They are now in the park as inholdings and therefore cannot be managed by the park but cannot be used for anything else. Therefore, we have two lessees: One is the park which has these inholdings it cannot handle; second is the school sections are to finance education, and they are not bringing in revenue to the State of Wyoming.

To make a long story short, I have a bill I hope will be before the committee soon to allow the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Wyoming to come to some agreement in finding a value for those lands by using an appraiser upon which they agree and then work out an arrangement to either trade those lands for other Federal lands outside the park, trade them for mineral royalties, or sell but come to some financial arrangement.

I hope is get some support for something that will be useful to Grand Teton National Park as well as the State of Wyoming.

I think our time has expired. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1077, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1077) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today, the Senate is debating S. 1077, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

On June 1, 2001, President Bush asked Congress to consider a supplemental request for $6.5 billion, primarily for the Department of Defense. The draft supplemental bill that is before us totals $6.5 billion, not one dime above the President's request—not one thin dime above the President's request. It contains no emergency funding. The President has said that he will not support such emergency spending, so the Committee has not included any emergency designations in this bill. Unrequested items in the bill are offset.

S. 1077 funds the President's request for additional defense spending for health care, for military pay and benefits, for missile defense, for natural gas and other utilities, for increased military flying hours, and for other purposes. The bill includes a net increase of $5.54 billion for the Department of Defense and $291 million for defense-related programs of the Department of Energy.

While the Appropriations Committee has approved most of the President's request for the Department of Defense, I stress the importance of accountability for these and future funds. Financial accountability remains one of the weakest links in the Defense Department's budget process. Just last month, the General Accounting Office reported that, of $1.1 billion earmarked for military pay in the fiscal year 1999 supplemental, only about $88 million could be tracked to the purchase of spare parts. The remaining $1 billion, or 92 percent of the appropriation, was transferred to operations and maintenance accounts. Where the tracking process broke down.

Perhaps a substantial portion of the money appropriated for spare parts was spent on spare parts; perhaps it was not. But, given the way the money was managed, nobody knows for sure and that, it seems to me, is an unacceptable circumstance, because one thing we do know for sure is that an adequate inventory of spare parts is a key component of readiness and the Defense Department apparently does not have an adequate inventory of spare parts. So we must do better in making sure these dollars for spare parts go for spare parts.

The supplemental funding bill before us today includes not less than $30 million for spare parts, this time specifically for the Army. As former President Reagan would have said, here we go again. To forestall a repeat of the problems that arose in accounting for spare parts expenditures provided in the fiscal year 1996 supplemental, the committee, at my request, approved report language requiring the Secretary of Defense to follow the money and to provide Congress with a complete accounting of all supplemental funds appropriated for spare parts. The intent of this provision is to ensure that money appropriated by Congress for the purchase of spare parts does not get shifted into any other program.

The supplemental appropriations bill before us includes not less than $30 million for the Low Income Energy Assistance Program, an increase of $150 million above the President's request, to help our citizens cope with high energy costs. The President appropriates $631 million that was not requested for grants to local education agencies under the Education for the Disadvantaged Program in response to the most recent poverty and expenditure data. Also provided is $100 million as an initial United States contribution to a global trust fund for AIDS, tuberculosis, and other illnesses.

In addition, $92 million requested by the President for the National Endowment for the Arts in Fiscal Year 2001 is included, as is $36 million requested by the President for the Corporation for National Service.

The Senate Appropriations Committee during the direction of cutting into the deficit. I stressed that the tax cuts were based on highly suspect ten-year surplus estimates and that if those estimates proved illusory, the tax cut bill would result in spending the Medicare surplus. Now, before the ink is even dry on the President's signature on that tax bill, we may find ourselves headed back into the deficit ditch and headed in the direction of cutting into the Medicare surplus.

Our distinguished Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, KENT CONRAD, has prepared an analysis of the budget picture for Fiscal Year 2001, the current fiscal year, based on recent economic projections from the President's own Director of the National Economic Council, Lawrence Lindsey. The tax-cut bill reduced the surplus by $74 billion in Fiscal Year 2001 alone. As a result, Chairman Conrad is projecting a raid on the Medicare Trust Fund in Fiscal Year 2001 of $17 billion.

Any efforts to increase spending in this bill without offsets will only make this problem worse.

The President asserted in his Budget Blueprint that the authority of the Congress and the President to designate funding as an emergency has been abused. The Administration has
indicated in its Statement of Administrative Policy of June 19, 2001, that the President does not intend to designate the $473 million of emergency spending contained in the House-passed bill as emergency spending.

The administration further states that, "emergency supplemental appropriations should be limited to extremely rare events." The Senate supplemental bill contains no emergency designations. Nonetheless, I do believe that it is appropriate for Congress and the President to use the emergency authority from time to time in response to natural disasters and other truly unforeseen events in the nature of disasters.

As I mentioned earlier, this supplemental appropriations bill provides immediate relief through the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP), for American families being hit hard by this energy crisis. Moreover, it includes funding to help educate our most needy students through the Education for the Disadvantaged Program. To help offset the cost of these two supplementals, a rescission of unallocated dislocated worker funds under the Workforce Investment Act was also included in the committee bill.

The States have accumulated a large, unexpended balance of dislocated worker funds due to start-up delays with the Workforce Investment Act of 1998. These funds are estimated to exceed $600 million for the program year that ended on June 30, 2001. Although the rescission of dislocated worker funds will reduce the Fiscal Year 2001 appropriation from $1.59 billion to $1.37 billion, the Labor Department projects that the carryover funds from the previous program year will more than offset the rescinded funding. Including carryover balances, the level for program year 2000.

Furthermore, report language was included in the supplemental appropriations bill expressing the Senate Appropriations Committee’s support for the Workforce Investment Act, the dislocated worker program, and the committee’s intent to carefully monitor the carryover funds and the services. Should it be determined that additional funds are needed, the Appropriations Committee will do all it can to ensure that sufficient funds are included in the Fiscal Year 2002 Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, Senator STEVENS and I will be offering a managers’ amendment that contains a number of amendments that have been agreed to by both sides. One of the items in the managers’ amendment is an amendment of mine to provide $3 million to hire additional USDA inspectors to promote the proper treatment of livestock. Another item would provide $20 million to help farm- ers in other areas of the nation, such as Oregon and California. The cost of these and other provisions contained in the managers’ amendment is fully offset.

I have noted in the press recently some stories that greatly concern me. I believe the American people are concerned and are becoming increasingly sensitive to the treatment of animals. Reports of cruelty to animals through improper livestock production and slaughter practices have hit a nerve with the American people. The recent announcements by major food outlets, such as McDonalds, that they would only buy products from suppliers that could assure certain levels of humane animal treatment speak volumes to changing public expectations.

The managers’ amendment will provide an additional $3 million through the USDA Office of the Secretary for activities across three department mission areas to protect and promote humane treatment of animals. Of the $3 million provided, no less than $1 million is directed to enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, under which standards for livestock production, laboratory animals, and so-called puppy mills are established. In addition, no less than $1 million is directed for activities under the Federal Meat Inspections Act, which will enhance humane treatment in the slaughter of animals in facilities under the jurisdiction of Federal inspection. Finally, an amount up to $500,000 is directed for the development and demonstration of technologies that can be used by producers, processors, and others to provide better care of animals at all stages of their lives.

Mr. President, I shall, in conclusion, ask unanimous consent—but not right at this point—that certain newspaper articles which have been written with respect to the slaughter of animals, and the inhumane slaughter of animals, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This bill responds to the President’s supplemental request for necessary defense spending, and it also provides funding for important domestic priorities. It will not one thinly, much-worn dime—over the President’s request. It is within the statutory spending limits. It is a responsible bill, and I urge Members to support it.

Before yielding the floor, let me express my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, who is the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee in the Senate. He is the former chairman of the committee with whom I had the great honor of serving several years in that position. And I believe it is a blessing, indeed, for me, as I stand on this floor today to present this bill, to also be able to say that Senator STEVENS and I stood shoulder to shoulder, and we shall continue to work shoulder to shoulder, as we moved forward with this legislation.

I cannot adequately express my appreciation to him and to his staff and to my own staff for the great work and excellent cooperation that have been shown in connection with the preparation and presentation of this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make his unanimous consent request at this time?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I do make that unanimous consent request.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 2001]

Two By Piece By Piece

IN OVERTAXED PLANTS, HUMAN TREATMENT OF CATTLE IS OFTEN A BATTLE LOST

(By Joby Warrick)

PASCO, WASH.—It takes 25 minutes to turn a live steer into steak at the modern slaughtering operations and processing plants. For 20 years, his post was “second-legger,” a job that entails cutting hocks off carcases as they whirl past at a rate of 699 an hour.

The cattle were supposed to be dead before they got to Moreno. But too often they weren’t.

“They blink. They make noises,” he said softly. “The head moves, the eyes are wide and looking around.”

Still Moreno would cut. On bad days, he says, dozens of animals reached his station clearly alive and conscious. Some would survive as far as the tail cutter, the belly ripper, the hide puller. “They die,” said Moreno, “piece by piece.”

Under a 25-year-old federal law, slaughtered cattle and hogs first must be “stunned”—rendered insensible to pain—blow to the head, for an electric shock. But at overtaxed plants, the law is sometimes broken, with cruel consequences for animals as well as workers. Enforcement reports, interviews, and affidavits describe repeated violations of the Humane Slaughter Act at dozens of slaughterhouses, ranging from the smallest, custom butchers to modern, automated establishments such as the sprawling IBP Inc. plant here where Moreno works.

“In plants all over the United States, this happens on a daily basis,” said Lester Friedlander, a veterinarian and formerly chief government inspector at a Pennsylvania hamburger plant. “I’ve seen it happen. And I’ve talked to other veterinarians. They feel it’s out of control.”

The U.S. Department of Agriculture oversees the treatment of animals in meat plants, but enforcement of the law varies dramatically. While a few plants have been forced to halt production for a few hours because of alleged animal cruelty, such sanctions are rare.

For example, the government took no action against a Texas beef company that was cited 22 times in 1998 for violations that included chopping of heads of live cattle. In another case, agency supervisors failed to take action on multiple complaints of animal cruelty at a Florida beef plant and fired an animal welfare technician for reporting the problems to the Humane Society. The dismissal letter sent to the technician, Tim Walker,
Among the findings:

One Texas Supreme Beef Packers in Ladonia, had 22 violations in six months. During one inspection, federal officials found nine live cattle dangling from an overhead rail, except for their necks, which announced last fall it was ceasing operations, resisted USDA warnings, saying its practices were no different than others in the industry. The company, responding to one such inspection, said: "There is no such thing as 'stunning.'" V.V. Swamy, a veterinarian and senior USDA official at the plant, wrote: The shift supervisor "allowed the cattle to be hung anywhere." IBP, which owned the plant at the time, contested the findings but "took steps to resolve the situation," including installing video equipment and increasing training, a spokesman said. IBP ran the plant.

At the Farmers Livestock Cooperative processing plant in Hawaii, inspectors documented 14 humane-slaughter violations in as many weeks. The plant had to pay $20,000 and meet other conditions, including increasing the number of humane-handling violations its inspectors find each year.

Several animal welfare groups joined in the petition.

"Privatization of meat inspection has meant a shift to the companies to the USDA for ensuring compliance," said Gail Eisnitz of the Humane Farming Association, a group that advocates better treatment of animals. "The USDA isn't simply relinquishing its humane-slaughter oversight to the meat industry, but is—without the knowledge and consent of Congress—abandoning its role altogether.

The USDA's Food Safety Inspection Service, which is responsible for meat inspection, says it has not relaxed its oversight. In January, the agency ordered a review of 100 slaughterhouses. An FSIS memo reminded its 7,600 inspectors they had an "obligation to ensure compliance with humane-handling regulations.

The review comes as pressure grows on both industry and regulators to improve conditions for the 55 million cattle, hogs, horses and sheep raised for meat in the United States by McDonald's and Burger King have been subject to boycotts by animal rights groups protesting mistreatment of livestock.

As a result, two years ago McDonald's began requiring suppliers to abide by the American Meat Institute's Good Management Practices for Animal Handling and Stunnaing. The company also began conducting annual audits of meat plants. Last week, Burger King announced it would require suppliers to follow the meat institute's standards.

"Burger King Corp. takes the issues of food safety and animal welfare very seriously, and we expect our suppliers to comply," the company said in a statement.

Industry groups acknowledge that sloppily killing has tangible consequences for consumers as well as company profits. Fear and pain at the time of death can result in meat that damage meat and cost companies tens of millions of dollars a year in discarded product, according to industry estimates.

Industry standards often do not stipulate how to kill cattle, sheep or pigs. Many animals are stunned in a process known as "knockdown" or "stunning." On most days the chamber is manned by a stainless steel wall. Here, live cattle go through a narrow chute to be dispatched in a piece of machinery. In imposing the sanction, the U.S. inspectors cited a string of violations in the previous two years, including the killing of cattle without stunning, and such "muscular reaction" can occur up to six hours after death. "None of these reactions indicate the animal is still alive," the report said. Hogs, unlike cattle, are dunked in tanks of hot water after they are stunned to soften the hide for skinning. As a result, a botted animal may have to be re-stunned, and that is a time-consuming operation. Secret videotape from an Iowa pork plant shows hogs squealing and kicking as they are being lowered into the water.

USDA documents and interviews with inspectors and plant workers attributed much of the problems to poor training, faulty or poorly maintained equipment or excessive production speeds. The problems were identified five years ago in an industry-wide audit by Temple Grandin, an assistant professor with Colorado State University's animal sciences department and one of the nation's leading experts on slaughter practices.

In the early 1990s, Grandin developed the first effective standards for treatment of animals in slaughterhouses, which were adopted by the American Meat Institute, the industry's largest trade group. Her initial survey of 14 plants revealed some of the first attempts to grade slaughter plants.

One finding was a high failure rate among beef plants that use stunning devices known as "captive-bolt" guns. Of the plants surveyed, only 36 percent earned a rating of "acceptable" or better, meaning cattle were knocked unconscious with a single blow at least 95 percent of the time.

Grandin now conducts annual surveys as a consultant for the American Meat Institute and McDonald's Corp. She maintains that the past four years have brought dramatic improvements—mostly because of pressure from McDonald's, which sends a team of meat industry auditors into dozens of plants each year to observe slaughter practices. Based on the data collected by McDonald's auditors, the portion of beef plants scoring "acceptable" or better climbed to 90 percent in 1998. Some workers and inspectors say they are skeptical of the McDonald's numbers, and Grandin said the industry's performance dropped slightly last year after auditors stopped giving numerical grade inspections.

Grandin said high production speeds can trigger problems when people and equipment and animals beyond the critical kill rate of 50 cattle an hour in the early 1990s, production speeds rose dramatically in the 1980s. They now approach 400 per hour in the newest plants.

"It's like the 'I Love Lucy' episode in the chocolate factory," she said. "You can speed up a job and speed up a job, and after a while you get to a point where performance doesn't simply decline—it crashes."

When that happens, it's not only animals that suffer. Industry trade groups acknowledge that improperly stunning can contribute to worker injuries in an industry that already has the nation's highest rate of job-related injuries and illnesses—about 27 percent per year. At some plants, inspectors are skeptical of the McDonald's numbers, and Grandin said the industry's performance dropped slightly last year after auditors stopped giving numerical grade inspections.
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shackled to a moving chain to be bled and butchered by other workers in a fast-moving production line.

The hitch, IBP workers say, is that some “stunned” cattle wake up.

“If you put a knife into the cow, it’s going to make a noise. It says, ‘Moo!’” said Moreno, the former second-legger, who began working in the stockyard last year. “They move the head and the eyes and the leg like the cow wants to walk.”

After a blow to the head, an unconscious animal may kick or twitch by reflex. But a video footage, reviewed by IBP workers and reviewed by veterinarians for The Post, depicts cattle that clearly are alive and conscious after being stunned.

Some cattle, dangling by a leg from the plant’s overhead chain, twist and arch their backs as though trying to right themselves. Close-ups show blinking reflexes, an unmistakable sign of a conscious brain, according to guidelines approved by the American Meat Institute.

The video, parts of which were aired by Seattle’s KING last spring, shows injured cattle being trampled. In one graphic scene, workers give a steer electric shocks by jamming a battery-powered prod into his back.

More than 20 workers signed affidavits alleging that the violations shown on tape are commonplace and that supervisors are aware of them. The formal statements and videos were prepared with help from the Humane Farming Association. Some workers had taken part in a 1999 strike over what they said were excessive plant production speeds.

“I’ve been in a davit. ‘The cows can get seven minutes through the slaughter process alive,’” IBP said were excessive plant production speeds. “We encourage the agency’s ability to identify problems.”

The meat inspectors’ union, in its petition last spring to Washington state’s attorney general, contended that federal agents are “often prevented from carrying out” the violations. Mandating a zero tolerance among the obstacles inspectors face are “dramatic increases in production speeds, lack of support from supervisors in plants and district offices...new policies...which significantly reduce our enforcement authority, and little to no access to the areas of the plants where animals are killed,” stated the union’s petition by the National Joint Council of Food Inspection Locals.

Barbara Masters, the agency’s director of slaughter operations, told meat industry executives in February she didn’t know if the number of violations was up or down, though she believed most plants were complying with the law. “We encourage the district offices to monitor trends,” she said. “The fact that we haven’t heard anything suggests there are no trends.”

But some inspectors see little evidence the agency is interested in hearing about problems. Under the new inspection system, the USDA stopped tracking the number of violations and dropped all mentions of humane slaughter from its list of rotating tasks for inspectors.

The agency says it expects its watchdogs to enforce the rules anyway. Many inspectors still do, though some occasionally wonder if it’s worth the trouble.

“It always comes down to: Instead of re-stunning the animal, you spend 20 minutes just talking about it,” said Colorado meat inspector Gary Dahl, sharing his private views. “Yes, the animal will be dead in a few minutes anyway. But why not let him die with dignity?”

 yakın, McDonald’s says, its suppliers will be convinced consumers to be aware of what is happening to their food before it gets to the store. That was the message delivered in February by a coterie of McDonald’s consultants to the 100-day seminar on behalf of the Humane Society of the United States, which decided in 1998 to conduct annual inspections at every plant that puts the beef into Big Macs. The chain’s observers observe how animals are treated at each stage of the process, keeping track of even minor problems such as excessive squealing or the overuse of cattle prods.

The members of McDonald’s audit team say their job is made easier by scientific evidence shows tangible economic benefits when animals are treated well. Meat from abused or frightened animals is often discolored and soft, and it spoils more quickly due to the animal secretions. The final moments of life, industry experts say.

“Humane handling results in better finished products,” AMI President Patrick Boyle said. “It also creates a safer work-place, because there’s a potential for worker injuries when animals are mishandled.”

Not everyone is convinced that slaughter practices have improved as much as McDonald’s surveys suggest. Gail Eisnitz, investigator for the Humane Farming Association, notes that until just a few months, all McDonald’s inspections were announced in advance.

“The industry’s self-inspections are meaningless,” Eisnitz said. “They’re designed to pull Americans into a false sense of security about what goes on inside slaughterhouses.”

But Jeff Rau, an animal scientist who attended the Kansas City seminar on behalf of the Humane Society of the United States, saw the increased attention to animal welfare as a hopeful step.

Rau said the industry has recognized it has some work to do.” The next step is to convince consumers to be aware of what is happening to their food before it gets to the store. He said it should be clear that their food dollars can carry some weight in persuading companies to improve. As a hopeful step.
EULOGY OF THE DOG
(By George G. Vest)

WARRENSBURG, MO, Sept. 23, 1870—Gentlemen of the jury, a man's dog stands by him in prosperity and in poverty, in health and in sickness. He will sleep on the cold ground when the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he can be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer, he will lick the wound that may come in battle with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince.

When all other friends desert, he remains. When riches take wings and reputation falls with a unanimous vote in the committee had only 2 weeks to consider companion measure, H.R. 2216. Our committee had only 2 weeks to consider the President's request and send the bill forward with a unanimous vote in the committee. That is a great compliment to Senator BYRD as the chairman of the committee.

I am pleased to join him in recommending the bill to the Senate. I urge all Members to support the bill and to adhere to the tight spending limits that have been adhered to by the committee itself. Nearly 90 percent of the funding provided in this bill will meet the ongoing needs of the Department of Defense.

I join also in commending the senior Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUYE, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, for his determination to meet the readiness, quality of life, and health care needs of the men and women who serve in our Nation's Armed Forces.

In addition to the amounts requested by the President and provided in the bill for the direct care system for military medicine, additional funds are also proposed for Army real property maintenance and spare parts advocated by General Shinseki, the Army Chief of Staff. Funds are also provided for military medicine, and defense medicine and engagement initiatives for the commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Command.

Based on extensive hearings by the Defense Subcommittee and numerous discussions with the Secretary of Defense, these amounts are adequate to meet the military's needs through the end of this fiscal year.

This bill is no substitute for the significant increase in defense funds that have been sought by the President in his budget amendment. He has sought an additional $18.4 billion over the original request for fiscal year 2002. We are looking here only at amounts received through September 30 of this year, 2001. In 85 days from now, we will see the end of this fiscal year.

Amendments may be offered that would provide additional funds for this year—for 2001. I urge my colleagues to withhold such amendments. We have adequately discussed the needs with the Department, and we believe there are no additional funds that could be spent within this fiscal year of 2001.

We will have an opportunity to assess the needs of the Department through the Defense authorization and appropriations bills for 2002, and I believe that we will address starting on October 1 of this year. We cannot address all those needs here. We do not need to deal with the 2002 requests in a 2001 supplemental appropriations bill.

I join my colleagues in their belief that we need additional resources for our national defense. I shall do my best to support the request of the President, and all other funding that we might need to achieve, to really deal with the Department of Defense mission.

The underfunding of the past cannot be corrected in one supplemental bill. The new Secretary and the President of the United States have asked for our permission to take the interim to study the needs and determine the most vital needs for our Armed Forces. We have had significant changes in our military strategy, and we should accord the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense the courtesy they have requested and wait for their report.

We need to move this bill out of the Senate today. I join Senator BYRD in committing to hold this bill to the level set by the committee and by the President for this fiscal year.

We need to get the military the money they need by getting this bill to the Senate. I have been working with my colleagues to secure the funding later this month, and in September, for fiscal year 2002 and future years.

In addition to the military requirements, there are several pressing disaster relief challenges that face our National Government. Through several conversations with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Joe Allbaugh, I am anxious about the level of FEMA disaster relief funding available for the rest of this calendar year.

So far, no further supplemental request has been received from the Office of Management and Budget for this fiscal year. It is my hope that additional information will be available to the conferees on this bill later this week.

Challenges from tropical storm Allison, ice storms in the Southeast, and current operations in the United States have asked for our response capability. Especially damaging was the loss to the medical research programs in Houston, TX, during the storm Allison.

The Senator from Texas, a member of our committee, has worked tirelessly to find means to address that crisis, and I look forward to working with her on that effort to the maximum extent possible.
July 9, 2001

With no budget constraints, I could support additional funding for the Department of Defense, for FEMA, for LIHRAF, and several other priorities sought by many of our colleagues. We were asked by the President to limit funding in this bill to such amounts as could be spent during the remainder of this fiscal year. That is a reasonable request. We were also asked to live within the moneys available under the funding caps set by the Congress. We have already voted on that this year, and we feel constrained by those limits.

We were asked to break the cycle of “emergency” appropriations as simply a tool to get around budget limits. We do not support those actions, and the executive branch in the past has required emergency appropriations each year. We hope the Senate to pursue that policy in the future.

This bill meets the demands of the Congress and the President of the United States for budget constraints. We hope we can go to conference this week with the House. If the Senate passes this bill, as we hope, early tomorrow morning, that will take place.

I implore all Senators to work with us today to complete this bill so the funds can get to the Armed Forces by the end of this week.

We have been in sort of a vicious cycle in recent years whereby the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Chiefs themselves have had to determine how much they could spend in the early parts of the fiscal year because of constraints placed on them due to the deviation of funds for peacekeeping and other activities. That has led every year to a supplemental. This is one of those supplemements for funds necessary to carry out the basic needs of our military during the summertime. The steaming hours of our Navy, the flying hours of our Air Force and our Marines and Navy, the ground exercises by our Army, and the activities that take place throughout the world by our men and women in the armed services demand additional money.

This is the bill to fund those for the remainder of July and August and September. Those activities will depend upon the passage of this bill.

The sooner we can pass this bill, the better off we will be in terms of the training and the activities of our men and women in the armed services to assure their capabilities to defend this country.

I urgently support this bill. I urgently urge the Senate to pass it as soon as possible.

I request the cooperation of every Member of the Senate in trying to help us accomplish that objective no later than tomorrow.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today in support of S. 1077, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

The Senate bill provides $8.477 billion in new discretionary budget authority, offset by the rescission of $1.563 billion in budget authority provided in previous years, for a net increase of $6.914 billion. As a result of this additional budget authority, outlays will increase by $1.291 billion in 2001. The Senate bill meets its revised section 302(a) and 302(b) allocations for budget authority and is well under—by more than $1 billion—those allocations for outlays.

I commend Chairman BYRD and Senator STEVENS for their bipartisan effort under unusual circumstances in bringing this important measure to the floor within its allocation and without resorting to unnecessary emergency designations. This bill provides important resources to our uniformed personnel, including funding statutory increases in pay and health care. In addition, it provides assistance to low-income families for heating and education. I urge adoption of the bill.

I ask for unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of this bill printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
<th>Mandatory</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate-reported bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Authority</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>7,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>2,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts available within Senate 302(a) allocation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Authority</td>
<td>6,545</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>7,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>3,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House-passed bill:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Authority</td>
<td>6,545</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>7,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s request:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Authority</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>7,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>2,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Senate-reported bill compared to:
| Amounts available within Senate 302(a) allocation: |
| Budget Authority    |               |           |           |
| Outlays             | (1,156)       | 0         | (1,156)   |
| House-passed bill:  |
| Budget Authority    | (1)           | 0         | (1)       |
| Outlays             | (50)          | 0         | (50)      |
| President’s request:  |
| Budget Authority    |               |           |           |
| Outlays             | 1             | 0         | 1         |

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Prepared by GFCM Staff, June 26, 2001.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 863

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall send to the desk a managers’ amendment supported by Senator STEVENS and myself. It consists of a package of amendments. These amendments have been cleared on both sides, and I know of no controversy concerning them.

The next amendment is offered by Senators Hutchinson and Inhofe for storm damage repair at military facilities in Texas and Oklahoma.

The next amendment is offered by Senators Torricelli and Corzine to convey surplus firefighting equipment in New Jersey.

The next is an amendment by myself to make technical corrections in the energy and water chapter in title I.

Next is an amendment for storm damage repair at military facilities in Texas and Oklahoma offered by Senators Hutchinson and Inhofe.

Next is an amendment by Senator STEVENS to increase the authorization for the Bassett Army Hospital.

Next is an amendment to provide $33 million for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for humane treatment of animals. That is my amendment. It is fully offset by a later amendment.

Next is an amendment offered by Senators Grassley, Roberts, and Stevens to expedite rulemaking for crop insurance.

Next is an amendment by Senators Feinstein and Boxer and Smith of Oregon and Wyden to provide $20 million for the Klamath Basin. Funding is offset in a later amendment.

This will be followed by an amendment by myself in the agriculture chapter to provide an offset for the $3 million for humane treatment of animals.

Next is an amendment to increase a rescission in the committee bill for the oil and gas guarantee program by $14.8 million.

Next is an amendment to strike section 2101 of the committee bill dealing with the Oceans Commission.

Next is an amendment to clarify the use of D.C. local funds to prevent the demolition by neglect of historic properties, followed by an amendment to redirect the expenditure of $250,000 within the Western Area Power Administration, followed by an amendment by Senator Burns to provide a transfer of $3 million for the Bureau of Land Management energy permitting activities.

Next is an amendment by Senator Harkin to clarify the timing of the disabilities worker rescission in the committee bill.

This will be followed by a technical change to a heading in the bill.

Next is an amendment offered by Senator Domenici to make a technical date correction in the Perkins Vocational Education Act.

Next is an amendment by myself and Senator Stevens to authorize the expenditure of $20 million previously appropriated, subject to authorization, to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for digital conversion by local stations.
Next is an amendment to allow the Architect of the Capitol to make payments to Treasury for water and sewer services provided by the District of Columbia.

These will be followed by amendments by Senators Murray and Stevens to, one, appropriate $16,800,000 to repair damage caused in Seattle by the Nisqually earthquake; two, appropriate $2 million for a joint U.S.-Canada commission dealing with connection of the Alaska Railroad to the North American system; and, three, make certain technical corrections. The funding is offset by rescissions.

Next is an amendment by Senator Inouye to transfer $1 million from the Morris K. Udall Foundation to the Native Nations Institute.

And finally an amendment to name a building in the State of Virginia for a late House colleague, Norm Sisisky, on behalf of Senator Warner.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc and that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the managers' amendment be agreed to and that it be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, it is my understanding that the chairman of the committee will offer another unanimous consent request for a second managers' amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I make that request in conjunction with the request pending.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number for the information of the Senate.

The bill clerk reads as follows:
The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], for himself and Mr. Stevens, proposes an amendment numbered 861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been agreed to.

The amendment (No. 861) was agreed to.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.""

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator's unanimous consent request included the request for a second managers' amendment; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That request has been granted.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this would be a very good time for all of our colleagues to offer their amendments if they have amendments. Senator Stevens and I are prepared to listen to Senators propose their amendments, and we are prepared to respond to their proposals. Much time could be saved if Senators will come to the floor and offer their amendments as early as possible.

Of course, if Senators don't have amendments, that will suit the two of us just as well.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, seeing no other Senator who seeks recognition at this time, I shall speak on another matter notwithstanding the fact that the Pasture rule has not run its course. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a few months ago, a lady by the name of Sara McMullin accidentally tapped a sports utility vehicle from behind on a highway in California. The angry owner of the bumped vehicle, Mr. Andrew Burnett, stormed back to Ms. McMullin's car and began yelling at her; and then reached through her open window with both hands, grabbed her little white dog and hurled it onto the busy roadway. The lady sat helplessly watching in horror as her frightened pet ran for its life, dodging speeding traffic to no avail. The traffic was too heavy and the traffic was too swift.

Imagine her utter horror. Recently, Mr. Burnett was found guilty of animal cruelty by a jury in a California court, so my faith in the wisdom of juries was restored. Ever since I first heard about this monstrous, brutal, barbaric act, I have wondered what would drive any sane person to do such a thing. There are some people who have blamed this senseless and brutal incident on road rage. But it was not just road rage, it was bestial cruelty. It was and is an outrage. It was an act of sheer depravity to seize a fluffy, furry, innocent little dog, and toss it onto a roadway, and have the certainty to watch as tons of rushing steel, iron, glass, and rubber, while its terrified owner, and perhaps other people in other vehicles, watched.

There is no minimizing such cruelty and resorting to the lame excuse that, after all, it was just a dog.

The dog owner, Ms. McMullin, puts the incident in perspective. Here is what she said: It wasn't just a dog to me. For me, it was my child. A majority of pet owners do believe their pets to be family members. That is the way I look at my little dog, my little dog Billy—Billy Byrd. I look at him as a family member. When he passes away, I will shed tears. I know that. He is a little white Maltese Terrier. As a pet ontainer and dog lover, I know exactly what that lady means, and so did millions of other dog lovers who could never even fathom such an act.

For my wife and me, Billy Byrd is a key part of our lives at the Byrd House in McLean Heights. He brings us joy and wonderful companionship. As I said on this floor just a few months ago, if I ever saw in this world anything that was made by the Creator's hand that is more dedicated, more true, more faithful, more trusting, more unyielding than this little dog, I am at a loss to state what it is. Such are the feelings of many dog owners.

Dogs have stolen our hearts and made a place in our homes for thousands of years. Dogs fill an emotional need in man and they have endured as our close companions. They serve as guards and sentries and watchdogs; they are hunting companions. Some, like Lassie and Rin Tin Tin, have become famous across the nation; these sociable little creatures are valued especially as loyal comforters to their human masters. Petting a dog can make our blood pressure drop. Try it. Our heart rate slows down. Try it. Our sense of anxiety diminishes, just goes away. Researchers in Australia have found that dog owners have a lower risk of heart disease, lower blood pressure, and lower cholesterol levels than those people who do not own dogs. Researchers in England have demonstrated that dog owners have far fewer minor health complaints than those people without a dog. Our dogs are about the most devoted, steadfast companions that the Creator could have designed. They are said to be man's best friend and, indeed, who can dispute it?

The affection that a dog provides is not only unlimited, it is unqualified, unconditional. A faithful dog does not judge its owner, it does not criticize them; it accepts us as we are, for who we are, no matter how we dress, no matter how much money we have or don't have, and no matter what our social