

provided to us, as members of the subcommittee, listing things that they need, but they could not fit into the overall budget. Now, many of the Members who have asked to have congressionally-directed adds put in this bill, many of those Members are asking that the shortfall list be dealt with. The Members who are very knowledgeable on national defense issues in this House, and there are many who are knowledgeable, they are working toward the same shortfall list that the Department of Defense has provided for us during our hearings. We will be very careful to make sure that anything that we add over the budget will fit into the category of having a direct national defense effect, and number 2, that there is a requirement for it.

So for those who are questioning how I intend to vote on the Obey motion, I intend to support it because I see nothing at all wrong with it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take another minute. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) mentioned the F-14. He is right, the F-14 had a pretty serious safety record. I led the fight in the committee for years to reengine the F-14s to eliminate the TF-30 engine that was causing many of the accidents and the problems. As the airplane got older, the Defense Department decided not to continue the reengining program because the airplanes would be going out of the inventory. But those F-14s that are going out of the inventory are not nearly as old as some of the C-130s that we are replacing with those that we add today. Some are as many as 40 years old. Yes, some of them are hurricane hunters. Others are refueling tankers used by the Marine Corps and are 40 years old. I just do not think that people who are in uniform and given a mission to fly into a hostile situation should have to fly an airplane that is 40 years old. Frankly, an airplane at 40 years old should not be in the air.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4112, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4112) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SERRANO

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SERRANO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4112, be instructed to bolster the Capitol police force by concurring in the Senate amendments that restore \$4.197 million of reductions passed by the House for Capitol Police salaries and Capitol Police general expenses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold my comments until we hear from the gentleman from downstate New York.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a motion every Member can support. This has been an extraordinary year for the Capitol Police and its police force. We have seen the first deaths of Capitol Police officers in the line of duty in many years. U.S. embassies have been bombed by terrorists, and the U.S. has responded to this terrorism with missile attacks. All of this raises the perception of threats, if not the actual threats to U.S. interests and institutions all over the world.

The Capitol, of course, is one of the great symbols of our Nation. Therefore, it is occasionally a target of people with seriously deranged thinking or violent anti-American views.

The Capitol is also the seat of the people's branch of our government and the destination of thousands of visitors every day, both constituents and tourists, as well as high-ranking officials of our own government and leaders from all over the world.

I suppose we could be much safer and perhaps also save money if we chose to wall the Capitol complex off from the people. But I believe everyone here would strongly oppose that approach to security.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the people's branch must remain open to the public. It is our duty, often through this bill, to make sure that the Capitol Police have the resources they need to keep this open campus safe and secure for Members, staff, employees, visitors, and guests.

As threats evolve, responses must evolve, and the Capitol Police must have the resources for the personnel, training, and technology they need.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before and will no doubt say again, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has done an excellent job in putting this bill together. I think our initial decisions on funding levels for the Capitol Police were entirely appropriate.

But since our bill passed the House in June, we have seen the unfortunate murders of Officers Chestnut and Gibson, the bombings of U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, and the resulting missile attacks on terrorist locations.

All of this has increased the obligations of the Capitol Police, increased the need for overtime, caused new thinking on the physical security needs for the campus and the need for additional resources.

As a first step to that end, and of course there will be additional and more substantial steps, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct conferees, to accept the Senate figures for the Capitol Police.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to accept the gentleman's motion to instruct the conferees. I think it is very constructive. It puts the House squarely in a position where we see the wisdom of the Senate's decision to fund these given the events that my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) has mentioned, especially the tragic events that occurred last month involving the loss of our two officers, Chestnut and Gibson.

We really need to enhance our security, and certainly we need to reward the professionalism and the high quality of service provided by our Capitol Hill Police.

So we see this as constructive and support the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct and that I may include tabular extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Walsh, Young of Florida, Cunningham, Wamp, Latham, Livingston, Serrano, Fazio of California, Hoyer, and Obey.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 4328, DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1999

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4328) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves, that in resolving the differences between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4328, be instructed to disagree to a provision in the Senate bill that amends the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act to allow helicopters unrestricted access to wilderness areas in Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 4328, the fiscal year 1999 transportation appropriations bill passed the House, it was a bill that was relatively free of anti-environmental riders. However, the Senate has attached to the bill several controversial riders that undermine important environmental protections.

Mr. Speaker, this Motion to instruct addresses the most controversial of

those riders which would amend the Alaskan National Interest Lands Conservation Act to permit helicopters to operate inland in all national wildlife refuges, national parks and wilderness study areas in Alaska. This motion to instruct directs the House conferees to disagree with this provision which is not in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate rider has no place in the transportation appropriations bill. First, the provision is a legislative provision that amends the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, a law that is within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Resources.

Second, this provision is not simply a provision to clarify as some have claimed. It would rewrite 18 years of national environmental policy with potentially far-reaching impacts that, according to the National Park Service, could fundamentally change the character of national parks in Alaska.

Currently, helicopter landings are allowed in Alaska wilderness areas only for emergency reasons and on a case-by-case basis for nonemergency uses in nonwilderness areas. These restrictions were carefully constructed when ANILCA was adopted in 1980.

This amendment would lift those restrictions, allowing helicopters to land routinely in the remote areas of the Tongass National Forest, the glaciers of Kenai Fjords National Park, and the inlets of Glacier Bay, primarily for the benefit of helicopter tour operators and cruise ship passengers who want to take these sightseeing tours.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has strongly objected to this provision. The Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture have previously recommended that bills containing similar provisions be vetoed. Federal land management agencies have already considered the expanded use of helicopters on wilderness lands in Alaska and found it to be inappropriate.

Numerous environmental groups also have objected to this provision. They fear that the constant buzz of helicopters dropping tourists into fragile ecosystems on the tops of mountains, near isolated lakes, and in other pristine areas for purely recreational purposes could destroy the very essence of these wild areas, disturb wildlife, and disrupt habitat protection activities for threatened and endangered species.

Further, hunting and sporting organizations have objected to this provision. They are asking us to safeguard default hunting and sporting opportunities in Alaska by rejecting this provision.

Mr. Speaker, this anti-environmental rider is controversial and complex and should not be included in the conference report on the transportation appropriation bill. I urge adoption of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very, very strong support of the motion to instruct the conferees offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

The Senate version of the FY 1999 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill includes a rider which would amend current law to change "airplanes" to "aircraft" to allow helicopters to operate and land in conservation systems units in Alaska, including wilderness areas and wilderness study areas. To permit helicopters in Alaskan wilderness and other conservation areas would be a travesty and, quite frankly, just flat wrong.

If the Senate provision were adopted, there would be widespread commercialization of the Alaska wilderness. Recreational helicopters, operated by tour companies, would penetrate and land in parks, wilderness and other conservation areas, significantly altering the experience of the park and threatening the resources of these very special places.

Opening these conservation units in Alaska to aircraft access is opening them to virtually unlimited access. Helicopter use has few limitations. Virtually any area can be accessed and any small clearing is suitable for landing. Furthermore, the Senate provision opens the door not only for helicopters but also for hover craft, ultralights and virtually any and every technological innovation that personal aircraft industry may produce.

Unrestricted helicopter access, operations and landings would disrupt ongoing conservation efforts in the national parks, national wildlife refuges, national forests and on the public lands. Scientific research has demonstrated that helicopter noise levels can adversely impact wildlife. The noise and wind disruption from helicopters would impact the caribou, the moose, the waterfowl, raptors and other bird species, brown and black bears, and certain other animals and mammals.

Unrestricted helicopter operations would destroy the very essence of these wild areas, by allowing helicopter-borne recreation, hunting and fishing access to areas of this country that we have determined to be pristine, and would be absolutely wrong. Poaching and other illegal hunting would also, I think, become commonplace.

The Senate amendment should be resoundingly rejected by the House. We must protect our Nation's wilderness areas for generations to come. We must not permit the commercialization of