildlife, wild places, and generations of Americans to come."

We had support from the commissioner of Santa Fe County in New Mexico on behalf of the National Association of Counties who endorsed the principles of this act that would reallocate Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas revenues to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a coastal State revenue sharing program, and add funding to the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program and establish an innovative procedure for adding funding for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program.

That is a very important thing. In my State, and a lot of States where the Federal Government owns a large amount of land—in my State, timberlands—and because, in my opinion, of bad national forest policies, those funds have been reduced. We are not cutting the trees that need to be cut. We had a disaster last year; a hurricane went through that affected two or three States. And because of resistance from certain environmental groups, the downed timber could not be removed. Now it is basically useless. Who benefits from that? Nobody. The timber that was downed wasn't used for the benefit of the lumber-timber industry. And by allowing it to just lay there on the ground and die raises the prospect of insects that would then infest other trees. It makes no sense whatsoever. So the idea that we would

get some more money for the payments in lieu of taxes is very attractive to me.

Governor Tom Carper of Delaware, on behalf of the National Governors' Association, testified in support of this legislation. Governor Christine Todd-Whitman of New Jersey also supported it. Mayor Victor Ashe, the mayor of Knoxville, came and testified about how helpful this legislation could be.

I know there are some concerns about how this money will be used. There has been some concerns expressed by the Farm Bureau and by the Loggers Association. These are two groups that are very important in this country and in my State in particular. I listened to them.

If they have concerns about how these funds would be used in connection with land use, I would want to hear them out and make sure there is not a problem technically with the bill or make sure this bill does not further discourage and dissipate our resources from farming and from timber in this country. I also don't want this to become an opportunity for public land use groups to try to grab more land.

While there are some public lands we want to have access to, we want to preserve, that is fine. But I think this administration, in particular, has been exceeding what the law allows and is still trying to tie up more Federal lands when, in fact, we are providing proper stewardship of the lands we already have. One example is the Park Service. Many of our national parks are deteriorating. Bridges are not passable, monuments eroding. Yet the Park Service seems to be more interested in adding more land to the parks before we take care of what we already have.

This bill may help deal with that problem because it would make these funds more equitably available to go for not only coastal preservation but also could go to the national and State parks.

I think we have a good idea here. It is one of those conservation bills that I think could be of benefit to everybody in this country, all States, and particularly my own State of Mississippi. I don't generally go on bills of this nature because I am very leery that these conservation efforts sometimes become—let's see, what is the word I am looking for—"confiscation" efforts rather than conservation. I don't believe that is what this bill does. This could lead us to some real good policies that could bring together divergent groups in a way that we have not had the opportunity in the past.

I am pleased to be here and point out to my colleagues this legislation, S. 25. I encourage them to take a look at it. I thank the chairman of the committee for his good work, and I look forward to working with Chairman MURKOWSKI as we move forward on this very important Conservation and Reinvestment Act.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, who controls the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader and the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU.

Mr. GREGG. I ask if the Senator will yield me 3 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader in congratulating the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Louisiana for putting forward this excellent proposal on land and water conservation. This is long overdue. I think it is an extraordinarily positive step.

The chairman of the key committee, Chairman MURKOWSKI, has decided to put forward this proposal, to support it, and to have the support of the majority leader.

Those are two pretty powerful figures in this Senate pushing forward on this extremely positive conservation initiative. From the view of the State of New Hampshire, the stateside land and water conservation fund is something in which we are very interested. There are places in this country today where I think their representative Senators maybe think that the Federal Government owns enough land. Maybe the Member in the Chair is from one of those places, being from Wyoming. But those of us on the eastern seaboard still see critical pieces of land we would like to have protected. We have a huge population, a megalopolis, running from Washington to Boston, that is always moving north.

In New Hampshire, there are critical elements of natural resources that need to be protected as we go through these massive expansions and these growth spurts, which are inevitable. The land and water conservation fund, over the years, has always been a positive force for protection and for allowing communities to do things they think are critical to making those communities better places to live—whether it happens to be building a park or a recreational area. Therefore, to refund or replenish the land and water conservation fund using the Outer Continental Shelf is absolutely appropriate and is absolutely critical if States such as New Hampshire, which are, unfortunately, in a wave of population growth, are going to be able to maintain their characteristics of being a rural environment and a pleasant place in which to raise a family.

I support Senator MURKOWSKI's bill, and I certainly appreciate the Senator from Mississippi, the majority leader, also being in support of this legislation. That bodes well for it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the committee. I see Senator LANDRIEU here, and I know she will want to speak.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. I don't want to interrupt the flow on this bill, but I wanted 5 minutes to talk about the 30th anniversary of the landing on the Moon. I wonder if I could have 5 minutes at the end of the colloquy.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I have no objection.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of my friend and colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, let me briefly comment on the status of the OCS revenuesharing legislation that we introduced some time ago. This is a significant addition to a much-needed reform and, as a consequence, it has been termed as the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999.

The bill itself reinvests OCS revenues. When I say "reinvests," I am specifically noting the reality associated from where this revenue comes. It comes from OCS activities of some States. It could include other States if indeed they wanted to have OCS activity exploration and production off of their individual shores. Some of the States have chosen not to. I appreciate and recognize their reluctance. But let's be realistic and recognize that in order to have a successful Conservation and Reinvestment Act, we have to have a continuation of OCS revenues occurring off the shores of some of our States—Louisiana, Mississippi, and other States.

My State of Alaska has a very small OCS activity; most of our activities are on land. But it is interesting to note the breadth of support for this legislation, which is related, to some extent, to those States that see an opportunity to generate a source of revenue. That is fine. That is the way Senator LANDRIEU and I constructed the legislation. Make no mistake about it, in order for it to be successful, we have to have, and encourage, OCS revenuesharing, as we have off the coast of Texas, and other States that I could mention.

This is a coastal impact assistance and State coastal program funding mechanism for the land and water conservation fund, including fulfilling a long-delayed promise of support for State, local, and urban park and recreation facilities, as well as State wildlife programs.

We have tried to cover a broad area of need, and I commend the Senator from Louisiana, Senator LANDRIEU, for her extraordinary ability to encompass, if you will, the various broad interest groups.

S. 25 gives States and local governments—and this is important—not the Federal Government, the responsibility for determining the conservation needs of their citizens and provides funding to help meet those needs.

Now, that is where we have a difference with the administration. The

administration proposes that it is the Federal Government's responsibility to make these decisions, and we say no. There are some other bills floating around that also propose to give the Federal Government the authority. We think responsible citizens know what their needs are, and these funds should be provided so they can make the decisions to help meet those needs, not a one-size-fits-all Federal Government.

I encourage my colleagues to recognize the significance that the local people at the local level know what their needs are. A number of bills spending OCS revenues, and the administration's bill, which has been put forth, identifies the Lands Legacy Initiative. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which I chair and Senator LANDRIEU is a member of, has had a series of hearings on all these proposals. We have learned about the need for coastal impact assistance. We are aware of the unavoidable social and environmental impacts on States that host OCS development. The State of Louisiana, for example, and the State of Texas, host, if you will, the impact because the activity is off their shores. It is an unavoidable social environmental impact, so they should receive additional consideration.

Coastal impact assistance helps mitigate these burdens, even in States that prohibit oil and gas activity off their coast, such as the State of Florida, where there is a unique coastal and marine need associated with their set of priorities. We appreciate that and understand that.

We have also learned about the widespread support in this country for State park, recreation and wildlife programs from the hearings. We have heard from the mayors, Governors, easterners, residents of the Great Plains, soccer coaches, hunters, environmentalists, and farmers. As evidenced by the witnesses we have heard in the hearings and the hundreds of letters the committee has received, we understand that Americans want meaningful conservation legislation. That is what we have attempted to do. But don't forget from where it comes. It comes from OCS oil and gas activity. We have to have a continuation of support for those States that foster and recognize the contribution of OCS activities. But those States have to be recognized for the impact, and they have to share in this as well.

Now, their concerns have been expressed. We have had bills to provide money for Federal land acquisition. This may sound great to the Eastern States, where there is no public land. But for those of us out West, it is a little difficult to suggest that we are going to fund Federal land acquisition when many of us out West think the Federal Government owns enough of the land out there. If they want to fund the Eastern States, why, that is some-

thing different. This is a problem that has to be rectified.

Residents of States with significant Federal land are worried that these bills will lead to a massive Federal land grab. The Federal Government owns about 70 percent of my State of Alaska. I can understand the fears. Fortunately, when Texas came into the Union, they made sure the Federal Government didn't own any. If we had it to do over again, I can assure you we would do it differently. Nevertheless, when we talk about the bill providing money for Federal land acquisition, the people in my State of Alaska, and in many of the Western States—to suggest that they would become unglued is an understatement. They fear this legislation will result in a Federal land acquisition grab, not where it is needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Louisiana has 20 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 minutes to finish.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Yes, that is fine.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

At the risk of understating the importance of this bill, what we have attempted to do is find a balance, develop a compromise; but each time we accommodate one group's special interest associated with this, there is a reaction from another group that perhaps gave us support and is concerned that we have gone too far in any one area.

As chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, my goal and objective in working with Senator LANDRIEU is to report a bill to the Senate floor. We must have a bipartisan bill. The bill is going to have to remedy the existing inequity in the distribution of OCS revenues. It is going to have to provide funds for State conservation programs. It is going to have to provide guarantees for a role of Congress in Federal land acquisition. In other words, Congress is going to have to have something to say about Federal land acquisition and purchases. Finally, it is going to have to assure westerners that there will be no gain of Federal land in their States—no gain of Federal land in the Western States.

This isn't going to be easy, but I think, working with Senator LANDRIEU and others, it is going to be worth the effort. Therefore, I look forward to working with my colleagues on this exciting opportunity, this exciting legislation. Previously, all of the OCS revenue has gone into the general fund. Now we have an opportunity to address this with some meaningful legislation that involves the OCS impact assistance, land and water conservation fund amendments, and the wildlife conservation fund under a formula that has been agreed upon.

I encourage my colleagues, in consideration of this language, to allow the local people to make the decision, not a disinterested bureaucracy, a Federal Government that dictates one size fits all.

I thank my colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, for her graciousness in allowing me this time and for her efforts to bring this before the body. I thank the majority leader, Senator LOTT, as well.

I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the chairman, the Senator from Alaska, for his leadership in steering us to this point. We are just a short time away from having an opportunity to mark up this historic bill, if you will, this historic effort in his committee.

I want to say that all of our committees have tremendous responsibilities and very significant efforts are underway. But our committee, Energy and Natural Resources, in addition to this effort, has the chairman negotiating a restructuring of our electricity industry for this Nation and he is trying to maneuver through a waste disposal bill that has been a source of great controversy. I thank him for giving his time and energy and determination in moving through a historic piece of legislation for the environment. Perhaps if we can accomplish this—and I believe we can—future generations will look back on this effort.

I thank him and our majority leader, the Senator from Mississippi, who knows full well, from the perspective of a producing State, the significant negative impacts that are associated with an industry that both of us support and the opportunity here to do something positive for our States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alaska, as well as other States in the Nation.

I will reserve the remainder of my time, and at this point yield to one of my colleagues from South Dakota, who has so graciously joined us on the floor for this colloquy. As a member of one of the interior States, and as one of the leading spokespersons on this bill, I thank Senator JOHNSON for being with us today. I yield to him 5 minutes to speak on this important issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSON, is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I thank Senator LANDRIEU for her leadership on this issue, as well as Chairman MURKOWSKI.

I think we have an enormous opportunity this year to at last reach a bipartisan agreement to increase significantly the funding for several critically important planned water and wildlife conservation programs. Several legislative efforts to establish

mandatory funding for conservation programs utilizing Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, revenue are under bipartisan discussion.

I have been pleased to participate in hearings on these initiatives in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. All of the conservation legislation introduced this year proposed significant steps to support the restoration, preservation and conservation of our natural resources. The hearings in our committee have been extremely useful since, if we are to be successful this year, we have the daunting task ahead of us of drafting a compromise conservation bill which meets the diverse needs of all fifty states. Consequently, we need to hear as many perspectives and learn as much about the needs in the states as possible before we begin drafting a compromise bill.

Preserving our natural resources is an issue to which many of us in this body are committed. Earlier this year I joined 35 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in sending a letter to Budget Committee Chairman DOMINICI and Senator LAUTENBERG requesting full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Further, during consideration of the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution, Senator BOXER and I offered an amendment to establish a conservation reserve fund. This amendment was unanimously approved by the Budget Committee, passed by the Senate but unfortunately dropped in the conference committee. Nonetheless, the strong support from the Senate for this concept signals a commitment to finding a way to fund additional conservation initiatives.

Additionally, one third of the Members of this body have cosponsored one of the conservation proposals which have been introduced. This level of interest indicates that while we have not come to an agreement on the details which should be included in a comprehensive conservation proposal, significant interest in this issue exists. This widespread interest offers an opportunity to find a bipartisan compromise to address this critically important issue.

I applaud Senator BOXER in particular for her efforts in this area, and I applaud Senators LANDRIEU and MURKOWSKI for their work on S. 25.

One of the primary reasons I supported the bill earlier this year is the sponsors' inclusion of the non-game wildlife initiative, often called Teaming With Wildlife (TWW). I am convinced that funding for specified nongame conservation programs must be secured if we want to successfully work to keep species off of threatened and endangered species lists while also meeting the skyrocketing demand for outdoor recreation and education opportunities.

Currently, I am circulating a letter which I will be sending to Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator LANDRIEU which advocates a higher percentage of funding for wildlife conservation than currently included in S. 25. Specifically, I am advocating increasing the funding allocation from 7 to 10. At this time other Senators joining me in sending the letter include: Senators CLELAND, FRIST, LINCOLN, DASCHLE, KERREY, GREGG, and BAYH—and more Senators may join in our effort.

I commend Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator LANDRIEU for their support of the TWW concept and look forward to working with them to find an adequate level of funding for this important program.

There are other issues, of course, for which I have a great deal of interest, including the funding for the PILT program and funding for historic preservation efforts.

However, probably the largest outstanding issue—and the potential show stopper—for all of us who want to find a compromise conservation proposal is identifying whether we have room in the budget to increase funding for conservation.

The recent mid-session review paints a rosy picture of our current economic situation and I believe that targeted tax relief and paying down the publicly held debt must be our top priorities. However, I also believe that within the context of a balanced budget, the new economic projections give us room to consider modestly increasing funding for domestic priorities, such as conservation.

Again, we have an opportunity this year to find a bipartisan compromise which will ensure adequate funding for conservation, restoration, and preservation efforts across this country. I again commend Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator LANDRIEU for their bipartisan effort and look forward to working with them in the coming weeks and month to craft a bill which can pass this body and which will, in fact, be signed by the President of the United States.

I yield such time as I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for those remarks, and again for his hard work in getting us to this point.

I would like to yield, if I can, 4 minutes to my colleague from Arkansas, for her remarks on this bill as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank the Chair.

I also want to thank my colleague from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Chairman MURKOWSKI, for their fabulous leadership on this issue.

I rise today in support of greater funding for land and wildlife conservation programs as embodied in S. 25, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation to ensure that a portion of the revenues from outer continental shelf oil and gas production are dedicated to land, water, and wildlife conservation programs throughout the U.S. It is well past time that the Land and Water Conservation Fund is permanently funded and used as originally intended to provide for state and federal land purchases and to help states with conservation and recreation needs. We need consistent, dependable funding for federal, state, and local governments to make investments in land preservation, habitat conservation, and wildlife management.

I know in my home state of Arkansas, this funding is badly needed for protection of exiting wildlife habitat and conservation programs as well as for funding additional conservation and recreation needs. Since inception, the state and federal sides of the Land and Water Conservation Fund have combined to provide Arkansas with over \$84 million in targeted land purchases for preservation of tracts of forested lands, purchases of needed land for state and municipal parks, lands for schools, land for baseball fields, bike trails, zoos, and recreation areas. The federal side of the LWCF has provided resources for needed land purchases in the Ozark and Ouachita National Forests, White River and Cache River National Wildlife Refuges, the Buffalo National River, and for preserving many other tracts of land. The state side of the LWCF has provided land for a ball park in Bentonville, a school park in Jonesboro, a zoo in Little Rock, a swimming pool in Searcy, a city park in Woodruff County, and for over 600 other projects across my home state. And there are still many needs for these resources. Funds are needed for in-holdings purchases in State and national forest and to assist rural communities with building parks for children and to help urban areas with preserving needed green space.

S. 25 would also create a permanent source of funding for state-run wildlife conservation programs. Title III of the bill will help state agencies identify and prevent species from being listed under the Endangered Species Act. In Arkansas, about 86 percent of all wildlife species are not pursued for sport or consumption, nor listed as threatened or endangered. It is these species that title III of S. 25 is targeted toward. There is currently no reliable, dedicated funding source for conservation, recreation or education programs for these non-game species. Title III will provide this necessary funding.

Two examples are the Swainson's warbler, traditionally found in the bottomland hardwoods of my home state, and the barn owl, traditionally found across my state's delta. The Swainson's Warbler can still be found in certain places in the Delta region of Arkansas, but is rapidly declining throughout its range due primarily to loss of its bottomland hardwood habitat. Funding from Title III of S. 25 will help head off the potential future listing of the Swainson's Warbler as threatened or endangered by increasing the amount of suitable habitat through a combination of management actions on public lands and habitat incentives for private lands.

The barn owl has been a traditional predator feeding almost exclusively on rodents that are agricultural pests. This owl has persisted in the Arkansas delta despite low population levels for years. The barn owl responds well to artificial nest boxes that could be erected on a large scale with funds provided, under Title III, especially if this effort were combined with an intensive landowner educational campaign. Both of these prevention programs can be accomplished easily under Title III of S. 25 without the disruptions and restrictions that would occur with a listing under the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. President, I could go on and on about the good things that land and wildlife conservation programs have done in the past and can continue to do into the future for all of Arkansas—the projects are too numerous to list—but I want to make clear that the programs in title II and title III of S. 25 are necessary sources of funding for states and localities to complete needed, targeted land purchases for conservation and to prevent to continual decline of wildlife throughout my home state and this Nation.

These are great examples of what this bill can do for States such as Arkansas and many others. I join my colleagues in support of what Senator LANDRIEU and Chairman MURKOWSKI are doing, and I look forward to seeing the bill on the floor where we can certainly see it pass in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Arkansas for describing with such enthusiasm what this bill brings to her State of Arkansas and to all of our States.

Let me take the remainder of my time to recap for a moment and to speak from the Louisiana perspective as one of the producing States and share with this Congress and with the Senate some of our perspectives.

First of all, as the majority leader said, this bill is a historic effort to provide a permanent and steady stream of revenue to do several important things: To fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund; to provide a reliable

stream of money for wildlife wetlands habitat preservation; and to provide much-needed revenue for the coastal impact assistance.

We are also hoping to include some funding for historic preservation and urban park initiatives.

From the Louisiana perspective, you may not realize that over 80 percent of the Federal oil and gas that is produced annually from the Outer Continental Shelf is produced from waters adjacent to the State of Louisiana.

The onshore activities that support the Federal OCS development in the Gulf of Mexico occur largely within the boundaries of our State. Mississippi contributes to that, as well as Texas.

Almost all of the oil and gas produced from the gulf moves through the State of Louisiana in pipelines thousands and thousands of miles in length—delivering oil to refineries and to natural gas distribution systems throughout our Nation.

We are happy to do our part to help this Nation in its need for energy supply. However, we can no longer abide by the Federal Government's unwillingness to share even a portion of these revenues with our State to help offset the adverse environmental impact and the public service impact on Louisiana.

That view is shared by Mississippi, Alaska, Texas, and others. Let me explain.

The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 provides that 50 percent of the revenues received by the Federal Government for the development of oil and gas and other minerals on shore will be shared with States in which those minerals are produced. Some of our interior States benefit from that arrangement.

In addition, because the Federal minerals are within the geographic boundaries of particular States, the State has the power over and above that sharing of 50 percent to collect a severance tax on the production and payment in lieu of taxes from the Federal Government for the acres of Federal land used for this endeavor.

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, which governs the production of Federal oil and gas minerals on the Outer Continental Shelf, however, contains no similar provision. In fact, from 1940, when this production began, until 1986, the State of Louisiana and other coastal States received no portion of these oil and gas revenues. Not until 1986 were we able to receive a very small portion of those revenues generated between a 3-mile and 6-mile line.

Just yesterday, however, exploration officials from British Petroleum announced the discovery of the largest deep-water find in history 125 miles southeast of New Orleans. The under-water find is dubbed "Crazy Horse." It was discovered in 6,000 feet of water.

Imagine the kind of equipment that is going to take to mine this kind of

find. We are happy to do this. The industry provides economic opportunity.

But can you imagine providing the infrastructure in your State, for a construction company building hundreds of skyscrapers such as this in your backyard? These underwater skyscrapers all have to be built and parts manufactured and moved to the site. All of this material moves through the fragile environment of coastal Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

If this monument, or if this structure, were out of the water to be seen, it would be as if you stacked the Washington Monument end to end 10 times. It is the kind of structure that has to be built to mine these sorts of finds in the gulf.

In 1998, Federal mineral development from offshore totaled approximately \$2.8 billion. That is what we sent to the Federal Government. Yet we only received \$20 million. That is less than a tenth of 1 percent.

Let me state that again—a tenth of 1 percent is what Louisiana was able to retain. Other States retained 50 percent. In addition, they received other payments. This situation is obviously not just; it is unfair, and this bill attempts to help correct that inequity.

As a result of OCS activity, Louisiana has suffered a significant negative environmental impact. We have lost over 1,000 square miles of coastal wetlands over the last 50 years. If we don't take action today, we are liable to lose another 1,000 square miles more in the next 50 years.

To bring this down to size, we lose a football field every day. We lose an area the size of the State of Rhode Island every year.

These losses are partially due to natural erosion but are aggravated by the way we have levied the Mississippi River, which, again, serves as a port for our entire Nation and not just our State, and it is also impacted by the activities associated with oil and gas drilling.

The people of Louisiana, while understanding that this is very important and this is a national asset—and, again, we are happy for the industry and want to promote an environmentally sensitive way of drilling as we know it today—believe that we should be more justly compensated for these impacts.

The distribution formula in S. 25 is weighted to provide an extra portion to those six States with Federal offshore oil production. We are not giving any incentive for future production. We want this to be a drilling-neutral bill, if you will, but a revenue-sharing bill that acknowledges the contribution made by our producing States.

As proposed in S. 25, Louisiana will only receive 10 percent of the Federal revenues that are generated. Again, historically, we have received less than one-tenth of 1 percent. Historically and

to date in the law, the interior States have received 50 percent. We are asking for our fair share and modest share of this money, and S. 25 outlines a 10-percent portion.

The cosponsors of S. 25 believe it is appropriate to share a portion of Federal OCS revenues with coastal States that do not and will not have any offshore oil production.

Today there is no dedicated source of funding for the variety of coastal environmental problems that are being experienced around the Nation, even in those States that are not producing. S. 25 recognizes that the producing States should be acknowledged and those States which are nonproducing also have challenges with their coastline—beach erosion, et cetera.

When Congress created the Land and Water Conservation Fund over 30 years ago, it was intended "to provide a steady revenue stream to preserve irreplaceable lands of natural beauty and unique recreational value." Royalties from offshore oil and gas leases will provide the money, giving the program an interesting symmetry. Dollars raised from depleting one natural resource would be used to protect another."

This, unfortunately, has not come true. These moneys were given but taken away. They were appropriated in different amounts over the years. This bill will attempt to use the dollars produced by depleting one natural resource to preserve many areas of natural beauty in our Nation, both on the coast and in our interior States.

This is an important bill for Louisiana and the gulf coast, but it is important for the entire Nation. Our legacy as leaders will be the land we leave to our children and their children. At the rate we are going, we might not have very much to give them.

This bill will give us a steady stream of revenue to provide full funding for our land and water conservation, to give much-needed resources for our coastal States to mitigate some of this negative impact and also to share justly with the other States in our Nation.

I thank the Chair for allowing us to have this time today. I, again, thank the majority leader and the chairman, and to the 20 or more sponsors we have for this legislation. It is my hope that we can mark this up shortly and move this bill through the process.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reserving the right to object, we were supposed to be in the policy committee starting at 12:30 p.m.

The Senator from Alabama.

CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, S. 25, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, offers a unique opportunity for the entire nation to enjoy the tangible benefits of Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas production. It redirects a portion of royalties from Outer Continental Shelf production directly back to States and local communities for environmental and conservation programs.

The effect of this bill will be to provide States and local communities funding to expand and maintain parks and to enhance hunting, fishing and other outdoor recreational activities.

In addition, this bill would redirect a portion of Outer Continental Shelf Royalties back to the States which have endured the risks of production through the bill's Coastal Impact Assistance program. This program will provide dedicated funding to coastal States for air quality, water quality and to mitigate the environmental effects of Outer Continental Shelf infrastructure developments.

Alabama might use these funds to help ensure water quality in Mobile Bay, part of the National Estuary Program, and for the preservation and restoration of oyster beds and other sensitive environments areas along our coast. States may choose to establish a protected trust fund, as Alabama has with existing state royalties, in order to use the revenues in perpetuity for environmental and conservation purposes.

Alabama is one of only six States with active Outer Continental Shelf natural gas production off its shore and onshore infrastructure to refine and transport those resources. Alabama ranks ninth in the country for natural gas production and produced over 430 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 1994. There are four onshore refineries and numerous natural gas pipelines to process Outer Continental Shelf natural gas. The State has made a significant investment in providing the land and infrastructure to handle this production, yet has not been able to enjoy any direct royalty benefits from Outer Continental Shelf production.

This bill takes a step towards ensuring Alabama and the entire nation receive at least a part of the direct benefits of Outer Continental Shelf production.

I commend the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, for their tremendous leadership on this issue and look forward to the passage of this bill soon.

I express my appreciation to Senators MURKOWSKI and LANDRIEU for working on this legislation. I have worked with them from the beginning. It has good potential to allow States to retain some of the oil and gas money for remediating environmental damage