MOYNIHAN has led the effort to reverse this trend.

It has been a pleasure to work in a bipartisan coalition with Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN. He has demonstrated that good public policy results from cooperation among Democrats and Republicans. His intellectual rigor and his demand for quality data have elevated policy discussions within both the Northeast-Midwest Coalition and throughout the entire United States Senate.

My colleagues from northeastern and midwestern states join me in thanking Senator MOYNIHAN for his consistent leadership and effective advocacy.

TIME TO STRENGTHEN HARDROCK MINING REGULATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have strongly advocated strengthening so-called 3809 regulations, which governs hardrock mining on public lands. However, attempts to update these regulations have been subject to much debate.

I am pleased to see that the Interior conference report included a compromise provision related to the regulations, which should allow the BLM to move forward with their efforts to better protect taxpayers and the environment from the impacts of the hardrock mining industry.

However, I am concerned about recent statements made by my colleagues, Senators REID and GORTON, which I feel distort the intent of the provision and would weaken the 3809 regulations. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify my understanding of the meaning of this provision.

To paraphrase the language of the bill text included in the conference report, the mining provision permits the BLM to prevent undue degradation of public lands with a new and stronger rule governing hardrock mining on public lands. The only requirement is that the rule be ''not inconsistent with'' the recommendations contained in a study completed by the National Research Council, or NRC.

I agree with the Department of the Interior's interpretation that the key phrase ''not inconsistent with'' means that so long as the final mining rule does not contradict the recommendations of the NRC report, the rule can address whatever subject areas the BLM finds necessary to improve environmental oversight of the hardrock mining industry.

For example, one of the recommendations made in the NRC report would clarify the BLM's authority to protect valuable natural resources not protected by other laws. Given that recommendation, it would be ''not inconsistent with'' the report to issue a rule that would allow the disapproval of a mine proposal if it would cause undue degradation of public lands, even if the proposal complied with all other statutes and regulations. The final mining provision included in the report would permit such a rule.

However, during earlier negotiations of the hardrock mining provision, mining proponents attempted to include language that would have effectively undermined the ability of the BLM to strengthen the 3809 regulations. This original language would have bound any final rule published by the BLM to the recommendations of the NRC report. This means that a final rule could only address those recommendations made by the report and nothing else, regardless of what actions the BLM identified as necessary. The original language is as follows:

BILL TEXT

None of the funds in this Act or any other Act shall be used by the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate final rules to revise 43 CFR subpart 3809, except that the Secretary, following the public comment period required by section 3002 of Public Law 106–31, may issue final rules to amend 43 CFR Subpart 3809 which are not inconsistent with the recommendations contained in the National Research Council report entitled ''Hardrock Mining on Federal Lands'' so long as these regulations are also not inconsistent with existing statutory authorities. Nothing in this section shall be construed to expand the existing statutory authority of the Secretary.

REPORT LANGUAGE

Section xxx allows the Bureau of Land Management to promulgate new hardrock mining regulations that are not inconsistent with the National Research Council Report entitled ''Hardrock Mining on Federal Lands.'' This provision reinstates a requirement that was included in Public Law 106–113. In that Act, Congress authorized changes to the hardrock mining regulations that are ''not inconsistent with'' the Report. The statutory requirement was based on a consensus reached among Committee Members and the Administration. On December 8, 1999, the Interior Solicitor wrote an opinion concluding that this requirement applies only to a few lines of the Report, and that it imposes no significant restrictions on the Bureau's final rulemaking authority. This opinion is contrary to the intentions of the Committee and to the understanding reached among the parties in FY2000. The Committee clearly intended Interior to be guided and bound by the findings and recommendations of the Report. Accordingly, the statutory language is included again in this Report and this action should not be interpreted as a ratification of the Solicitor's opinion. The Committee emphasizes that it intends for the Bureau to adopt changes to its rules at 43 CFR part 3809 only if those changes are called for in the NRC report.

Fortunately, this original language did not stand because it was so limiting. In fact, President Clinton threatened to veto the entire Interior Appropriations bill if the mining provision unduly restricted the ability of the BLM to update the regulations. The improved, final language indicates that the intent is not to limit the BLM's authority to strengthen the hardrock mining regulations.

The Interior Department has been working for years to update the 3809 regulations after numerous review and comments from BLM task forces, congressional committee hearings, public meetings, consultation with the states and interest groups, and public review of drafts of the proposed regulations. There is no longer any reason to delay improving these regulations.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TERRORISM ACT

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, as an original sponsor of the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act, I wish to make clear that the reference to June 7, 1999 in the anti-terrorism section of H.R. 3244 is intended to refer to the case of Thomas M. Sutherland.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on September 19, I submitted for the RECORD, a list of objectionable provisions in the FY 2001 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill. Mr. President, these line items do not violate any of the five objective criteria I use for identifying spending that was not reviewed in the appropriate merit-based prioritization process, and I regret they were included on my list. They are as follows:

$472,176,000 for construction projects at the following locations:

California, Los Angeles, U.S. Courthouse;

District of Columbia, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Headquarters;

Florida, Saint Petersburg, Combined Law Enforcement Facility;

Maryland, Montgomery County, Food and Drug;

Administration Consolidation;

Michigan, Sault St. Marie, Border Station;

Mississippi, Biloxi-Gulfport, U.S. Courthouse;

Montana, Eureka/Roosville, Border Station;

Virginia, Richmond, U.S. Courthouse;

Washington, Seattle, U.S. Courthouse.

Repairs and alterations:

Arizona: Phoenix, Federal Building Courthouse, $26,962,000;

California: Santa Ana, Federal Building, $27,864,000;

District of Columbia: Internal Revenue Service Headquarters;

(Phase 1), $31,780,000, Main State Building (Phase 3), $28,775,000;

Maryland: Woodlawn, SSA National Computer Center, $4,285,000;

Michigan: Detroit, McNamara Federal Building, $26,999,000;

Missouri: Kansas City, Richard Bolling Federal Building, $25,882,000;

Kansas City, Federal Building, 8930 Ward Parkway, $8,964,000;

Nebraska: Omaha, Zorinsky Federal Building, $45,960,000;

New York: New York City, 40 Foley Square, $5,037,000;

Ohio: Cincinnati, Potter Stewart U.S. Courthouse, $18,434,000;

Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh, U.S. Post Office-Courthouse, $54,144,000;