The story behind the headlines is the injury that is caused to family farmers, to the manufacturing sector, to that part of America's economy that has produced the strength of this country today. That strength will not long exist if we don't do something about the trade deficit. Those who talk about tax cuts for 10 years, anticipating future economic growth and future economic surpluses, will not see those develop and will not experience that growth unless we do something about this exploding trade deficit. You cannot sustain long-term economic growth when you run a $21.3 billion deficit in one month. It wasn't more than a couple decades ago that we ran a trade deficit of a couple billion dollars in a quarter of the year. Wilbur Mills, who used to be chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, called special meetings to talk about emergency tariffs to be put on goods to reduce the debilitating trade deficits. Now they are $21 billion a month and growing in a very significant way.

We need the Administration and the Congress to understand that the underlying trade negotiations and trade agreements we have had with a number of countries, including NAFTA and GATT, have undercut this country's interests. They do not work. They sell out the interests of family farmers in this country. They injure our manufacturing sector. I am not suggesting putting up walls and retreating. I want our producers to be required to respond to competition. But our producers cannot and should not be expected to respond to competition when our producers have one hand tied behind their backs by unfair trade agreements.

Finally, I want to talk for a moment about what happened last December with the U.S. Trade Ambassador announcing a deal with respect to the Canadian trade issue. They have all kinds of agreements that, as I said, weren't worth much. We just allowed them to put a bunch of points down on a piece of paper. I reviewed that deal, and nothing much has happened. In fact, our trade situation with Canada grows worse. Our agricultural economy grows worse. Prices have continued to collapse. Family farmers continue to be injured and, at the same time, we have durum and spring wheat, cattle and hogs flooding across the border, most unfairly traded and most in violation of the basic tenets of reciprocal trade. Yet, nothing happens. Nobody lifts a finger to say let us stand up on behalf of your interests and take the actions you would expect the Federal Government to take to insist on fair trade.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE FRANK M. JOHNSON, JR.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 165, in memory of Senior Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, submitted earlier by Senators HATCH, LEAHY, and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 165) in memory of Senior Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr., of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, late last week, Senior Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals passed away at his home in Montgomery, Alabama. Judge Johnson will be remembered for his courageous stands in some of the most difficult struggles of the Civil Rights era. At a time when men of lesser fortitude would have avoided direct confrontation on the highly unpopular issues of school desegregation and voting rights for African-Americans, Judge Johnson stood firm on his convictions and the law.

Soon after his appointment to the district court by President Eisenhower in 1955, Johnson took the courageous step of striking down the Montgomery law that had mandated that Rosa Parks sit in the back of a city bus. He believed that ''separate, but equal'' was inherently unequal. Judge Johnson upheld the constitutionality of federal laws granting African-Americans the right to vote in Alabama elections. He believed in the concept of ''one man, one vote.''

Despite tremendous pressure from Governor George Wallace, Judge Johnson allowed the voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery to proceed despite threats of continued civil unrest and violence. The national fervor that followed the march resulted in the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Today, around a courthouse that bears Frank Johnson's name in Montgomery, there are integrated schools, buses, and lunch counters. Truly representative democracy flourishes in Alabama with African-American state, county, and municipal officials who won their offices in fair elections with the votes of African-American and white citizens. In large part because of Judge Johnson, attitudes that were once intolerant and extreme have dissipated, but the example he set has not.

The members of the Judiciary Committee extend our deepest sympathies to Judge Johnson's family and the host of friends that he had across the country. We will always remember this federal judge for exemplifying unwavering moral courage in the advancement of the wholly American ideal that ''all men are created equal'' and deserve ''equal protection of the laws.''

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 165) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 165

Whereas Frank M. Johnson, Jr. was appointed a United States District Judge in Alabama by President Eisenhower in 1955;

Whereas Judge Johnson was elevated to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit by President Carter in 1979;

Whereas in a time when men of lesser fortitude would have avoided direct confrontation on the highly unpopular issues of school desegregation and voting rights for African-Americans, Judge Johnson stood firm in upholding the constitution and the law;

Whereas Judge Johnson struck down the Montgomery, Alabama law that had mandated that Rosa Parks sit in the back of a city bus, because he believed that ''separate, but equal'' was inherently unequal;

Whereas Judge Johnson upheld the constitutionality of federal laws granting African-Americans the right to vote in Alabama elections, because he believed in the concept of ''one man, one vote'';

Whereas despite tremendous pressure from Governor George Wallace, Judge Johnson allowed the voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery to proceed, thus stirring the national conscience to enact the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas today, around a courthouse that bears Frank Johnson's name in Montgomery, Alabama there are integrated schools, buses, and lunch counters, and representative democracy flourishes in Alabama with African-American state, county, and municipal officials who won their offices in fair elections with the votes of African-American and white citizens;

Whereas in part because of Judge Johnson's upholding of the law, attitudes that were once intolerant and extreme have dissipated,

Whereas the members of the Senate extend our deepest sympathies to Judge Johnson's family and the host of friends that he had across the country;

Whereas Judge Johnson passed away at his home in Montgomery, Alabama on July 23, 1999;

Whereas the American people will always remember Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. for exemplifying unwavering moral courage in the advancement of the wholly American ideal that ''all men are created equal'' and deserve ''equal protection of the laws'' and for upholding the law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That—

(1) The Senate hereby honors the memory of Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. for his exemplary service to his country and for his outstanding example of moral courage; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns on this date it shall do so out of respect to the memory of Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe we are about ready to make the unanimous consent agreement to proceed with the Interior appropriations bill. We had one further modification. I believe it is being cleared on both sides.

I expect there will be no problem, and hopefully we can go forward with that.

In that connection, I urge Senators to come to the floor if they have amendments to this Interior appropriations bill so we can make progress and not spend too much time on opening statements or in quorum calls. I am not encouraging amendments. But if a Senator has an amendment that he or she is very serious about, they should come onto the floor and offer it. If that is not done, we will have a vote before too long. So Members should understand that we will have the Interior appropriations bill available and that we are serious about going forward with it. We hope to make good progress on it tonight. Actually, I would like to see us complete the bill in view of the modifications that have already occurred concerning some of the provisions within this Interior appropriations bill.

It is a very important bill for our country. It involves, obviously, the parks and lands all over our country that are very important to people of all persuasions, as well as funding for various commissions.

I hope that it can be considered quickly. I commend in advance Senator SLADE GORTON for the work he has done on this bill, and his ranking Member, Senator BYRD, and Senator REID, who I know has been very interested in this bill and supports it.

When you have Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD prepared to work on an appropriations bill, I suspect that most of its problems have already been resolved, and the Senate should be able to act very quickly on that legislation.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield to Senator DORGAN.

Mr. DORGAN. I inquire of the majority leader about the schedule. My understanding is that he is intending to bring the Interior appropriations bill to the floor. I wonder if the majority leader might tell us about the plans he has with respect to the reconciliation bill. Would that be the bill that follows the Interior appropriations bill?

Mr. LOTT. Yes. The reconciliation bill, which provides for the tax relief package, would be next after the Interior appropriations bill. We would like to go to that tonight and begin opening statements. But regardless of what happens with Interior, we will be on the reconciliation bill by 10:30 or quarter to 11 tomorrow morning.

We have to have some time in the morning for statements with regard to the juvenile justice bill, which is going to conference. But that should be completed about 10:30 or 10:45.

Mr. DORGAN. Because of the time limitations on the reconciliation bill, is it the intention, I am curious, of the majority leader that that would consume all of the time tomorrow and Thursday?

Mr. LOTT. That would be our intention. Of course, under the rules dealing with reconciliation, you have 20 hours for debate on the tax relief package. Included in that 20 hours would be debate on amendments, although the vote time on amendments would not count against the 20 hours. So it would be our intention to go through the day and into the night on Wednesday and all day Thursday on this subject and into the night. If we finish the bill Thursday night, then it would be our plan at this time for that to be the conclusion for the week.

I hope we would have already done the Interior appropriations bill. If we can't get it done because of problems that develop Thursday or, as you know, if amendments are still pending when all time has expired, we go through this very unseemly process on voting during what we call a ''votarama,'' with one vote after another and only a minute or two between the votes to explain what is in them.

I hope we won't have that problem this time. But if we can't get it done Thursday night, of course, we would have to go over into Friday. But under the rules, we should be able to finish it not later than Friday and, hopefully, even Thursday night.

We had indicated earlier a desire to go to the Agriculture appropriations bill early next week and, hopefully, complete the Agriculture appropriations bill. We then have the option to go back to the reconciliation conference report.

Mr. DORGAN. I will just observe, if I might, that one way to avoid a lot of recorded votes is to accept a lot of amendments.

Mr. LOTT. If the pattern continues on that bill as it has on other bills, I think that probably will happen. As I recall, last Thursday night at about 8 o'clock around 43 amendments were accepted en bloc on the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill.

It is a little tougher when you are talking about tax policy. But I am sure that some probably will be accepted to move forward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the House Interior bill, and, immediately following the reporting by the clerk, Senator GORTON be recognized to offer the text of the Senate reported bill, as modified, to strike on page 116, lines 3 through 7; page 129, line 14, through page 132, line 20, as an amendment to the House bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill, as thus amended, be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that any legislative provision added thereby be subject nevertheless to a point of order under rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, we just heard that Senator BYRD wanted to come to the floor for a couple of seconds. If you would withhold the unanimous consent request until that time, we would greatly appreciate it.

Mr. LOTT. Is there some other issue that Senator BOXER wished to address?

Mrs. BOXER. My issue is taken care of. I am very happy to say that the oil royalties will be stricken from this particular bill. I am very pleased about that. I don't know about the other Senators, but, for me, I have no issue and no problem with the unanimous consent request.

Mr. LOTT. I had been notified that the Senator from California wanted to be on the floor when this unanimous consent request was made.

Mrs. BOXER. I, in fact, read it, and the whole thing is fine with me.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I might inquire of the majority leader, while we are awaiting the arrival of Senator BYRD, perhaps the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, could respond to some questions about the unanimous consent request.

First, it is my understanding that the unanimous consent request does not waive any rule XVI objections.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct. It does not.

Mr. DURBIN. Am I also correct that the four sections being stricken by the unanimous consent request are sections 328, relevant to the introduction of Grizzly bears into the States of Idaho and Montana, as well as section 340, relative to hard rock mineral mining in the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri; section 341, another environmental rider relative to energy efficiency; and, finally, section 342, the one referred to by the Senator from California, the environmental rider on crude oil and royalty for purposes of the evaluation question?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Illinois is correct on all four.

Mr. DURBIN. Out of the 13 objectionable environmental riders, 4 objectionable by the administration, 4 are being stricken by this unanimous consent request, and all others are in the bill for consideration and subject to rule XVI, or any other appropriate motions.

Mr. GORTON. Or any amendment which may be proposed.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could inquire of the Senator, is the Senator saying that the administration supports the introduction of Grizzly bears into Idaho and the other State?

Mr. DURBIN. I think the administration's concern is that they allow for the first time Governors of these States to dictate the policy on Federal lands.

Mr. LOTT. That sounds like a good idea.

Mr. DURBIN. It depends on your point of view.

At this point, I withdraw any objection to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, are we waiting on Senator BYRD's arrival?

Mrs. BOXER. It is my understanding, I say to my leader, that he is, in fact,

on his way over, and he needs just a couple of minutes. If the leader will, I ask him to delay the unanimous consent request.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I withdraw the formal text of the unanimous consent request by the majority leader, and I will reread it so it is grammatically correct.

I ask consent that the Senate turn to the House Interior bill and, immediately following the reporting by the clerk, Senator GORTON be recognized to offer the text of the Senate-reported bill, as modified, to strike page 116, lines 3 through 7; page 129, line 18 through page 132, line 20, as an amendment to the House bill. I further ask consent that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as thus amended be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment and that any legislative provision added thereby may nonetheless be subject to a point of order under rule XVI.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by Title.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1357

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] proposes an amendment numbered 1357.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The bill totals $13.924 billion in discretionary budget authority, an amount that is $1.125 billion below the President's budget request and $19 million below the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. The bill fully complies with the spending limits established in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and the amount provided is right at the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation.

As is always the case, putting this bill together has been a tremendous challenge. While I am extremely grateful that Senator STEVENS, in consultation with Senator BYRD, was able to provide the subcommittee with an increase over its original 302(b) allocation, the amount contained in this bill is still slightly below the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. I wish to point out to my colleagues, however, that this does not mean that delivery of programs can be continued at the current level simply by holding appropriations even with last year.

The programs funded in this appropriations bill are highly personnel-intensive, supporting tens of thousands of park rangers, foresters, and Indian Health Service doctors. As such, mandated pay and benefit increases for Federal personnel and increases in rent charged by the General Services Administration—increases over which the subcommittee has no control—place a significant burden on Interior bill agencies. The committee must choose either to provide funds to cover these costs, or require agencies to absorb them by reducing services or finding more efficient ways of delivering programs. For fiscal year 2000, these fixed costs amount to more than $300 million. While the committee has provided increases to cover a majority of this amount by drawing on carryover balances and reducing low priority programs, some agencies will be forced to absorb a portion of their fixed costs.

Given the necessity of funding most fixed costs increases within an allocation that is slightly below the current year level, there is little room in this bill for new programs, increases in existing programs, or additional projects of interest to individual Members. But by terminating low priority programs and making selective reductions in others, we have been able to provide targeted increases for certain high priority programs.

The committee has provided a $70 million increase for the operation of the national park system, including $27 million to increase the base operating budgets of 100 park units. This increase is further indication of the Senate's commitment to preserving and enhancing our national park system while remaining within the fiscal constraints of the balanced budget agreement. The Senate bill puts funding for the operation of our parks at a level fully $277 million higher than the fiscal year 1995 level, and 82 percent over the amount provided a decade ago.

For the other land management agencies, the bill provides an increase of $27 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service, including more than $13 million for the operation of the national wildlife refuge system. The bill increases the Forest Service operating account by $17 million, including significant increases for recreation management, forest ecosystem restoration, and road maintenance. A $22 million increase is provided for management of lands by the Bureau of Land Management, as well as another $5 million increase for payments in lieu of taxes. The amount provided for PILT reflects a continued effort to steadily increase appropriations for this program without harming the core operating programs funded in this bill. Though appropriations for PILT were stagnant throughout the first half of this decade, the amount provided in this bill represents a 28 percent increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 1995.

Among the programs in this bill that are specifically for the benefit of Native Americans, the committee's top priority has been to provide the Secretary of the Interior with the resources necessary to fix the Indian trust fund management system. Indian land and trust fund records have been allowed to deteriorate to a deplorable state, and the Department of the Interior now finds itself scrambling to reconcile thousands upon thousands of trust records that are scattered across the country. Many of these records are located in cardboard boxes that have not been touched for years, or in ancient computer systems that are incompatible with one another. The Department is performing this task under the watchful eye of the court, having been sued by those whose trust accounts it is supposed to be managing.

I believe that Secretary Babbitt is making a good faith effort to address this problem, and as such have recommended a funding level for the Office of the Special Trustee that is $39 million over the amount originally provided for fiscal year 1999. This amount will provide for both the manpower and the trust management systems necessary to fix the problem. I will note, however, that the Federal track record in managing large system procurements is spotty at best. As such, I hope to continue to work closely with the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to ensure that these funds are expended wisely, and that we will not regret our decision to provide such a considerable amount for this purpose. I plead with my colleagues, however, to refrain from offering amendments to this bill that would radically change the course of action for trust management that has been laid out by the administration. Any such changes should be carefully considered and have the benefit of hearings by the authorizing committees.