

financial waste perpetrated in Washington, they are also generous people. I am pleased to highlight their support for the Kosovar relief effort.

It is a tribute to America's generous spirit and sense of goodness that all of these organizations have mobilized to assist people suffering half a world away. There is no doubt that, despite the overwhelming challenge, these organization will collectively make the difference in the lives of these displaced Kosovar refugees and will provide hope for their future.

#### THE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. FEINGOLD. Senator KOHL, as Senator COCHRAN read through the amendments included in the Managers package of the FY2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill late last night, I noticed that an amendment I had filed was not included. It had been my understanding that my amendment would be accepted during the wrap-up on the Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Mr. KOHL. I am aware of the Senator's amendment. Will the Senator please describe his amendment?

Mr. FEINGOLD. My amendment was a non-controversial sense-of-the-Senate resolution that the U.S. Customs Service should, to the maximum extent practicable, conduct investigations into, and take such other actions as are necessary to prevent, the importation of ginseng products into the United States from foreign countries, including Canada and Asian countries, unless the importation is reported to the Service, as required under Federal law. It merely asks that current law be complied with.

Mr. KOHL. Your amendment, expressing the sense-of-the-Senate regarding ginseng, was inadvertently left off the list for the Manager's amendment. However, it should be noted, that the amendment was not excluded based on its substance, but only because of a regrettable omission.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator and ask his assistance in including my ginseng amendment in the final conference report on the FY2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Mr. KOHL. I would like to assure Senator FEINGOLD that I will work toward inclusion of this provision in the conference report. The Senator is correct that there was no objection raised to his amendment and I will make that point clear to my fellow conferees.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to engage the Senators from Wisconsin in this colloquy. Yesterday, when the Senate considered the Agriculture Appropriations Bill, I had offered three amendments regarding the Conservation Reserve Program. It is my understanding that at least one of these amendments had been cleared for approval until just prior to final passage of the bill, and that the Ranking Member and Chairman had been giving consideration to the remaining two

amendments. However, the Department of Agriculture had expressed concerns and objections were raised.

Mr. KOHL. That is correct. Will the Senator from Kansas describe his amendments?

Mr. ROBERTS. The first amendment regarding CRP cross compliance is to address a problem we have had in Kansas. In many areas of the state, we have old homesteads that have long been abandoned. As time has passed these old homes have become dilapidated, rundown, and liability risks. Many producers want to remove these old homesteads and incorporate the land into their CRP land, conservation practices, or cropping rotations. But they are unable to do so due to CRP cross compliance rules. Under these rules, producers lose eligibility for CRP payments if they break Highly Erodible land (HEL) into production. Much of the land is considered HEL. Thus most of these homesteads sit on HEL land, and if they are removed, producers have violated the rules and lose payments. This does not seem to make sense and USDA agrees. USDA informed me that they planned to recommend to the Congress the elimination of this program in the next Farm Bill.

The other two amendments involve notices regarding CRP Notices 327 and 338 issued by the Farm Service agency last fall and this spring.

CRP Notice-327 issued by the Farm Service Agency prohibits the use of CRP land for hunting preserves. The notice does not prohibit land owners from leasing hunting rights or charging access fees to hunters. However, it does prohibit hunting preserves. This notice overturns a practice that has been allowed in many areas since the inception of the CRP program. In fact, these hunting preserves operate from the Kansas and Oklahoma areas to the Dakotas. These preserves are strongly regulated in Kansas and they have resulted in an important economic development activity for many rural areas. In Kansas, we have 112 tracts of land designated for use as hunting preserves. 36 of these tracts are in counties designated by USDA as eligible to apply for Round II Rural Empowerment zones under the criteria established by USDA. Basically, to qualify under this criteria, a county must have lost 15 percent or more of its population between 1980 and 1994. These population losses represent a significant erosion of the economic base of these rural areas. Disallowing these hunting preserves would represent a loss of tourism dollars and an economic hit that many of these counties simply cannot afford to take.

CRP Notice 338 prohibits the planting of grass strips on terrace tops for enrollment in the continuous CRP. The notice prohibits the enrollment of grass strips located on the tops of terraces—where erosion is most likely to take place—but allows the enrollment of strips planted between terraces—

where crops can actually be grown. Strips planted on terraces provide important environmental functions by reducing both wind and water erosion. Grass strips help to prevent the breakage of terraces that sometimes occurs during torrential rains and they provide important habitat for wildlife. Fifteen groups in Kansas ranging from the State Secretary of Agriculture to the Kansas Audubon Society have asked Secretary Glickman to reverse this ruling. USDA's actions seem directly aimed at a recent brochure prepared by these 15 Kansas organizations that explains how landowners can use these grass strips to improve environmental and wildlife benefits. This amendment tries to return some aspect of local control to these decisions.

I thank the ranking member for taking another look at these amendments, and I would ask the Ranking Member's assurance that he will work with his Chairman and House counterparts to address my amendments on the Conservation Reserve Program in conference as well.

Mr. KOHL. I would like to assure the Senator from Kansas that I will work with Senator COCHRAN, Chairman of the Subcommittee, to make all members of the conference committee aware of the objectives of these three amendments. The Senator also has my assurance that I hope we can overcome any remaining objections to his amendment relating to CRP cross compliance. Further, I would like the Senator to know that I will continue discussions with all parties regarding his other two amendments to see if it will be possible to give them favorable consideration during conference committee action.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Ranking Member for his assistance and all his work on the bill.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I would like to echo that sentiment and also thank Senator KOHL for his assistance and all his work on this very important bill.

#### CBO COST ESTIMATE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on August 3, 1999, I filed Report 134 to accompany S. 1330, a bill to give the city of Mesquite, NV, the right to purchase at fair market value certain parcels of public land in the city, that had been ordered favorably reported on July 28, 1999. At the time the report was filed, the estimates by Congressional Budget Office were not available. The estimate is now available and concludes that enactment of S. 1330 "would increase direct spending by about \$500,000 over the 2000-2004 period." I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the CBO estimate be printed in the RECORD.

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