instances already, but let me say, for our State of Rhode Island, this is an issue of particular importance, because we are very proud in Rhode Island that our former Senator, Claiborne Pell, was amongst the champions of NEA when he first got here to the Congress in 1960 and, with the help of my uncle, President Kennedy, was able to fashion the National Endowment of the Arts early on. And what a success it has been.

In my State of Rhode Island, we have a program called Arts Talk that focuses on dropouts in our schools. We have found students in the Vo-Tech schools, who have no exposure to the arts, are able to get exposure through the programs like Arts Talk, which expand the arts to people that do not ordinarily have access to the arts.

What this has done is, it has helped awaken their imaginations, helped them have a better self-image, because in many instances they learn about their own cultural heritage expressions within the arts. In addition to that, they may find some inherent talent in their own being that will allow them to express themselves through the arts, either by playing an instrument, acting in a play or painting a picture.

These things may sound esoteric to us, but I can tell you in Rhode Island they have had a marked impact on helping reduce juvenile delinquency in the schools. We have actually seen students that we have paired up with this program have a greater attendance in the schools, because they feel good about what they are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a program that really does not just meet the eye with respect to the arts. The implications of this program go well beyond just the immediacy of having our young people exposed to the arts.

I would ask my colleagues to keep this in mind when we have the point of order on the Obey language which will strike it and, therefore, strike the $98 million for NEA; and I would hope we support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) to restore that funding, because I think it is so critical for our future generations to build their self-esteem and sense of self, which is so powerfully done through the arts.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for the work that he has done on this bill and on two other issues related in this bill, the Blackstone Valley Heritage Quarter and the support he gave Indian health services, which I must say was drastically underfunded, but thanks to the work that the chairman and the committee members provided, we are going to see an increase in Indian health services, which is something that I think we should all applaud.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also associate my words with the words about the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and this bill being a good bill, and also with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). Though we have opposed each other on many issues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) reminds me of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Natcher.

One time when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was on the floor and I was mad as a hornet, Mr. Natcher, being from Kentucky, who was in the majority at the time and in control of the bill and, with me, fuming right there at that microphone, said ''Mr. CUNNINGHAM,'' he said, ''I am from Kentucky and we have race horses. Quite often they come out of the block so fast that they break their legs, and we then have to shoot them. If you will settle down, I will help you pass your amendment.'' So I got the word of the then-chairman, Mr. Natcher.

But I would say that I am proud of what the Republican majority has done with the balanced budget, welfare reform, and tax relief for working families, and I am proud of this bill.

I have a potential sadness with this bill, in the fact that in 1995, on the Interior appropriations bill and the rule, the Republican Party was at an impasse. There was a group that wanted to increase the funding for the NEA and there was a group that wanted to strike the funding for the NEA. The result would have been that we would have lost that rule and the other side of the aisle would have taken over that rule and written it as they saw fit.

So then the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), got the Republicans of both groups in a room for 4 hours and we came to an agreement. That agreement was that we would continue to fund the National Endowment for the Arts for a certain period of time.

Then the problem was that they could not use the funding within the year and they would lose that amount of funding, so we agreed to let them keep it so they could establish a true endowment that would fund the NEA, and we also promised to work for a tax break where you could give to the arts and get an additional tax break.

That was a word and that was a bond. My view of a principles of your word is that if I give, say, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) my word, I would fall on my sword before I would break that word, unless I came to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and looked him in the eye and said, I cannot follow that because of these reasons, and let him respond.

But once an agreement had been executed, like the National Endowment for the Arts agreement, you cannot come back on your word.

I would ask the committee, many Members feel very strongly on both sides of this issue. That is fine, and they have fought for that. But the agreement was not just to reduce the NEA, it was not just to compel it to follow certain rules; it was, after the agreement, to eliminate it from the taxpayers, and Joe Six-pack would not have to pay for the NEA, but it could become its own endowment.

I would ask this House and those Members that signed and agreed, I was in the room, you can spin it any way that you want. I am not talking about the Democrats, they were not part of this agreement, I am talking about my own party.

You can spin it any way you want. I was in the room, I know the agreement, I know the acknowledgment, and I know how it was carried out. My potential sadness is that that word would be broken in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to live up to their word and vote against the Johnson amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman, but I would point out, we came to the floor of the House from the committee with zero funding 3 years in a row; 1997 and 1998 and this year would have been zero had there not been an amendment in the full committee supported by some Republicans.

We got to the Senate for a conference on the bill, and the Senate made it very clear that they were not bound by any agreement made by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has expired.

(On request of Mr. REGULA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CUNNINGHAM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In my humble opinion, it should be struck, the point of order, the Johnson amendment should not be offered, or if it is offered, those members should stick to their word. The chairman of the committee in conference should not yield and accede to the Senate provision, and then the word would be kept.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is rather difficult. The Senate has dug in, the other body, and also the President made it very clear that a $14 billion bill, which affects a lot of things in your State as well as others, would be vetoed over this issue. So it is pretty complicated.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand.

Mr. REGULA. We kept our part of the bargain. We came with the zero.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER) assumed the chair.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 318. To require automatic cancellation and notice of cancellation rights with respect to private mortgage insurance which is required as a condition for entering into a

residential mortgage transaction, to abolish the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to move to page 88, line 8, through line 6 on page 89, for the purpose of making a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, some of us have amendments in title I. How does the gentleman's proposal affect those amendments getting heard today?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, it would in no way affect the other amendments. We are doing this at the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), who would like to deal with the issue of NEA, is my understanding.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is not my request. It was my understanding that the request was, would I agree to it? If the gentleman wants to continue at another stage of the bill, it is all right with me, but to place this in my pocket is the wrong approach. I would just as soon hear it or just as soon postpone it.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield further, let us move on and dispose of this issue. Most of the speeches thus far have been on that issue, so I think it is important that we deal with it expeditiously. It will not affect in any way the gentleman's ability to offer amendments.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman saying he wanted to go to the NEA and for how long a period?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, 30 minutes has been allowed in the rule.

Mr. SANDERS. Then we will come back to the beginning of the bill?

Mr. REGULA. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we will go right back to the start of the bill after we finish this?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $81,250,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $16,760,000, to remain available until expended, to the National Endowment for the Arts: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2), subsections 11(a)(2)(A) and 11(a)(3)(A) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the two paragraphs beginning on page 88, line 10, and all that follows through page 89, line 6, include unauthorized appropriations in violation of clause 2 of House Rule XXI.

The language I have just specified is an appropriation of $98 million for the necessary expenses for the National Endowment of the Arts. Authorization in law for the National Endowment for the Arts expired in fiscal year 1993. Clause 2 of House Rule XXI states ''No appropriation shall be reported in a general appropriations bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.''

Since the National Endowment of the Arts is clearly not authorized in law and the bill includes an appropriation of funds in this agency, I make a point of order that the language is in obvious violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as the author of the language which is proposed to be stricken under the point of order, I would simply ask, is this the point of order that would allow the House to put back by recorded vote exactly what will be stricken 5 minutes earlier so that one party can claim victory over another, or is this a serious legislative approach?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask that the gentleman confine his remarks to the point of order.

Does anyone wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee of jurisdiction over NEA, I would like to speak on the point of order with respect to funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, and want to make a few comments to put NEA funding in context.

Last year the Interior appropriations bill that came to the House floor provided continued funding for NEA for fiscal year 1998.

□ 1415

The point of order was made that constituted funding for a nonauthorized program. The point of order prevailed and the bill left the House with zero funding for the NEA, and then the master of all arts came into play, Houdini. When we found this bill again, we discovered that there was an appropriation, even though it was not authorized.

This year we find ourselves in much the same position. The appropriations bill has been reported to the House with $98 million for the NEA, yet the NEA has not been authorized since 1993. For the past few years it has been continuing on a year-by-year basis only by virtue of the appropriations process. A point of order has been made that the $98 million should be struck on the grounds it constitutes funding of a nonauthorized program. Some of my colleagues may ask, well, what has the authorizing committee been doing? Let me explain.

Back in 1995 the committee reported an NEA authorization bill. It would have permitted the NEA to exist for 3 more years, phasing it out over that same 3-year period, giving plenty of time for the private sector, local States and municipalities to take over the program. In fact, the NEA would have ceased to exist as of October 1 of this year had that bill become law. However, there was no floor action taken on it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not addressing the question of the current legislation and I think his attention should be directed to that fact. I think if he wants to state the history of the appropriations, the point of order should be disposed of and the gentleman permitted to strike the last word or participate in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the Chair would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to confine his remarks to the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.