

and on bankruptcy, she has been working on this matter for a long, long time and has made great progress.

I share the view expressed by the majority leader that this is an issue that has great impact not only in her region of the country but in regions throughout the country. I hope we can resolve this satisfactorily and she can be satisfied with the final product. I will do all I can to work with the majority leader to see that happens in the remaining days of this session.

I commend the majority leader for getting the Senate to this point. I think we are very close to reaching an agreement. As I understand, we have not yet had the opportunity to exchange amendments, but we will be doing that shortly. He and I have both worked with our colleagues to ensure we can work through this agreement. I think this is a win-win. I think it is an opportunity to finish an important piece of legislation, an opportunity to deal with some issues that both sides think are important. I think it is a very appropriate vehicle with which to get our work done. I am hopeful we will get total cooperation procedurally to allow the Senate the opportunity to finish this work.

I am fully expecting before the end of the day we will have an agreement that will allow the Senate to go through the next couple of days in expectation of finishing this legislation.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 15 minutes to speak in morning business.

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

OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS REVENUES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I posed a few questions to the majority leader about a very important piece of legislation, an appropriations bill that is still pending. As we know, there are several important appropriations measures being debated and negotiated, and that is the process. Some of that happens, a lot of it, behind closed doors, which is the way it has worked for many, many years and will probably continue to work that way.

However, there are some questions I want to raise or some points I want to bring up. There are a great number of Members—Senators from the South, the East, the North, and the West, Democrats and Republicans, a great group of House Members, led by DON

YOUNG of Alaska and GEORGE MILLER of California, CHRIS JOHN from Louisiana, BILLY TAUZIN from Louisiana, a Democrat and Republican respectfully, and Representative UDALL in the House—who have worked very hard to come to some bipartisan agreements about a new way to spend offshore oil and gas revenues in a way that is fair to all the coastal States, particularly those States including Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and Alabama to a certain degree, that produce these offshore oil and gas revenues. Without our States acting as a platform, this industry would not exist.

Many Members have worked on a bipartisan redirection of some of those revenues to come back to the States and local governments instead of going into the Federal Treasury as they do now, and as they have been since 1955, redirecting those revenues back to help the coastal restoration programs, to help restore our coastlines particularly in Louisiana, which is so fragile, and the Florida Everglades, which need a tremendous amount of help.

In addition, we have the idea these moneys could be permanently allocated to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund which has been funded intermittently—hit and miss—through the decades.

We think the American people should have something to count on, so they know every year their Federal Government is going to take a very small portion, but an important portion, of money for land purchases and acquisitions and conservation easements to help expand our park system, both at the Federal level and to improve our park system, as well as giving Governors and mayors and county officials the ability to create recreational opportunities. As a Governor, Mr. President, you know how important that is to the people of your State and my State. They believe strongly in recreation and access to the outdoors.

In addition, this bipartisan group believes it can also take a portion of those moneys and expand the very successful Pittman-Robertson, which is one of the most successful Federal programs, working in partnership with local outdoors enthusiasts—hunters, fishermen and women, conservationists in those areas—and to fully fund historic preservation and urban parks, to name just a few. It is a very comprehensive approach. It is an innovative approach.

Although we do not have a bill out of either House yet, we do have a great markup that I want to share with the Members, Chairman Young's markup that came out this morning. Their bill, which is reflective of some of the things I have said, will be considered next week. It would be a tremendous accomplishment for this administration and for this Congress to come together in a bipartisan way to make at least a downpayment this year. If we cannot fully fund what I have generally just described, let us at least make an

effort this year to fund, for 1 year, these programs that are currently already authorized, that have been in existence for many years, to actually put some money where our mouth is—with in the budget caps and the balanced budget agreement we have reached—so we could perhaps build on this year and, over the next several years, fully fund the programs I have talked about.

I will ask to have printed in the RECORD today a letter I received from 800 individuals and organizations supporting this initiative. It is signed by 800 of some of the leading environmentalists and activists in the country today, groups representing all different aspects of the environmental community from the east coast to the west coast, from south to north. They have submitted a letter to us today supporting the efforts I have just articulated.

I ask unanimous consent the letter, dated November 1, 1999, as well as a table of Federal offshore mineral revenue collections for 1989–1999 and projects for 1999–2000, be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOVEMBER 1, 1999.

*U.S. Senate/House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: As the twentieth century draws to a close, Congress has a rare opportunity to pass landmark legislation that would establish a permanent and significant source of conservation funding. A number of promising legislative proposals would take revenues from non-renewable offshore oil and gas resources and reinvest them in the protection of renewable resources such as our wildlife, public lands, coasts, oceans, cultural treasures, and outdoor recreation. Securing this funding would allow us to build upon the pioneering conservation tradition that Teddy Roosevelt initiated at the beginning of the century.

The vast majority of Americans recognize the duty we have to protect and conserve our rich cultural and natural legacies for future generations. A diverse array of interests, including sportsmen and women, conservationists, historic preservationists, outdoor recreationalists, the faith community, business interests, state and local governments, and others, support conservation funding legislation because they recognize it is essential to fulfill this obligation.

We call upon you and your colleagues to seize this unprecedented opportunity. Pass legislation that would make a substantial and reliable investment in the conservation of our nation's wildlife, public lands, coastal and marine resources, historic and cultural treasures, urban and rural parks, and open space. Design a bill that provides significant conservation benefits, *is free of harmful environmental impacts to our coastal and ocean resources, and does not unduly hinder land acquisition programs.*

An historic conservation funding bill is within our grasp. It will be an accomplishment that all can celebrate. We look to Congress to make this legislation a reality.

Sincerely,

Federal Offshore Mineral Revenue Collections, Calendar Years 1989–1999

Year	Amount
1989	\$2,915,145,540
1990	3,367,738,819
1991	2,793,166,498
1992	2,561,405,652
1993	2,856,913,823
1994	2,915,284,805
1995	2,723,753,949
1996	4,253,641,347
1997	5,259,228,035
1998	4,322,637,332
Average	3,396,891,580

Projected Federal Offshore Mineral Revenue Collections, FY 1999–2005

Year	Amount
1999	\$2,946,000,000
2000	2,584,000,000
2001	2,812,000,000
2002	2,827,000,000
2003	2,669,000,000
2004	2,575,000,000
2005	2,489,000,000
Average	2,700,285,714

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, basically they are saying there is a way, a better way, to allocate these revenues from offshore oil and gas to fund a variety of programs that are fair to all the different parts of this Nation, one that is environmentally friendly, one that focuses on the needs of our coastline and also recognizes the proper role of Congress in authorizing the purchases of land because that is something that should be done not only by the administration, whoever the President may be, Republican or Democrat—whether it is the current President, who has been terrific in many ways on this issue—but it is something that must be worked on in conjunction with the Members of Congress.

They have signed a letter that is going to be distributed. I will have it printed for the RECORD. In addition, I would like the RECORD to reflect we received 2 weeks ago an endorsement from the National Chamber of Commerce. They usually do not get into environmental issues such as this, but the Chamber of Commerce realizes, as businesspeople representing some of the finest businesses in our country, that a clean environment, access to parks and recreation, improving the quality of life for Americans everywhere, is the Chamber's business because we are about improving the quality of life, improving our economy. They see this as an important bill.

It is not that usual to have the environmental community and the business community together. This is one idea they have both said is terrific; let's move forward.

Finally, for the RECORD, I want to re-submit a letter from 40 Governors—not 10, not 12, not Democratic Governors, not Republican Governors. Mr. President, you were a Governor at one time, and a great leader, so you know it is not easy to get 40 signatures from the Governors' Association of Democrats and Republicans who have said the same thing.

I ask unanimous consent those letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 21, 1999.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. THOMAS DASCHLE,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD GEPHARDT,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LOTT AND DASCHLE AND REPRESENTATIVES HASTERT AND GEPHARDT: The 106th Congress has an historic opportunity to end this century with a major commitment to natural resource conservation that will benefit future generations. We encourage you to approve legislation this year that reinvests a meaningful portion of the revenues from federal outer continental shelf (OCS) oil and gas development in coastal conservation and impact assistance, open space and farmland preservation, federal, state and local parks and recreation, and wildlife conservation, including endangered species prevention, protection and recovery costs.

Since outer continental shelf revenues come from nonrenewable resources, it makes sense to permanently dedicate them to natural resource conservation rather than dispersing them for general government purposes. Around the nation, citizens have repeatedly affirmed their support for conservation through numerous ballot initiatives and state and local legislation. We applaud both the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the House Resources Committee for conducting a bipartisan and inclusive process that recognizes the unique role of state and local governments in preserving and protecting natural resources.

The legislation reported by the Committees should, to the maximum extent possible, permanently appropriate these new funds to the states, to be used in partnership with local governments and non-profit organizations to implement these various conservation initiatives. We urge the Congress to give state and local governments maximum flexibility in determining how to invest these funds. In this way, federal funds can be tailored to complement state plans, priorities and resources. State and local governments are in the best position to apply these funds to necessary and unique conservation efforts, such as preserving species, while providing for the economic needs of communities. The legislation should be neutral with regard to both existing OCS moratoria and future offshore development, and should not come at the expense of federally supported state programs.

We recognize that dedicating funds over a number of years to any specific use is a difficult budgetary decision. Nevertheless, we believe that the time is right to make this major commitment to conservation along the lines outlined in this letter.

We look forward to working with you to take advantage of this unique opportunity and are available to help ensure that this commitment is fiscally responsible. Thank you for your consideration of these legislative principles as you proceed to enact this important legislation.

Gov. John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Oregon;
Gov. Mike Leavitt, Utah; Gov. Tom Ridge, Pennsylvania; Gov. Mike Foster, Louisiana; Gov. John G. Rowland, Connecticut; Gov. Parris N.

Glendening, Maryland; Gov. Howard Dean, M.D., Vermont; Gov. Thomas R. Carper, Delaware; Gov. Christine Todd Whitman, New Jersey; Gov. James B. Hunt, Jr., North Carolina; Gov. Roy E. Barnes, Georgia; Gov. Jim Hodges, South Carolina; Gov. Lincoln Almond, Rhode Island; Gov. Angel S. King, Jr., Maine; Gov. Gary Locke, Washington; Gov. Argeo Paul Cellucci, Massachusetts.

Gov. Cecil H. Underwood, West Virginia; Gov. Marc Racicot, Montana; Gov. Don Siegelman, Alabama; Gov. Gray Davis, California; Gov. Mel Carnahan, Missouri; Gov. Benjamin J. Cayetano, Hawaii; Gov. Jane Dee Hull, Arizona; Gov. Dirk Kempthorne, Idaho; Gov. Tony Knowles, Alaska; Gov. George H. Ryan, Illinois; Gov. James S. Gilmore III, Virginia; Gov. Jeanne Shaheen, New Hampshire; Gov. Bill Graves, Kansas; Gov. George E. Pataki, New York; Gov. Paul E. Patton, Kentucky; Gov. Tommy G. Thompson, Wisconsin; Gov. Bill Owens, Colorado.

Gov. Mike Huckabee, Arkansas; Gov. Frank Keating, Oklahoma; Gov. Jim Geringer, Wyoming; Gov. Edward T. Schafer, North Dakota; Gov. Frank O'Bannon, Indiana; Gov. Kirk Fordice, Mississippi; Gov. William J. Janklow, South Dakota.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 24, 1999.

Hon. MARY LANDRIEU,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LANDRIEU: On behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, I am writing in support of S. 25, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999. The Chamber has long supported the concept that the federal government should share a portion of revenues from Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) energy production efforts with the coastal states that may be affected by these activities.

S. 25 recognizes the contribution that states make to national fuel production and reducing our nation's dependence on foreign oil. It would direct more monies from leasing and production activities to those states and communities that shoulder the responsibility for energy development along their coastlines. It would provide local communities with impact assistance funds to address infrastructure problems and other public service needs associated with federal offshore activities. It is a bipartisan conservation legislation that would help promote a lasting legacy of natural resource stewardship for future generations.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing more than three million businesses of every size, sector, and region, applauds your efforts to help remedy the disparity between states and the federal government in offshore development and looks forward to working with you to achieve this important goal.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,
Executive Vice President,
Government Affairs.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to say, as we get down to the final days of these negotiations, even though we do not have a bill out of the Senate or out of the House, we do have a lot of language that helps to show there is bipartisan support for this effort. I am hoping the

appropriators, who are at the negotiating table, will hear loudly and clearly from hundreds and thousands of individuals and groups that there is a better way to spend this money.

We realize we do not have all we would like, but we would like the final product of this Interior bill to come out in a way that is reflective of the principles I have outlined—Federal/State partnership, coastal impact assistance, full funding for land and water, historic preservation, and wildlife conservation, with current appropriated and authorized programs—not anything new, just something a little better, a little different, a little improved.

As we are waiting for the final decisions of today and how we are going to proceed I wanted to take some time to have these documents printed in the RECORD and to thank my colleagues on this side of the aisle, particularly my senior Senator from Louisiana, for his tireless work; particularly Chairman MURKOWSKI for his terrific work on this issue as chairman of our committee; particularly the members of the committee, Senator JOHNSON, Senator BAYH, Senator LINCOLN, and others; Senator SESSIONS, who has been a terrific supporter.

I thank them for their work on this bill and tell them we are moving forward. We are building support and building a bipartisan bill. Today was good news when Chairman YOUNG and the ranking member, GEORGE MILLER, who had competing versions, came together and signed an agreement that is very reflective of what I think the American public wants us to do in this Congress.

We may not be able to get it all done this year, but we could make an important downpayment, a first step towards this historic conservation bill and leave a real legacy for our children and our grandchildren—not just a 1-year appropriation but a real legacy, as this century ends, of which we can all be proud and all share credit for something well done.

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

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

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I come before the Senate today to speak about a subject which has been the topic of much political rhetoric in recent days: Social Security. While there was a time when not all in Congress acknowledged this fact, Social Security's long-term solvency is crucial to today's and tomorrow's retirees. There has never been a more successful Government

program: Social Security has helped cut the poverty rate of older Americans by two-thirds. We must ensure this program will survive well into the 21st century.

The current dispute centers on which party is more committed to preservation of the Social Security program. I must say that I am personally pleased to see this development, which reflects the fact that Social Security is truly a consensus issue among the American people. The current debate takes place in the confusing world of arcane budgetary terminology and it is sometimes difficult to sort out. However, in evaluating the present-day claims and counterclaims, the historic record clearly shows that it is the Democratic Party which has consistently fought to protect the program since its inception in the Social Security Act of 1935. And though I could certainly be accused of being biased on the question, I believe that a close look will reveal unmistakably that Democratic proposals to save Social Security for future generations greatly surpass the recent efforts of my friends across the aisle in laying claim to be the protectors of Social Security.

For example, let's look at the competing proposals to place a "lockbox" around Social Security and see which one truly best protects the benefits of tomorrow's recipients.

First, Democratic lockbox proposals establish a Social Security and Medicare lockbox that precludes any portion of the Social Security surplus or any portion of the surplus reserved for Medicare to be used for any purpose other than to strengthen and preserve these programs. Over the next 15 years, the Democratic lockbox would protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus each year, and one-third of any on-budget surplus for Medicare.

On the other hand, the Republican lockbox proposal does not reserve any of the projected surpluses for Medicare, nor does it extend the life of the Social Security trust fund, which, under their proposals, will be insolvent in 2034. Furthermore, in the absence of protections for Medicare, this critical program is projected to be insolvent in 2015. Perhaps most importantly, the Republican proposals include language which creates a large potential loophole for the lockbox protections. Specifically, if any legislation is designated as "Social Security reform provisions"—regardless of whether such provisions help or hurt the interests of beneficiaries—lockbox surpluses would not have to be used to pay benefits and could be used for tax cuts. Finally, the Republican lockbox proposal does not even require that such Social Security "reform" legislation extend the solvency of the Social Security program. Is this meaningful, long-term protection for Social Security?

Some on the other side have accused Democrats of raiding Social Security surpluses, yet the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office—whose head was appointed by the Republican leader-

ship—has determined that spending bills supported by the congressional majority have already tapped into the Social Security surplus by at least \$13 billion. In belated recognition of this fact, House Republicans have proposed a 1.4 percent across-the-board cut in the operating budgets of Federal agencies. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am loath to take a step in the wrong direction just after we have recently provided—on a bipartisan basis—the Department of Defense with much-needed budget relief for both personnel and equipment costs.

But when we consider the impact of recent congressional proposals on the future of Social Security we must look back no further than August 1999 when the Republican majority pushed through Congress a tax cut that, at the time, I labeled a "convenient but fiscally irresponsible measure." This tax bill would have consumed virtually all of the projected \$1 trillion non-Social Security budget surplus over the next 10 years, without setting aside any funds for Medicare solvency. The direct revenue loss was estimated at \$792 billion over that period, and with the sharply diminished surplus, higher interest costs on the national debt would bring the total to \$964 billion. And the projected \$1 trillion surplus itself is dependent on large cuts in national defense, education, and other priority programs. If one only assumes that these programs are held at their current levels, plus inflation, the projected 10-year surplus falls from \$1 trillion to \$46 billion.

Clearly, enactment of this massive tax cut, which the President appropriately vetoed, would have vastly compromised and complicated our ability to preserve Social Security and Medicare. No other action considered in this Congress comes even close to having this large a negative impact on Social Security's future.

We can continue to attempt to "one-up" each other over who has the better plan to protect the existing Social Security trust fund. In trying to set the record straight from my own viewpoint, I have spoken today from perhaps a partisan perspective. However, there is plenty of blame to go around for our joint failure in this session of Congress to use the unique opportunity afforded by the long-sought end to massive Federal budget deficits to enact true Social Security reform to protect the benefits of millions of future recipients. The millions of Americans who depend on Social Security for themselves or their parents and grandparents, now and in the future, deserve no less.

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