

obfuscates the tireless, good faith efforts of local representatives who participated in the ICBEMP process; and

Whereas, public lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are to be managed for multiple use for the benefit of the citizens of the United States, and road closures proposed within the ICBEMP EIS preferred alternative will severely limit the multiple use of millions of acres of public land; and

Whereas, current road closures already dramatically limit physical and financial abilities to control noxious weeds, and the ICBEMP-proposed further closures pose a serious threat of further and more serious weed encroachment into Montana's forests and grasslands; and

Whereas, the ICBEMP has become a political document, rather than a resource manageable planning document; and

Whereas, the ICBEMP contains too many economic assumptions and too few economic projections based on accurate information; and

Whereas, implementation of the ICBEMP will directly affect management of 16 BLM districts and 30 national forests, all in the western United States; and

Whereas, the ICBEMP coverage extends to 104 counties and 144 million acres of land (72 million acres of which are private), and the ICBEMP implementation will directly and indirectly affect the livelihoods of millions of citizens in the planning area; and

Whereas, a major component of the basic economies of about two-thirds of the affected rural and natural resource-dependent counties would be directly and potentially severely impacted by implementation of the ICBEMP; and

Whereas, the citizens of Montana, Montana's local government units, and Montana's communities have a direct interest in public land management that produces payments in lieu of taxes and (most importantly) forest receipts that generate revenue to the federal treasury and significantly contribute to funding public schools and roads; and

Whereas, it is questionable whether Congress will fund the ICBEMP implementation, and the impacts of inadequate implementation funding would be significantly more disastrous for natural resources than if implementation were fully funded; and

Whereas, the citizens of the United States and communities throughout the western United States depend on the stewardship, sustained yield, and even-flow production of goods and services from multiple-use management of public lands located in those states; and

Whereas, there is increasing national and world demand for renewable, recyclable goods and services, including recreation, wildlife, fisheries, food, fiber, clean air, and clean water; and

Whereas, in Montana, the U.S. Forest Service has reduced timber harvest by over 50% since 1950, even though wood is the preferred raw material for home building, and transferred global environmental consequences were never discussed or considered when decisions were being made to reduce budgets; and

Whereas, domestic raw materials production is being increasingly restricted in the United States, even in light of rising domestic consumption and the United States' position as a massive net importer of raw materials; and

Whereas, decisions are being made on a daily basis and at all levels of government to restrict raw materials production, almost always on environmental grounds, yet consumption is virtually never discussed; and

Whereas, the ICBEMP draft documents fail to adequately and truthfully define and dis-

close the economic, environmental, and social conditions of Montana's communities and local government units and the future effects on these entities of implementation of the proposed ecosystem management practices; and

Whereas, the ICBEMP represents a top-down management paradigm that reduces or eliminates effective local input to natural resource management and environmental decisionmaking; and

Whereas, the ICBEMP has become a 6-year, over \$40 million project, with no end in sight: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana. That the federal government be strongly urged to:

(1) terminate the ICBEMP and issue no Record of Decision on the ICBEMP;

(2) forward the accurate ecosystem management data developed through the ICBEMP to relevant BLM district managers and U.S. Forest Service forest supervisors;

(3) ensure that all public comments on the ICBEMP be incorporated into the public record for the ICBEMP;

(4) forward to district managers and supervisors the public comments provided on the ICBEMP for the managers' and supervisors' consideration related to updates to the land and resource management plans required by federal law; and

(5) coordinate plan revisions between adjoining management units to provide consistency and connectivity and to consider cumulative impacts in dealing with broad-scale issues that affect multiple jurisdictions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that federal natural resource planning and environmental management feature site-specific management decisions made by local decisionmakers, local citizenry, and parties directly and personally affected by these decisions for our public lands.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the federal government acknowledge that the alternatives presented in the ICBEMP EIS are inconsistent with but should be consistent with the balanced "Purpose of and Need for Action" statements in the same documents, which are:

(1) "restore and maintain long-term ecosystem health and ecological integrity" (i.e., restore and maintain a healthy forest); and

(2) "support economic and/or social needs of people, cultures, and communities, and provide sustainable and predictable levels of products and services from our public lands administered by the Forest Service or BLM"; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the presiding officers of the Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House, the Montana Congressional Delegation, the Chief of the Forest Service, and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROBB:

S. 948. A bill to amend chapter 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the equitable waiver of certain limitations on the election of survivor reductions of Federal annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 949. A bill to clarify and enhance the authorities of the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 950. A bill to award grants for school construction; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a permanent tax incentive for research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 952. A bill to expand an antitrust exemption applicable to professional sports leagues and to require, as a condition of such an exemption, participation by professional football and major league baseball sports leagues in the financing of certain stadium construction activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 953. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land in the State of South Dakota to the Terry Peak Ski Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

S. 954. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect citizens' rights under the Second Amendment to obtain firearms for legal use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 955. A bill to allow the National Park Service to acquire certain land for addition to the Wilderness Battlefield in Virginia, as previously authorized by law, by purchase or exchange as well as by donation; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. FRIST):

S. 956. A bill to establish programs regarding early detection, diagnosis, and interventions for newborns and infants with hearing loss; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 957. A bill to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 958. A bill to amend certain banking and securities laws with respect to financial contracts; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. Res. 93. A resolution to recognize Lincoln Park High School for its educational excellence, congratulating the faculty and staff of Lincoln Park High School for their efforts, and encouraging the faculty, staff, and students of Lincoln Park High School to continue their good work into the next millennium; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. GRAMM):

S. Res. 94. A resolution commending the efforts of the Reverend Jesse Jackson to secure the release of the soldiers held by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. Res. 95. A resolution designating August 16, 1999, as "National Airborne Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 949. A bill to clarify and enhance the authorities of the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE USDA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY REFORM AND YEAR-2000 COMPLIANCE ACT OF 1999

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the USDA Information Technology Reform and Year-2000 Compliance Act of 1999. This legislation aims to centralize all year 2000 computer conversion and other information technology acquisition and management activities within the Office of the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Agriculture. Centralization is the most efficient way to manage the complex and important task of ensuring that all critical computer functions at the department are operational on January 1, 2000. It is also a wiser and more cost-effective way to construct an information technology infrastructure to enable USDA's hundreds of computer systems to interoperate, which unfortunately they cannot now do.

The Department of Agriculture is charged with enormous responsibilities and its year 2000 readiness is crucial. It has a diverse portfolio of over 200 Federal programs throughout the Nation and the world. The department delivers about \$80 billion in programs. It is the fourth largest Federal agency, with 31 agencies and offices. The department is responsible for the safety of our food supply, nutrition programs that serve the poor, young and old, and the protection of our natural resources. Since more than 40 percent of the non-tax debt owed to the Federal Government is owed to USDA, the department has a responsibility to ensure the financial soundness of taxpayers' investments.

Responsibility for keeping the mission-critical information technology functioning should clearly rest with the Chief Information Officer. The decentralized approach to the year 2000 issue at USDA led to a lack of focus on departmental priorities. Each agency was allowed to determine what services, programs, and activities it deemed important enough to be operational at the end of the millennium. This decentralized approach also led to a lack of guidance, oversight and the development of contingency plans. Efforts to rectify this situation are well underway. I am pleased that Secretary of Agriculture Glickman has pledged his personal commitment to the suc-

cess of year 2000 compliance and has made it one of the highest priorities for USDA.

In fiscal year 1999, USDA plans to spend more than \$1.2 billion on information technology and related information resources management activities, including year 2000 computer compliance. The General Accounting Office has chronicled USDA's long history of problems in managing its substantial information technology investments. The GAO reports that such ineffective planning and management have resulted in USDA's wasting millions of dollars on computer systems.

Last year, I introduced S. 2116, a bill to reform the information technology systems of the Department of Agriculture. It gave the Chief Information Officer control over the planning, development, and acquisition of information technology at the department. Introduction of that bill and similar legislation in 1997 prompted some coordination of information technology among the department's agencies and offices. However, component agencies are still allowed to independently acquire and manage information technology investments solely on the basis of their own parochial interests or needs. This legislation is needed to strengthen that coordination and ensure that centralized information technology management continues in the future.

This legislation further requires that the Chief Information Officer manage the design and implementation of an information technology architecture based on strategic business plans that maximizes the effectiveness and efficiency of USDA's program activities. Included in the bill is authority for the Chief Information Officer to approve expenditures for information resources and for year 2000 compliance purposes, except for minor acquisitions. To accomplish these purposes, the bill requires that each agency transfer up to 10 percent of its information technology budget to the Chief Information Officer's control.

The bill makes the Chief Information Officer responsible for ensuring that the information technology architecture facilitates a flexible common computing environment for the field service centers based on integrated program delivery. The architecture will also provide maximum data sharing with USDA customers and other Federal and state agencies, which is expected to result in a significant reduction in operating costs.

Mr. President, this is a bill whose time has come. Unfortunately, USDA's problems in managing information technology are not unusual among Government agencies, according to the General Accounting Office. I commend the attention of my colleagues to this bill designed to address a portion of the information resource management problems of the Federal Government and ask for their support of it.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text and a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 949

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "USDA Information Technology Reform and Year-2000 Compliance Act of 1999".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings and purposes.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Management of year-2000 compliance at Department.
- Sec. 5. Position of Chief Information Officer.
- Sec. 6. Duties and authorities of Chief Information Officer.
- Sec. 7. Funding approval by Chief Information Officer.
- Sec. 8. Availability of agency information technology funds.
- Sec. 9. Authority of Chief Information Officer over information technology personnel.
- Sec. 10. Annual Comptroller General report on compliance.
- Sec. 11. Office of Inspector General.
- Sec. 12. Technical amendment.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) United States agriculture, food safety, the health of plants and animals, the economies of rural communities, international commerce in food, and food aid rely on the Department of Agriculture for the effective and timely administration of program activities essential to their success and vitality;

(2) the successful administration of the program activities depends on the ability of the Department to use information technology in as efficient and effective manner as is technologically feasible;

(3) to successfully administer the program activities, the Department relies on information technology that requires comprehensive and Department-wide overview and control to avoid needless duplication and misuse of resources;

(4) to better ensure the continued success and vitality of agricultural producers and rural communities, it is imperative that measures are taken within the Department to coordinate and centrally plan the use of the information technology of the Department;

(5) because production control and subsidy programs are ending, agricultural producers of the United States need the best possible information to make decisions that will maximize profits, satisfy consumer demand, and contribute to the alleviation of hunger in the United States and abroad;

(6) a single authority for Department-wide planning is needed to ensure that the information technology architecture of the Department is based on the strategic business plans, information technology, management goals, and core business process methodology of the Department;

(7) information technology is a strategic resource for the missions and program activities of the Department;

(8) year-2000 compliance is 1 of the most important challenges facing the Federal Government and the private sector;

(9) because the responsibility for ensuring year-2000 compliance at the Department was initially left to individual offices and agencies, no overall priorities have been established, and there is no assurance that the