Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate resume the consideration of H. J. Res. 82 and the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 235), was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, November 18, 1999, through Monday, November 22, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it shall stand adjourned until noon on Thursday, December 2, 1999 (unless it receives a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in the conference report to accompany H. J. Res. 82 in which case the House shall stand adjourned sine die, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, and that when the Senate adjourns on any day from Thursday, November 18, 1999, through Thursday, December 2, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by the Majority Leader or his designee, it shall stand adjourned sine die, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution.

Sec. 2. When the House convenes for the second session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, it shall conduct no organizational or legislative business on that day and, when the House adjourns on that day, it shall stand adjourned until noon on January 27, 2000, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution.

Sec. 3. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leaders of the House and Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Sec. 4. The Congress declares that clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, authorizes for the duration of the One Hundred Sixth Congress the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively, to receive messages from the President during the period when the House and Senate are not in session, and thereby preserve until adjournment sine die of the final regular session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress the constitutional prerogative of the House and Senate to reconsider vetoed measures in light of the objections of the President, since the availability of the Clerk and the Secretary during any earlier adjournment of either House during the current Congress does not prevent the return to the President of any bill presented to him for approval.

Sec. 5. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall inform the President of the United States of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

Passed the House of Representatives November 18, 1999.

Further Continuing Appropriations, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate resume the consideration of H. J. Res. 82 and the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. LOTT. Therefore, at least one further vote will occur yet tonight. In addition, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 10 a.m. and hopefully process some legislative items that have been cleared and that would be considered by the House.

The Senate could also consider the Work Incentives conference report. Therefore votes can be expected to occur during the session of the Senate on Friday. We will stay in close touch with both sides of the aisle to see when the best time might be for that. We will try to accommodate as many Senators as possible and stack them if we need to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: SEC. __. DISPOSAL OF EXCESS SPOIL AND COAL MINE WASTE.

(a) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any regulation or court ruling), hereafter—

(1) in rendering permit decisions for discharge of excess spoil and coal mine waste into waters of the United States from surface coal mining and reclamation operations, the permitting authority shall apply section 304 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) and the section 404(b)(1) guidelines pursuant to section 404(b)(1) of the
Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), including implementing regulations set forth in part 230 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on October 19, 1999);

(2) the permitted disposal of such spoil or waste, meeting the requirements of the section 404(b)(1) guidelines referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to satisfy the criteria for granting a variance under regulations set forth in sections 136.57 and 137.57 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, and applicable State regulations; and

(3) Federal water quality standards shall not apply to the portions of waters filled by discharges permitted pursuant to the procedures set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2); all applicable Federal and State water quality standards shall apply to all portions of waters other than those filled pursuant to the permitting procedures set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) DURATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The permitting procedures specified in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until the later of

(1) the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is 2 years after the date of termination of the effectiveness of this Act, shall remain in effect unless repealed by law repealing or terminating the effectiveness of this Act, or

(c) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section modifies, supersedes, undermines, displaces, or amends any requirement of, or regulation issued under, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the “Clean Water Act”) (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.), as applied by the responsible Federal agencies on October 19, 1999.

(d) PERIOD OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law repealing or terminating the effectiveness of this Act, this section shall remain in effect until the date of termination of the effectiveness of the permitting procedures in accordance with subsection (b).

SEC. 17. MILLITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of section 1000(a)(3) of division B of the Act enacting H.R. 3194 of the 106th Congress (commonly known as the “Clean Water Act”) (33 U.S.C. 1388 et seq.) or the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (Public Law 106-31) shall be construed as an explicit or tacit adoption, ratification, endorsement, approval, rejection, or disapproval of the opinion, the decision, and the order of the United States District Court for the District of Montana concerning the Millsites opinion, the following shall apply:

(i) MILLITES OPINION.—No funds shall be expended by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, to limit the number or acreage of millsites based on the ratio between the number or acreage of millsites and the number or acreage of associated lode or placer claims with respect to—

(A) any patent application excluded from the operation of section 112 of the Department of the Interior Appropriations Act, 1995, by section 113 of that Act (108 Stat. 2519);

(B) any operation or property for which a plan of operation or plan of reclamation has been approved before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(C) any operation or property for which a plan of operations, or amendment or modification of a plan, was submitted to the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service before May 21, 1999.

(2) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section excludes, alters, or amends the statutory authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to issue final regulations that controlled then were superseded, undermined, displaces, or amends any requirement of, or regulation issued under, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the “Clean Water Act”) or the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 as applied by the responsible Federal agencies—

Which are the agencies of this administration—

on October 19, 1999.

So there it is. The amendment has been misrepresented. There has been much misinformation about this amendment.

Mr. President, I close by thanking those who have cosponsored this amendment with me. Their names are on the amendment.

How much time have I used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2½ minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield myself another minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time was 5 minutes equally divided, which is 2½ minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak another minute and a half.

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

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

The amendment is proposed by Mr. BYRD, for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENTON, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CHAPo, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. KYL.—I thank all those Senators who supported this amendment and others who will vote for it. Particularly I want to
recognize the efforts of my chief co-sponsor, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, whose early and strong support of this amendment is given to this amendment, for which I am extremely grateful. I thank both leaders for making this vote possible. I could speak longer, but I have said enough already. I urge all Senators to vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from West Virginia. I appreciate his leadership not only on behalf of the coal miners of Kentucky but miners all across America.

The President of the United States came to Hazard, KY, this summer. He bit his lip; he felt our pain. He said he wanted coal to stay but a dump was not the way to go. As to the opportunity came to support the Byrd amendment which would at least keep the jobs we have now. The President would not support him.

This administration is trying to destroy the mining industry in America, make no mistake about it. That is what this amendment is about.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership, and we hope very much our colleagues will be able to support us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I hope other Senators will want to speak in opposition. I think there should be opposition to this amendment. I have tremendous respect for my colleagues who have offered this amendment. I will say a couple of words in response to the Senator from Kentucky.

I am a Senator who cares a great deal about workers and about mine workers. I am a Senator who appreciates the sentiment behind this amendment. But the question is, What happens when the strip mining takes place, and what are the consequences for the people who live in these communities?

I can speak certainly from what I have seen in eastern Kentucky, and it is pretty awful when that leftover rock and the mine waste is dumped into the streams. Many of the people have the wealth taken away from them, but they still have the land, they still have the streams, they still have the water, and now we see that kind of devastation.

My concern is this amendment will create a loophole to the Clean Water Act. I know my colleague from West Virginia believes otherwise, but it is a very real concern. I point out to colleagues that it is my understanding the Federal district judge put a stay on his own decision while it was being appealed to the court of appeals. So it is not operative right now.

I do not know why we are taking this action tonight. It is a big mistake from an environmental point of view, and I do believe the tradeoff from Kentucky, the tradeoff that he presents as to workers versus some protection for the environment and some concern about the strip mining.

I did not want to be the person to speak in opposition, but I do believe there is another perspective. I will vote no.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I know what is in this amendment. I prepared this amendment. I have been explaining it now for weeks. And, upon my previous statements that undermines or undercut the Clean Water Act or the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, both of which I supported, one of which I called up as majority leader in this Senate in 1977.

This administration is trying to destroy the mining industry in America, make no mistake about it. That is what this amendment is about. I have lived under a coal miner’s roof, ate from a coal miner’s table, slept in a coal miner’s bed. I have known the joys and the sorrows of coal miners. I married a coal miner’s daughter. I know what I am talking about. I haven’t just made a trip into West Virginia and come back to Washington to issue a news report on the State and its people. I have lived there for many years.

I will be 82 years old the day after tomorrow. I know what those miners need. I am not misleading anybody. Let me say this to the Senator: That stay he refers to that the judge put on has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis. The judge stated that it has no legal basis.

I hope Senators will vote for this amendment. There were 125,000 coal miners when I went to the House of Representatives; 125,000 in West Virginia. Today there are 20,000 or less. My dad was a coal miner. My wife’s sister’s husband died with black lung. My wife’s sister’s husband’s father died under a slate fall. I know the joys and the sorrows of the mining people. I have helped to carry those miners, the heavy coffins, on the steep hillsides of West Virginia. I have not just gone into those hills poking around, and then coming back, and issuing news reports about their poverty. I know what they need, because I am one of them.

Those 20,000 coal miners earn their bread in the sweat of their brow. Let’s give them a vote. If the Senator from Minnesota had people who were faced with the loss of their jobs, this Senator would vote with the Senator from Minnesota and not say a word about it. I resent anything as has been said by the Senator about my State and its people.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have 1 minute to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I appreciate the words of my colleague. It is an honest difference of interpretation of the amendment.

The only thing I want to respond to is I do not want to be personal, but I would like to say to my colleague, I do not pretend to know West Virginia like you know West Virginia and Senator Rockefeller does; that is not the position I am taking, but as to the bopping in and bopping out, I will say that I want my colleague to know I have spent quite a bit of time in eastern Kentucky. That is where my wife’s family is from. Her grandparents were all coal miners. I have spent time in east Tennessee as well. I spent a lot of time with people. I have seen what the strip mining has done to those communities. I am just expressing my honest views about it.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I join many others in this body in expressing my support for miners and for mining communities. In Virginia’s Southwest region, mining creates the jobs that provide enough income to lift the next generation, that put the sons and daughters of miners through college, and that gives the region options other than coal.

Virginia miners have expressed deep concerns that the broad application of Judge Haden’s ruling would result in the devastation of the mining industry in the Southern Appalachian coal region. The Judge’s decision is limited to the mountain top mining that was the subject of the original suit. It would apply to the use of valley fills from other forms of mining, including underground mining. The practical effect of this ruling is a virtual moratorium on mining in mountainous regions. We need to protect the environment and we also need to protect the livelihood of those hardworking families. I had hoped we could reach a compromise on this issue that would effectively mitigate the consequences of valley fills if they were allowed to continue.

I have reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding between the federal and state agencies that could be used to mitigate the consequences of valley fills if they were allowed to continue. It was signed by the EPA, Department of the Interior, Army Corps of Engineers, and the State of West Virginia. All the signatories are sworn to protect the nation’s water. I am convinced that if the MOU stood, the agencies involved would work diligently to mitigate any negative consequences from mining in the West Virginia coal fields. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we continue to be vigilant on the effects of mining...
in the environment, and work to mini-
mize its effects.

I have reviewed Judge Haden’s ruling and see in that ruling the under-
lying conflict between what the regula-
tions intend to do, and the actual costs
of applying those regulations. It dem-
onstrates once again how essential act-
ing on regulatory reform is going to be
in this Congress. It is imperative that we
set in place a method of analyzing the
ture cost of the regulations, before they
are put into place. I am certain the agen-
cies involved want to do the right thing, by both miners and the en-
vironment. The rules as I read them
make that virtually impossible. I am
hopeful that this conflict can be re-
solved as quickly as possible. In the
meantime, I intend to support the min-
ers of Southwest Virginia.

I must therefore voice my strong op-
opposition to the language on hard rock
mining that has been added at the last
minute to this amendment. My vote on
this amendment stems only from my con-
cern for the immediate effect Judge
Haden’s ruling would have on the econ-
omy of Southwest Virginia. I have op-
posed and will continue to oppose ef-
forts to delay the review and revision
of the Clean Water Act.

The rules as I read them
make that virtually impossible. I am
hopeful that this conflict can be re-
solved as quickly as possible. In the
meantime, I intend to support the min-
ers of Southwest Virginia.

I must therefore voice my strong op-
opposition to the language on hard rock
mining that has been added at the last
minute to this amendment. My vote on
this amendment stems only from my con-
cern for the immediate effect Judge
Haden’s ruling would have on the econ-
omy of Southwest Virginia. I have op-
posed and will continue to oppose ef-
forts to delay the review and revision
of the Clean Water Act.

This is a matter of survival for many
other States like my own State of Ken-
tucky as well.

We need to pass the Byrd Amend-
ment to stay this ruling until we have
had time to get the results of a pending
environmental impact statement.

It is a matter of simple fairness. The
jobs and lives of many of our constitu-
ents are at stake.

I urge my colleagues to support the
Byrd amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I voted in
support of the Byrd amendment to pro-
vide for a 2-year moratorium during
which mountain top mining activities
may continue under a memorandum of
agreement with the Environmental
Protection Agency, the Department of
Interior and the Army Corps of Engi-
neers. The EPA which is in charge of
implementation of the Clean Water Act
was a party to the agreement which
would continue to force during the 2-
year moratorium. An environmental
impact study will go forward during the
moratorium and regulations pursuant
to the agreement which can be promul-
gated. My vote on this amendment does not commit me
to support the continuation of any
moratorium beyond this 2-year period
during which the courts and the regu-
lar agencies will more fully evaluate the
impacts on both the environ-
ment and the affected coal miners
and their communities. The fact that
the court has stayed the effect of its
own opinion is further evidence that
this legislative moratorium is both
warranted and will do no damage to
the underlying act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ma-
jority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, has all
time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time
called.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unan-
ious consent that I be allowed to offer
an amendment at this time on behal-
of Senators HELMS and EDWARDS
of North Carolina with regard to funds
for their disaster. And I ask unanimous
consent that that vote occur in a
stacked sequence, after it is debated,
after the vote on the amendment by
Senator BYRD and Senator MCCONNELL,
and that the first vote be just 10 min-
utes, and then the second vote would
be 10 minutes also.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send to
the desk then the amendment on behalf
of Senators HELMS and EDWARDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk
will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT],
for Mr. HELMS and Mr. EDWARDS, proposes an
amendment numbered 2781.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-
OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATION VERSATILITY

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall
reduce the amount of any principal due on
a loan made to a marketing association incor-
porated in the State of North Carolina
for the 1999 crop of an agricultural com-
mmodity by at least 75 percent if the market-
ing association suffered losses of the agricul-
tural commodity in a county with respect to
which it is a party to a natural disaster was declared
by the Secretary for losses due to Hurricane Dennis,
Floyd, or Irene; or (2) a major dis-
aster or emergency was declared by the
President for losses due to Hurricane Dennis,
Floyd, or Irene under the Robert T. Stafford
Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance
Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for
the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity
marketed by an association described in sub-
section (a) that is below the grade quality of
the agricultural commodity, the Secretary
shall compensate the association for losses
incurred by the association as a result of the
reduction in grade quality.

Up to $81,000,000 of the resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used
for the cost of this provision. Provided, That
the amount is designated by the Con-
gress as an emergency requirement pursuant
to section 251(b)(2)(A) and Section 252(e) of
the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit
Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 2. In administering $50,000,000 in emer-
gency supplemental funding for the Emer-
gency Conservation Program, the Secretary
shall give priority to the repair of structures
essential to the operation of the farm.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am hon-
ored they would allow me to do this on
their behalf because I believe they were
not treated properly in the wee hours
of the morning with regard to an
amount of money for disaster assist-
ance for North Carolina. We are deter-
mined to assist them in getting that.

We hope this will be accepted by the
House in this form. But if not in this
form, we will be back to carry out our
commitment to the people in North
Carolina and as a symbol to people all
across America that, when it comes to
disasters, there are no party lines and
the no division of the Capitol; we will do what is necessary to help
people when they are desperate and
need help.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for
this amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for
the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a
sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for
the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a
sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-
tion is on agreeing to amendment
No. 2780. 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 Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Frist), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Lautenberg), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Smith) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote “yea.”

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Lautenberg), and the Senator from New York (Mr. Moynihan) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 1, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akaka</td>
<td>Feingold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allard</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayh</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaux</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleland</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWine</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodd</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenici</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorgan</td>
<td>Feinsteiin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amendment (No. 2781) was agreed to. Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the joint resolution having been read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table. The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82), as amended, was passed.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 77

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation’s achievements in aeronautics and space during Fiscal Year (FY) 1998, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities involved 14 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the results of their ongoing research and development affect the Nation in many ways. A wide variety of aeronautics and space developments took place during FY 1998. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) successfully completed five Space Shuttle flights. There were 29 successful expendable launch vehicle (ELV) launches in FY 1998. Of those, 3 were NASA-managed missions, 2 were NASA-funded/Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-licensed missions, 8 were Department of Defense (DOD)-managed missions, and 16 were FAA-licensed commercial launches. Scientists also made some dramatic new discoveries in various space-related fields such as space science, Earth science, and remote sensing, and life and microgravity science. In aeronautics, activities included work on high-speed research, advance subsonic technology, and technologies designed to improve the safety and efficiency of our commercial airlines and air traffic control system.

Close international cooperation with Russia occurred on the Shuttle-Mir docking missions and on the ISS program. The United States also entered into new forms of cooperation with its partners in Europe, South America, and Asia. Thus, FY 1998 was a very successful one for U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in these areas have contributed significantly to the Nation’s scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, a healthier environment, and a more competitive economy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 18, 1999.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

At 3:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the