

LoBiondo	Pease	Smith (OR)
Lofgren	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Lowey	Petri	Smith, Adam
Lucas	Pitts	Smith, Linda
Luther	Pombo	Snowbarger
Maloney (CT)	Pomeroy	Snyder
Maloney (NY)	Portman	Solomon
Manton	Price (NC)	Souder
Manzullo	Pryce (OH)	Spence
Martinez	Quinn	Spratt
Mascara	Radanovich	Stabenow
Matsui	Rahall	Stark
McCarthy (MO)	Ramstad	Stearns
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Stokes
McCollum	Redmond	Strickland
McGovern	Regula	Stump
McHugh	Reyes	Stupak
McInnis	Riggs	Sununu
McIntosh	Riley	Talent
McIntyre	Rivers	Tanner
McKeon	Rodriguez	Tauscher
McKinney	Roemer	Tauzin
Meehan	Rogan	Taylor (MS)
Meek (FL)	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
Meeks (NY)	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson
Metcalf	Rothman	Thornberry
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Thune
Millender-	Royce	Thurman
McDonald	Rush	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Ryun	Tierney
Minge	Sabo	Torres
Mink	Salmon	Towns
Moakley	Sanchez	Trafficant
Mollohan	Sandlin	Upton
Moran (KS)	Sanford	Velazquez
Moran (VA)	Sawyer	Vento
Morella	Saxton	Visclosky
Murtha	Scarborough	Walsh
Myrick	Schaefer, Dan	Wamp
Neal	Schaffer, Bob	Waters
Nethercutt	Scott	Watkins
Neumann	Sensenbrenner	Watt (NC)
Ney	Serrano	Watts (OK)
Nussle	Sessions	Waxman
Oberstar	Shadeegg	Weldon (FL)
Obey	Shaw	Weller
Olver	Shays	Wexler
Oxley	Sherman	Weygand
Packard	Shimkus	White
Pallone	Shuster	Whitfield
Pappas	Sisisky	Wicker
Parker	Skaggs	Wilson
Pascrell	Skeen	Wise
Pastor	Skelton	Wolf
Paul	Slaughter	Woolsey
Paxon	Smith (MI)	Wynn
Payne	Smith (NJ)	Yates

NOT VOTING—45

Army	Gonzalez	Owens
Baker	Harman	Pelosi
Bilirakis	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Burton	Hill	Pickering
Cardin	John	Pickett
Crapo	Kaptur	Porter
Danner	Kennelly	Poshard
DeLay	Markey	Roukema
Dixon	McCrery	Sanders
Doolittle	McDade	Schumer
Dunn	McHale	Stenholm
Engel	McNulty	Turner
Evans	Northup	Weldon (PA)
Ewing	Norwood	Young (AK)
Ford	Ortiz	Young (FL)

□ 1102

Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida, ISTOOK, LINDER, SAXTON, NUSSLE, WHITE, KLUG and COOKSEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MINGE changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4193, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the last year in which debate on the Federal support for the arts will be led by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations. Renowned as the champion of the NEA and credited for keeping it alive by the sheer force of his will, the gentleman from Illinois is retiring at the end of the year.

Under the usual procedures of the House, the gentleman would have the honor of offering amendments to strengthen the arts. But this rule takes that honor away from him. Of course, this disappointment can never obscure the debt that artists, art educators, and art institutions across the Nation owe to their long-time champion. History will record SID YATES' legacy, the vitality of the arts across our Nation.

This rule cannot tarnish SID YATES' leadership on the issue, but it does demonstrate the nature of the leadership so caught up in its power that it has the audacity to deny the foremost supporter of the arts one last chance to lead the battle for the NEA survival.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to talk about the National Endowment for the Arts. It has been 32 years since President Johnson signed into law the bill legislation that would create the National Endowment for the Arts. He, along with most Americans, believed that the Federal Government must have a role in supporting arts.

Since then we have seen a profound impact on the nonprofit arts community in this country. The number of arts agencies has risen from five in 1965 to 56 today. Local arts agencies have grown from 400 to 4,000. Nonprofit theaters from 56 to 425. Orchestras from 1,000 to 1,800, and opera companies from 27 to 120.

From an economic perspective, the benefits of the NEA are unmistakable. Last year, the \$98 million allocated to the NEA provided the cornerstone for a \$37 billion industry. For the price of one hundredth of one percent of the Federal budget, we helped create 1.3 million full-time jobs in States, cities, towns, and villages across the country, generating \$3.4 billion for the Federal Treasury in income taxes.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors, and more than 100 CEOs of major corporations, all support the NEA because they recognize the contribution of the arts to our economy and to our culture.

Most importantly, we must not forget the impact of the arts on our Nation's most precious resource, our children. Providing students access to art has a significant impact on their overall development, including academic achievement and behavior. In fact, a study conducted by the College En-

trance Examination Board showed that students with 4 or more years of arts classes raised their SAT scores by 53 points on the verbal and 35 points on the math portions of the test. For 36 cents per capita, how can we not even consider making this investment?

The NEA is also instrumental in making sure all Americans have access to the arts. Through its innovative new program, ArtsREACH, the agency is working to stimulate participation in areas that are often underserved by the arts grants. This program, which will be announcing its first set of grants later this year, provides funding directly to communities and States that receive fewer than five grants during the preceding year. With help from the NEA, communities develop a cultural plan with input from the local Chamber of Commerce, social service agencies, police departments, mayors, local artists and other community leaders. Outreach grants will enable communities to undertake such endeavors as building performance and exhibit spaces, enhancing opportunities in arts education, and developing arts alternatives for youth at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we may hear opponents of the NEA argue that the agency is no longer needed, that the private sector is fully capable of supporting the arts in America. I respectfully beg to differ.

Every Federal dollar spent by the National Endowment for the Arts leverages many additional public dollars at the State and local levels, as well as multiple private donations. Funding for the arts rests on a delicate balance of Federal, State, and local government funding, ticket sales, other earned income, as well as corporate and individual philanthropic giving. No arts organization can survive on earned income alone. In fiscal year 1997, the \$99.5 million contributed by the Federal Government helped leverage \$280 million in State funding and more than \$675 million from local governments. The Federal Government needs to continue to do its share.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop holding the NEA a political hostage. We owe this to the agency, to the artists, and most importantly to our constituents.

In the 1996 Louis Harris poll, a majority of all Americans supported a Federal role in funding the arts. Federal funding for the arts has been and will continue to be a hallmark of civilized societies around the world. The benefits that we receive for our economy, for our children, and for our communities far outweigh our small financial investment. I urge my colleagues to oppose any efforts to shrink this important responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations recognized the benefits of the arts by providing \$98 million, nearly level funding. That funding should have remained in the bill, making an amendment to restore it unnecessary.

However, this rule allows the funding to be struck and then allows an amendment to restore it. If the rule passes, I ask my colleagues to vote for the amendment to restore the NEA funding.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Committee on Rules chose this procedure; however, in the end, the rule does allow a straight up-or-down vote to provide funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was upstairs in my office up in the Committee on Rules preparing for some Rules meetings so that the House can expedite all of these appropriation bills that keep coming down here on us, and I heard the word "partisanship" mentioned several times.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to retire from this body come December 31, and the one thing I guess I will not miss about this body is when people stand up any time there is a disagreement and they start yelling partisanship. It should not be that way.

We can disagree. Reasonable people can disagree. But we ought to come down here and we ought to argue it out on a friendly basis. I say that with all due respect to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) who represents one of the nicest places in New York State, as I do. She represents Rochester, New York.

But let me explain why we are here in the first place. And I do so because there are not many Members, like the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and myself and many others, who have been around here for a period of time. Two-thirds of the House is new in the last couple of elections, and maybe they do not understand. But, Mr. Speaker, we have rules in this House. And when we have appropriation bills, we generally bring those appropriation bills right to the floor and we let the House work its will.

Now, there is a problem with that because if we do that, then there are many items in these bills that are subject to points of order. That means they can be stricken out without any debate whatsoever. We have two Members of this body, one is departed, deceased now, and the other is about to leave with me in December. And his name is SID YATES, and the other was a man named Bill Natcher of Kentucky. They used to bring these bills right to the floor and let the House work their will.

If we did that we, of course, would not have a debate on an issue that is terribly important to many Members of the House on both sides of the aisle,

and especially to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) who is without a question the personification of the word "gentleman" in this body.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) very, very much, both for his very kind words and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York is incorrect in asserting that, like Bill Natcher, my good friend and his as well, I brought the Interior bill when I was chairman, to the floor, the Interior bill when I was chairman, without a rule. That is not correct.

I brought the bill to the floor asking for waivers of the unauthorized programs that were in the bill, including the National Endowment for the Arts. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), who was then in the position now occupied by the distinguished gentleman from New York, gave us a waiver on all of those. The gentleman differs in that respect by refusing to grant that waiver to the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his clarification. Let me just point out the difference now between the current majority and the old Democratic majority.

In the past, the Committee on Appropriations would overrule the standing committees, the authorizing committees, of which there are 13 in this body. They would legislate in their appropriation bills. This would create a lot of animosity on both sides of the aisle.

We now have a protocol where if an issue appears in an appropriation bill, and it has not been authorized by the authorizing committee which, under the rules of this House, has the obligation to deal with these authorization programs, then we just do not protect them unless we do have the support of the authorizing committee.

Mr. Speaker, here is the letter from the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The gentleman points out that his committee has not authorized the National Endowment for the Arts, nor do they intend to this year. That means, under normal protocol then, we would simply leave this issue unprotected and that would be the end of it because some Member, like myself who opposes Federal funding of the National Endowment for the Arts, and we can differ on that whether that is right or wrong, but I or any other Member should stand up and strike it. There would be no debate on this issue.

Now, instead of that, in trying to be fair to Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats both divided on this issue, we issued a rule and we lived up to the protocol, our ob-

ligation to the authorizing committees and we left the NEA funding exposed.

Now, we also wrote into the rule, and I have the language right here, that if someone, myself or anyone else, should strike the funding for the NEA because it had not been authorized, we would then make in order an amendment by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON), wherever she is here, that would restore \$98 million, the entire funding match from last year, to this issue, and we would have a debate, up or down, on this bill.

Now, we did something else earlier on, because in the Committee on Appropriations I think our good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who is also one of the highly respected Members of this body, saw fit to offer an amendment where he placed in the appropriation bill money for this unauthorized program, and he took it out of the account which funds fire fighting on Federal lands in this country. Now, that to me is a high priority. We know the heat wave that is striking this country. We need those funds in the bill.

We have self-executed into this bill the funds that were taken out of it for fire fighting, at the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. HELEN CHENOWETH). It is her amendment. And I want to commend her highly, because if it were not for her, right now these funds would not be in this bill. So I highly commend the gentlewoman for what she has done.

Now, her amendment, once this rule passes, is in the bill. It restores the \$67 million. Now, then, the House is going to have the opportunity, whether Members are for or against the NEA, to work its will on an up or down vote. We cannot be any more fair than that. And we have attempted to be as fair as we possibly could.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. Could the gentleman claim some time from the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER)?

Mr. OBEY. Since the gentleman used my name, I want the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, I am cutting into other Members' time, but I will yield for 30 seconds.

Mr. OBEY. Thirty seconds is all I need.

I would simply point out that money was taken from the fire fighting account because that was where money was intentionally parked by the committee, which they knew was above the amount that they were going to be asked to be spent on that item anyway. So we took the money from the account that the gentleman's own committee leadership planned to take it from to do the very thing that we did. I do not know how we can be blamed for that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not think the gentleman can explain that to the 21

fire fighters from my district that went out to fight fires and were gone for 3 months in this country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the Republican rule on the National Endowment for the Arts and in support of full funding for the NEA. We must make this commitment not only to fulfill our Nation's cultural life but also to nourish the local economic development efforts which rise from our investments in the arts.

I hope that the majority of the House will eventually support funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, but we can only get there by crossing an obstacle course put in place by the Republican leadership. Their Byzantine maneuvering on this rule is a waste of the House's precious time.

Support for NEA is more than just about the love of art or high-minded support of cultural endeavors. It is about supporting the efforts of State and local governments to create economic growth. The NEA's funding goes to projects which increase economic opportunity by promoting the cultural and artistic activities of local citizens. The arts enhance a community's quality of life, thereby attracting industry, jobs, and increasing the tax base. Investment in the arts is both economically prudent and wise.

Federal funds are leveraged by localities to bring about a bigger bang for the NEA buck. The \$98 million invested in the NEA by the Federal Government stimulated State and local governments to provide more than \$975 million to the arts. This is big business: The nonprofit arts industry generates \$36 billion of business annually and supports 1.3 million full-time jobs.

And the NEA benefits rural as well as urban areas. The NEA's partnerships foster rural community revitalization, downtown development, and historic revitalization. The cultural traditions of local communities can serve as a strategy for economic development of economically depressed rural communities.

Also, funding for the NEA is about supporting a full and rich education for our children. In 1997, 10 percent of its annual grant dollars were spent in support of pre-K through 12 arts education programs. NEA grants are used to provide educational opportunities for millions of children to learn and be enriched by the arts, opportunities that would not exist without the NEA.

So we need to fund the NEA to make sure that we nurture the artistic capabilities of all Americans. Funding for the NEA is a small investment in the spiritual and intellectual health of our country. It has and will continue to pay great dividends for our Nation, far beyond its modest cost.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and support full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Both sides have 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH).

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to express my heartfelt appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JERRY SOLOMON), and I will miss him terribly. The gentleman from New York worked tirelessly to guarantee that my amendment to increase wild land fire fighting capabilities is considered as adopted, and I thank the chairman for recognizing the importance of the funding of this account and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources, it is easy to understand my elation when I learned that the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations increased the wild land fire management account. With roughly a half million acres burned and burning in Florida, and I guess just the recent rains have just finally put those fires out, and with one and a half million acres burned so far this year nationwide, the subcommittee properly funded the fire fighting account and they funded it at a higher level.

This should be a national priority, to make sure that our national resources do not burn. We very well may have a record fire year this year, even exceeding the fire year of 1910. I would not be surprised to see more acres burn this year than in 1910. The subcommittee's response was very proper. So, Mr. Speaker, when the full appropriations legislation left the fire fighting budget seriously underfunded, my disappointment and distress should come as no surprise.

Now, let me say that I appreciate the arts. Let me also say that I declared a major in music. Let me also say I received a scholarship in music. My whole family is very, very musical. I appreciate the arts. But this is a Nation that must have its funds in order and its priorities in order as to how we expend these funds.

When we are a Nation that can meet the necessary services, like a national defense, fire fighting for our public lands, and take good care of the resources that we already have, such as our forests, then, absent pornographic arts, maybe there is a case that can be made for the National Endowment for the Arts, but only after we have taken care of all the necessary services.

I am not sure that this should ever be a function of the Federal Government.

The ultimate irony is that funding for the National Endowment for the Arts came from the fire fighting account. Now, that is a misprioritization of our funds. It would be especially odd considering that the NEA is an organization this body has elected to terminate. But to fund the NEA at the cost of the wild land fire fighting capabilities is unacceptable.

I appreciate the Committee on Rules accepting my amendment to reconfirm our priorities. I do not intend to engage in a debate in the validity of using taxpayers' monies at this point in time for the arts. Suffice it to say that I do not support the NEA in its present form. I will say, though, that when the Federal Government controls vast amounts of land and absolutely refuses to take steps to prevent and control wildfires, steps such as thinning or harvesting dead and dying timber, and steps such as providing roads, like they admit now they needed in Florida in order to prevent the wildfires from spreading, the Federal Government must pay for fire suppression and protect communities, forests, wildlife habitat and the State and private forests and private property.

The Clinton Administration's hands-off approach to forest management is coming back to haunt us. The administration's poor management has resulted in some very serious fires. In 1996 we burned 3 million acres. How many more acres will it take for them to wake up and change their management priorities? We are, at the beginning of this summer, at 1.5 million acres already and counting, and it is only mid-July. Their attitude has been let it burn, but just be sure and get a good picture.

I am pleased again, Mr. Speaker, that our chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), worked so hard to help me in restoring funding.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, this is a strange rule. In almost 50 years in the House, I have seen a lot of strange rules, but I think this is probably the strangest and probably the most political.

The Committee on Appropriations had gone out of its way to approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to re-fund the National Endowment for the Arts. This rule kills the action of the subcommittee.

And, incidentally, that vote was a bipartisan one. Not only the Democrats, but five Republicans helped pass the Obey amendment. This rule kills the action of the Committee by denying a waiver that would bar a point of order for lack of authorization of the program.

Then the rule turns around, having taken the money away from NEA, and

tries to put it back by giving the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) the opportunity to offer an amendment to restore it.

My good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, says "What could be fairer than that?" I will tell the gentleman that, in my opinion, what could be fairer than that would be if he had provided the waiver for NEA that he gave to about 30 other unauthorized programs in the bill. NEA was unfairly singled out for the denial of a waiver.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman yielded to me. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1130

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the respected gentleman that no other authorizing committee had asked to leave a point of order stand except this one.

Let me say to the gentleman, the only fair thing was to do it the way we did it. The other alternative, and I will say this to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), wherever he may be, because he argued to defeat the rule: If we defeat the rule, the bill comes on the floor without a rule; under regular order of the House, someone stands up and strikes the funding for the NEA, and then there is no debate and there is no funding.

I do not think the gentleman wants that, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) should reconsider.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that does not vitiate the error that took place in not having waived the rule of the House for NEA, as was done for the other programs.

For 10 years we have brought our bill to the Committee on Rules asking for a waiver of all the unauthorized programs. When the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) occupied the Chairman's seat now claimed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), he gave this waiver to NEA and we brought it to the floor and we handled it successfully.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank both him and the chairman of the committee as well for their cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted the additional time so I could advise the House that I intend to fight the previous question when the rule comes up for a vote. We have prepared an amended rule with a waiver for NEA that will be presented to the House, to place it in the same equal status as the other unauthorized programs, and I would hope that the House would approve that amended rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and for this legislation, the FY 1999 Interior appropriations bill.

I also want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the ranking member, for their bipartisan support of the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie at the former Joliet Arsenal in Illinois, what we call the Land of Lincoln.

The former Joliet Arsenal in my congressional district was converted to peacetime uses by way of legislation passed by this House and signed into law by the President in 1996. Out of this legislation came the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, the largest conservation area of its kind, 19,000 acres, which will be available for generations to come.

The Midewin Prairie was established to conserve and enhance native populations and habitats of fish, wildlife, and plants; to provide opportunities for environmental education and scientific research; and to provide recreational opportunities for the millions of people in the Chicago Midwest and throughout our Nation.

This committee has been very helpful in support of the development of the Midewin. The Midewin is now on its way to becoming what some have called the Yellowstone of the Midwest. This legislation contains \$2.7 million for operations, planning and design and for development so that visitors can be coming in the coming year.

As my colleagues know, this is a high priority environmental initiative. This project has long had bipartisan support, including support from the entire Illinois delegation. My friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has been a great advocate and supporter of the Midewin, and I salute him for that.

Creation of the Midewin Tallgrass Prairie was widely supported by business, labor, veterans, the environmental community, local elected officials, and our outgoing Governor Jim Edgar. The U.S. Forest Service, in partnership with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, has been working with various agencies, organizations and individuals, including to the point where "Team Midewin" has obtained \$2.3 million in private sector support for the development of the Midewin Prairie.

This is an excellent example of a public-private partnership. I again want to thank the Committee on Appropriations, under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), for funding this project. It is important to Illinois. It is important to our Nation. It is a top environmental priority. I thank them for supporting the Midewin Tallgrass Prairie. I urge support of this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today not so much in anger as in bemusement. This rule is the most blatantly partisan manipulation of the House rules that I have seen in my 29 years' service here. And I guess what I feel more than anything else is simply sorrow for those who feel that they have to engage in such manipulations in order to claim political victories.

I think we ought to take a look at the history of the arts to understand what is being done here today and why. The history is that, for the last 2 years and really for a number of years before that, a large segment of the Republican Caucus in this House has had as its number one mission the elimination of all Federal funding for the arts. Last year no money was provided for funding for the arts in this bill by the majority party, and it took a clear veto threat from the President and a clear bipartisan resistance to their position by the Senate and an insistence by House Democrats that funding be restored before the conference committee on this bill last year did in fact restore the money.

This year, the Republican majority gave zero dollars for the arts in the original bill that came before our committee. In committee, I offered the amendment to restore funding. It was adopted by a virtually unanimous Democratic vote with, I believe, 5 additional Republican friends supporting us to create a bipartisan majority for funding the arts.

This rule under which the bill will now be debated simply allows a single Member to eliminate the funding for the arts under the excuse that they are not technically authorized. And then it makes it in order to restore the very money which they will have just stricken, but only if that amendment is offered by a Republican.

Is there anyone on the House floor who does not see through that charade? Is there anyone who does not understand that what this indicates more than anything else is that this House, in the closing days before the election, is being turned by the majority leadership from a legislative body into a reelection machine? Does anybody really believe there is any other game but that going on?

It is really, in my view, this kind of manipulation that makes so many people back home think that politics in this Congress has become more a question of what politicians do to each other rather than what we are supposed to be doing for the people we represent. And in my view, it is a regrettable chapter in the history of the House.

The rule has only one purpose. It knocks out funding put in the bill on a Democratic motion for the purpose of giving a Republican Member a chance to claim credit for putting it back, and it also has the parliamentary effect of raising the number of votes required to

preserve the arts because we have to have a majority to put the money back in rather than a majority to take it out. That is all it does.

And all I would say to my friends on the Republican side is that if that is what it takes to make them feel good, if that is what it takes to make them feel a little bit more secure from public opinion, by all means, go ahead. But it is not going to fool anybody, not on this floor and not anybody watching.

So go ahead, play the partisan games. It is amazing to me to see what some people will do in order to try to claim a political victory. But in the end, what counts is not these partisan manipulations; it is whether or not the arts are funded. That is a grace note this society needs.

And so, regardless of the ludicrousness of the rule, I expect to support the amendment when the time comes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. It is also a rule that keeps our word to those who desired an up or down vote on the controversial subject of the NEA.

I know that the NEA supporters are upset that the burden has shifted. I have been a supporter of the NEA in the past. I know it is well-championed. But I happen to believe under this rule we are going to end up in the right place, if we do it even a different way, and I think we are going to have a good debate.

I am also pleased that the rule self-executes an amendment to fully fund the wild land fire suppression operation, which is of course a critical issue for the folks in my home State of Florida, given the horrible experience we have just had there.

As usual, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has done an extraordinarily good job of balancing very difficult issues, and I want to publicly thank him. This year's bill provides much needed funding increases for the national parks, the national forest system, and the national wildlife refuges.

I am especially appreciative of the committee's attention to a number of initiatives important to my home State of Florida, not only the fires, but the Everglades, the OCS Moratorium, and the Coastal Barrier Resources system. These are all things that are vital to our quality of life, and they are all truly national assets.

While we have an opportunity to discuss the Coastal Barrier Resources issue in more detail later on if my colleague the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) offers an amendment, I hope that people will reject the GILCREST amendment if it is offered.

I generally support the efforts of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) to promote our barrier islands. He is a true champion in that respect. But the particular amendment that he is proposing today, or may propose today, strips out a provision in the bill that ensures that a law that has already been signed by the President, 2 years ago in fact, making technical corrections to the Coastal Barrier system maps goes forward. It seems to me that we have already fixed that problem and we do not need to go back.

I agree with what the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) is saying prospectively, but I hope that his amendment today will not pass because it unties the fixes that we have made to settle the maps correctly and get them done properly in a fair interest between private-property rights' interests and the public's interest.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not start off by congratulating the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for his over 30 years of leadership in funding for the arts and on many other subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is a great deal of controversy surrounding this rule, but rise today because I think it is necessary to restate the vital importance of the National Endowment of for the Arts.

Thanks in part to the NEA, the non-profit arts industry now generates more than \$36 billion of business annually, supports 1.3 million full-time jobs, and returns \$3.4 billion in federal taxes every year.

Many local agencies have formed partnerships with local school districts, law enforcement, parks and recreation departments, chambers of commerce, libraries, and neighborhood organizations. Together they have used the arts to address local community development issues.

The NEA, however, does much more than just fund local arts agencies. The NEA supports nationally important work like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, public television programs, and numerous touring artist groups that bring excellent art to local communities all across the nation. What state arts agency would spend its limited funds on touring dance or theater groups outside of their state? Only the NEA would support these types of touring arts groups who travel across the country bringing the arts to the American people.

The NEA also supports arts education, which is essential in developing critical thinking skills such as reading, math and science. Last year, the NEA invested \$8.2 million, 10% of its annual grants, in kindergarten through grade 12 arts programs. The U.S. Labor Department report of the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills cites the important role of arts education in achieving many "core competencies" for the workplace, including creative problem solving, allocating resources, team building and exercising individual responsibility.

In short, the NEA is good for education and good for our children. NEA funds help every State in the country. The NEA is a sound economic investment by the federal government, and it plays a critical role in improving our everyday lives and promoting the general welfare. I personally feel that one thing that has been proven by its distinguished history is that, when it comes to fostering the arts, the NEA is the best option there is, the best there was, and the best that—for the foreseeable future—there ever will be.

Mr. Speaker, the arts are vital in American life, and the NEA is vital to promote the arts. It has contributed to the tremendous growth of professional orchestras, nonprofit theaters, dance companies and opera companies throughout the country. Before the NEA, there were 58 orchestras in the country. Today there are more than 1,000. Before the NEA, there were 37 professional dance companies. Now there are 300. Before the NEA, only 1 million people attended theater each year. Today more than 55 million attend a year.

The NEA also stimulates the growth of local arts agencies and investment in the arts by State and local government. Before the NEA, only 5 States had State-funded arts councils. Today all 50 States do.

Mr. Speaker, we should not only continue funding the NEA; we ought to increase its funding substantially. That is why it is unfortunate we are considering this vital program under this silly rule. The Committee has already voted to restore the NEA's funding, and now we are here playing games with the rule that takes out this funding precisely so that we can debate putting it back in. What is most important today is that we live up to our constitutional obligation to promote the general welfare, and that means protecting and promoting the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule; and I do so with the greatest respect for my very good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (SID YATES) who, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) said earlier, is going to be retiring.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has over the last several weeks been insisting that the genes that have come from my late father will continue, because it is no secret that my father, who was very active as the head of the Lyric Opera Company in Kansas City, Missouri and several other organizations, was a strong supporter of the National Endowment of the Arts and encouraged me to do that.

But let me just talk for a moment about this rule. I have heard words like "Byzantine" and "extreme partisanship" used to describe this rule, and I

think it is important for us to note that there is a great deal of controversy about the National Endowment for the Arts.

□ 1145

I am on record in the past saying while I am a very strong supporter of the arts, I make personal contributions to different efforts around the country, I do believe that when we look at the limited resources that we have here in Washington, D.C. and the fact that priorities need to be established, I think it is a very justifiable debate to say that expending hard-working taxpayer dollars on the arts is in fact not the most responsible use of those dollars when we have a very strong economy and voluntary contributions, with tax deductibility, can in fact be expanded.

But as far as this rule is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that with this controversy we have without an authorization run by this structure that we have put into place saying that we should not have this measure protected in the appropriations bill but we will still, when it is struck out, have the opportunity for an up-or-down vote to be made with the Johnson amendment that will be made in order. So I think that the rhetoric is what has troubled me in saying that this is somehow Byzantine and extremely partisan when we are giving the debate an opportunity to be heard in the House. I do support this rule and the final bill as it comes forward.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I too want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for what they have done with the underlying bill. But I want to talk about a matter that involves part of our district in Tennessee, the Land Between the Lakes, because there is a legislative provision protected in the rule that makes little economic sense, is unfair to the people of the country and is punitive toward the Tennessee valley.

LBL, Land Between the Lakes, is currently managed by the Tennessee Valley Authority with an annual budget of about \$11 million, \$4.5 million of that coming from user fees. It draws more than 2 million visitors each year and is the hub of our local economy.

TVA's management, policies and employees' performance at LBL has been under a thinly disguised attack by the House leadership for more than 2 years, notwithstanding the fact that virtually every objective person who has an interest in its future agrees that TVA is doing a good job of stewardship. The TVA Caucus, the National Wild Turkey Federation, the Tennessee Conservation League, and the Land Between the Lakes Association all say so.

This record of sound management now depends on the outcome of a

House-Senate conference reconciling fiscal year 1999 energy and water appropriations.

What is protected in this rule is the backup plan, what they characterize as a backup plan. It is part of the continued attack on TVA in general and in my judgement will ultimately imperil LBL's future as the national treasure as a wilderness area in the eastern United States it is. It sets in motion a transfer of LBL's management to the National Forest Service.

Given the budget considerations that the Forest Service has in respect to the problems it has budgetarily outlined in the Public Lands Funding Initiative, I would hate to see LBL get lost in the Forest Service backlog.

Let me just say this. Transferring LBL to the Forest Service or perhaps other Federal agencies in my judgment will not save the taxpayers of this country one single dime. This is not the way to go on LBL.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula), the distinguished subcommittee chairman that is responsible for this legislation.

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. First of all I want to say I have been pleased with the debate we have had on this rule. I think we have had many different points of view expressed. I hope that the entire bill will be treated with the same courtesy and respect for the opinions of others.

It is clear that one of the major issues in the bill is the National Endowment for the Arts. We have wrestled with this issue, the gentleman from Illinois and myself, for several years. Last year we went through a rather convoluted procedure to get to a final disposition.

So I started out 6 months ago doing some missionary work to reach a solution on the NEA. I talked to those on our side who would like to abolish it, I talked to the leadership on the other side and to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). We finally reached an agreement that we would come to the floor with a zero funding for the NEA. There was an agreement that we would get a waiver on an amendment so to put the funding in and the Members of the House could have an up or down vote.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio and I came to that agreement, I had the impression that the effort for the vote would be led by the Democrats, as it has been over the last several years, and I was unaware of the convoluted structure that the rule was going to take.

Mr. REGULA. I understand. I think he has some legitimate concerns, and I

had not really said particularly who should offer the amendment. My mission was to get a clean vote so we would know where 435 Members of this House stood on the basic issue, and, that is, Is it the government's role to fund the NEA? With all the restrictions, we have put on the NEA, most recently the original Senate amendment on obscenity upheld by the Supreme Court last month, plus the fact that we have three Members of the House and three of the Senate sitting on the National Council. I know that a couple of these Members are not very big fans of the arts, to say the least.

So we have worked out the arrangement to come to the floor with zero funding, and I think in good faith the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offered the amendment in the full committee, not being sure that this agreement would stick in the House. That is what brought us to where we are today. We are going to have the clean vote on the NEA.

Let me say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, there is a difference. Had the gentleman from Wisconsin's language been given a waiver, we would have had a series of amendments from this side, to cut the NEA by 2 percent, 3 percent, 4 percent. The gentleman from Illinois and I went through that before, with attempts made to cut it, and then obviously an amendment to take it out completely.

What the Committee on Rules has done here is something unique, to give us that clean vote that the gentleman from Illinois and I had agreed was an important element of all this, and, the rule provides for this vote. This makes it different than the Obey amendment, since there can be no amendments to the amendment putting the money back in. That is a different dynamic than would have been the case had there been a waiver on the Obey language. So I think this is an important difference.

I think given all those circumstances, I hope my friends will not push the issue on the previous question, that they will support the rule. Other than that issue and it is clear from the discussion this morning, that is the issue in many respects because most of the statements here have been directed to the NEA rather than the merits or demerits, of the rule itself. We are going to have that opportunity.

There are a lot of other good things in this bill. It is a very balanced bill, it is very fair, it is totally nonpartisan as I think the gentleman from Illinois would agree. We did not ask on projects or programs, "Is this a Democratic or Republican program?", we asked, "Does it have merit?" Because we had a limited amount of money. We had \$200 million less this year than last year to meet the needs of what probably are the most popular programs in our government, parks, forests, fish and wildlife, the Bureau of Land Management.

I hope Members will read the report. We have a section on the recreation on

all of our land agencies plus the cultural agencies, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Holocaust Memorial Council, the Kennedy Center, and others.

So it is a very good bill. It is very reasonable in the way we have approached things. I think we have been fair in the allocation of the resources and fair to the Members. Most importantly we have been fair to the people of this Nation, because we have tried to preserve the jewels of our cultural heritage, as well as our ecological, our natural heritage.

I would urge all the Members to support the previous question and support the rule. Let us have a debate on the merits of NEA. Let us have a debate on the merits of other programs and the way in which we have allocated the funds available to us.

I urge both sides to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I support funding for the Endowment for the Arts.

On the central coast of California, thousands of people of all ages have been thrilled and inspired by a variety of programs, exhibits and performances made possible by NEA funding. For example, the Children's Creative Project, the Cal Poly Arts Program, the Cuesta College Public Events Program and the Santa Barbara Museum of Arts all have benefited from NEA seed money.

I have worked in schools for over 20 years and I have also seen firsthand the advantages of our education. Art opportunities teach our children rhythm and design. But they also teach critical thinking skills and portable creativity. My State, a leader in computer technology and programming, demands a workforce that can think and work innovatively. These skills do not begin in college with an engineering class but in a child's elementary art class or a class trip to the museum.

I urge my colleagues to restore funding for the NEA. It is matching funds but it allows private dollars to grow.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY ASKED AND WAS GIVEN PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND HER REMARKS.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, what an embarrassment. Once again NEA is under attack here in the House of Representatives. Opponents of NEA cry fiscal discipline. The majority party employs procedural wizardry, as if the richest Nation in the world needs to be the most culturally impoverished. We know that the dollars we invest in the NEA multiply many times over.

So what are we really witnessing here? We are witnessing an assault on

free expression, a war on culture, a rule that denies the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) his earned right. This is a battle as old as the stockades in puritan times and just as wrongheaded.

I urge my colleagues, oppose this rule, support a bipartisan effort to fully fund the NEA. It is a small investment with a return as vast as your imagination.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

(Mr. FARR of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge that this appropriations issue is probably led in this House by two of the finest gentlemen in here, the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois. It is indeed a beautiful relationship between two senior men in this legislature who have done such an outstanding job in this appropriation, one of the most important for our country because it is really about our soul, about the land and the culture.

□ 1200

What I am concerned about is that we again have to bring to the floor and go through a very difficult debate on funding the NEA. The National Endowment for the Arts is not a debate just about arts. It is a debate about whether we are willing to be creative in America. If we are not creative, we are going to lose the competitive advantage.

There is not an industry in the United States that does not depend on the arts, does not depend on the imagination, does not depend on the ability to look at things, as they say, outside the box.

The people with that creativity come through the art world. It is as the same fingers that operate the computers that operate the piano keys. We have to realize in this country that, if we forgo support for the arts, we forgo our culture.

Look at this room and this building. Is this not about art and history of our country? So the National Endowment should not be coming to the floor struggling. We are appropriating \$98 million.

A few weeks ago, we had a debate which I supported on giving support for marketing our agricultural crops abroad. We are appropriating more money to sell oranges than we appropriate for the National Endowment for the Arts. I think that is a pity in a country that is probably the most creative country in the world.

So when we talk about the arts, let us talk about business. Let us talk about why all of Wall Street supports the National Endowment for the Arts. Anything less hurts America.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my disagreement with the proposed rule. But first of all, I would like to thank my colleague from Illinois who, for 48 years, has consistently fought for citizens' access to the arts. His dedication and assistance have been essential to the preservation of the NEA.

I have heard many miscalculated and illusory statements from those who want to destroy the National Endowment for the Arts. The arts and humanities are an important component to American life. The NEA brings the arts to communities all across America regardless of geographic location.

The arts and humanities can speak of things that cannot be spoken of in any other way. They foster a sense of community by advancing an understanding of history, culture, and ideas. It instills social values by helping people identify common bonds and connections.

While not large in terms of budget, these programs serve as an important catalyst and source of recognition for artists and programs throughout the country. Back in my own community, they are many: The West Side Cultural Arts Council, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Chicago Black Ensemble Theater Corporation, the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, the Black Ensemble's Little City Program, the Museum of Contemporary Art, Illinois Arts Alliance, and Field Museum.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and vote for the preservation of, not just the arts, but the preservation of a way of life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, why would we target a program like the NEA when it costs so little for our country but provides such a great benefit across this wide country?

We engage in a continual debate about cutting funding to this agency that increases citizens' access to the arts, helps us preserve our diverse cultural heritage, and stimulates private and local funding for the arts.

In many States, like Colorado, NEA funding provides the necessary funds for small museums in tiny towns, for school programs, for children who would never have any arts education, and for a variety of arts programs across the country.

This is an incredibly beneficial program. We should not be talking about cutting it. We should be talking about finding increased funding to provide this necessary public benefit across the country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I propose to have a vote on the previous question as I indicated when I addressed the House formerly. I would hope that, with the favorable

vote on the previous question, I will then offer an amendment to provide the waiver for NEA that it deserves.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make four points after hearing the debate here on the rule.

First of all, most of the debate here has been regarding NEA, which is only a small part of this bill. This is an open rule in all other areas. Members that have disagreements with what the committee has come up with will have an opportunity on the floor following this to perfect the bill as they see fit.

The second point is that we have protected the protocol of not authorizing on an appropriation bill without leave of the authorizers. We have tried to maintain that. We think that is good policy in the Committee on Rules under Chairman SOLOMON, and we have protected that. That is why the NEA is not protected.

Third, in the short time that I have been in this Congress, there has been a great deal of debate, I will not say dissension, but maybe that is a proper word, regarding NEA.

If I heard it once, I heard it a number of times, why do we not just have an up or down vote on this issue and be done with it. At the end of the day, that is precisely what we are going to have is an up or down vote on NEA.

Finally, I would like to make this observation. It was said in debate that the gentleman from Illinois who is retiring at the end of this year has worked very hard on this question. I do not think his work on this question will be forgotten because of the way this rule is structured at all. In fact, I think he will probably be remembered.

I might say that I happen to be one that disagrees with his position as far as Federal funding, but the gentleman's work will certainly be remembered; and I think that is important. Certainly when he leaves here, he can have some solace in that.

So I think this is a good rule. It provides an open rule. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote yes on the previous question, yes on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following explanation of ordering the previous question:

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

House Rule XVII ("Previous Question") provides in part that: "There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum is present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked or ordered."

In the case of a special rule or order of business resolution reported from the House Rules Committee, providing for the consideration of a specified legislative measure, the previous question is moved following the one hour of debate allowed for under House Rules.

The vote on the previous question is simply a procedural vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution that sets the ground rules for debate and amendment on the legislation it would make in order. Therefore, the vote on the previous question has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because it does not protect the NEA funding included in the bill against points of order. Republicans will argue that the NEA should not be protected against a point of order because it is not currently authorized. That is utterly disingenuous and they know it. There are eight other unauthorized programs with funding totaling nearly \$2 billion contained in this bill that are protected from points of order by this rule. The NEA is the only unauthorized program not protected by the rule. The fact of the matter is that if the rules committee was truly concerned about unauthorized programs, it wouldn't have allowed \$2 billion in funds to be protected from a point of order, while singling out the \$100 million included for the NEA.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows funding for the NEA to be stripped from the bill because the Republicans want to cut the NEA. It's that simple. Every year since the Republicans gained the majority in Congress, we have had a divisive fight over arts funding, and every year the NEA has managed to survive those battles. This year, proponents of the arts were promised a clean vote on NEA funding, but it they became concerned about that promise when the full committee voted to include funding for the arts in the bill. The Republicans know that if a bill came to the floor that included funding for the arts, it would put proponents of arts funding in a stronger position than if the bill did not include funding. So, instead of allowing the funding to be included in the bill, as it was reported out of full committee, the Republicans have put forth a rule that allows funding to be stripped, putting supporters of arts funding in the weaker position of putting arts funding back in the bill. This is a truly cynical procedure that this House should reject.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interior Appropriations subcommittee, I have learned a great deal about the NEA in the last few years. I know that the NEA would admit it has made mistakes in the past, but it has instituted a series of management reforms to ensure that those types of problems will not recur. Even given those problems, opponents of the NEA can point to only a handful of questionable grants out of hundreds of thousands that have been awarded during the 32-year history of the NEA. After hearing real people and real artists discuss what the NEA has brought to them and to their communities, I know that the NEA is an incredible catalyst for bringing people together and expressing, in a creative fashion, the full range of the human experience. The National Endowment for the Arts is successfully working to bring arts to underserved communities, through after school youth programs that are introducing our young people to the power of creative expression as an alternative to violence, and through folk and traditional arts they remind us of our common bond and what it means to be an American.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule so that we can have a fair debate on the NEA and honor the views of the full committee, which voted to report a bill to this House

that included \$98 million in funding for the NEA. A vote against this rule is a vote for the arts.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. YATES. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 196, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Emerson	Kolbe
Archer	English	LaHood
Army	Ensign	Largent
Bachus	Everett	Latham
Ballenger	Ewing	LaTourette
Barr	Fawell	Lazio
Barrett (NE)	Foley	Leach
Bartlett	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Barton	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Bass	Fowler	Linder
Bateman	Fox	Livingston
Bereuter	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bliley	Galleghy	Manzullo
Blunt	Ganske	McCollum
Boehlert	Gibbons	McCreery
Boehner	Gilchrest	McHugh
Bonilla	Gillmor	McInnis
Bono	Gilman	McIntosh
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McKeon
Bryant	Goodling	Metcalfe
Bunning	Goss	Mica
Burr	Graham	Miller (FL)
Burton	Granger	Moran (KS)
Buyer	Greenwood	Morella
Callahan	Gutknecht	Myrick
Calvert	Hall (TX)	Nethercutt
Camp	Hansen	Neumann
Campbell	Hastert	Ney
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Northup
Castle	Hayworth	Nussle
Chabot	Hefley	Oxley
Chambliss	Herger	Packard
Chenoweth	Hill	Pappas
Christensen	Hilleary	Parker
Coble	Hobson	Paul
Coburn	Hoekstra	Paxon
Collins	Horn	Pease
Combest	Hostettler	Petri
Cook	Houghton	Pickering
Cooksey	Hulshof	Pitts
Cox	Hunter	Pombo
Crane	Hutchinson	Porter
Crapo	Hyde	Portman
Cubin	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
Cunningham	Istook	Quinn
Davis (VA)	Jenkins	Radanovich
Deal	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Redmond
Diaz-Balart	Jones	Regula
Dickey	Kasich	Riggs
Doolittle	Kelly	Riley
Dreier	Kim	Rogan
Duncan	King (NY)	Rogers
Dunn	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Ehlers	Klug	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Roukema

Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt

NAYS—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon

Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Baker
Bilirakis
Canady
Dixon
Ford

Gekas
Gonzalez
Hinojosa
John
Kennelly

McDade
McNulty
Norwood
Ortiz
Peterson (PA)

□ 1227

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KILDEE and Mr. TURNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GILLMOR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 191, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—224

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske

Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson (CA)
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oxley

Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White

Whitfield
Wicker

Wilson
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode

Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hefner
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar

Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—19

Baker
Bilirakis
Dixon
Ford
Gekas
Gonzalez
Graham

Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
John
Kennelly
Livingston

McDade
McNulty
Norwood
Ortiz
Rodriguez

□ 1234

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 310, and rollcall No. 311, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on 310 and "no" on 311.