

their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2466, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 337 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 337

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

□ 1545

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 337 would grant a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 2466, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 2000 and against its consideration. The rule further provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report to accompany H.R. 2466 appropriates \$14.5 billion in new fiscal year 2000 budget authority, which is 599 million more than the House-passed bill and 236 million more than the fiscal year 1999 level; but it is 732 million less than the President's request.

Approximately half of the bill's funding, 7.3 billion, finances Interior Department programs to manage, study, and protect the Nation's animal, plant and mineral resources. The balance of the bill's funds support other non-Interior agencies that perform related functions. These include the Forest Service, conservation and fossil energy development programs run by the Department of Energy, the Indian Health Service, as well as Smithsonian Institute and similar cultural organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for their ongoing efforts to resolve a large number of complex and controversial issues contained in this legislation. As it is every year, theirs has been a difficult task, but one that they have taken with the customary fairness and balance. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the conference report itself.

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

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

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

I rise in opposition to the consideration of House Resolution 337, the rule governing consideration of H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations conference report for Fiscal Year 2000. Mr. Speaker, approving the rule would allow this House to consider a conference report which richly deserves defeat. Voting down the rule would send a message to our friends on the conference committee that they need to go back to the drawing board.

This conference has a little bit of something for almost everyone to dislike. Many of its provisions are nothing short of a slap in the face to the majority of this House which voted on specific instructions which the conferees ignored.

The conference report is saddled with some truly offensive environmental riders which allow mining companies to continue doing damage to the public lands on which they operate, permits oil companies to operate under sweetheart deals on public lands, relaxes forest management practices and permits more timber to be taken from the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, just to name a few. The conference report is also woefully short of the mark on the administration's lands legacy effort which is designed to save environmentally sensitive and important land across this Nation and for which this Nation wants attention.

Mr. Speaker, Members looking for a reason to vote against this bill based on a concern for the environment have an embarrassment of riches from which to choose. As Chair of the Congressional Arts Caucus, let me address for a moment another egregious shortcoming in this bill.

Last month the other body took the responsible position of increasing funding by \$5 million each for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In keeping with that position this House voted to instruct the conferees to accept the higher funding levels. The conference committee, presumably acting under direction of the House leadership, choose to ignore our in-

structions. Sadly NEA funding has once again been hijacked by a small number of individuals who long ago put on their blinders and now refuse to take them off.

In fiscal year 1996 the NEA had its budget cut by 40 percent, a cut from which very few agencies could even recover. Since that time NEA opponents have made it their obsession to oppose a complete recovery. They have chosen to obfuscate the facts by falsely characterizing the agency's work and by demeaning the value of art and culture to our society.

Had the conferees gone along with the modest funding increase provided by the other body and endorsed in a vote on the floor of this House, it would have been the first increase in arts funding since 1992. It would have allowed the NEA to broaden its reach to all Americans by partially funding its proposed Challenge America initiative which is expressly designed to provide grants in communities which have been underserved by the agency because of its lack of money. Some of our colleagues rail against the NEA, saying it has ignored their districts but now withhold the very funding which would correct the problem.

This funding increase would have given the Endowment the resources to undertake the job that we in Congress have asked it to do to make more grants to small and medium-sized communities. In addition, the agency has spent the past few years implementing reforms to make itself more accountable to the American people, and I strongly believe they have earned the opportunity to pursue this plan.

The arts are supported by the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties and by such corporations as CBS, Coca-Cola, Mobil, Westinghouse, and Boeing, to name just a few. These organizations support the arts because they provide economic benefit to our communities. With one hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget, we help to create a system that supports 1.3 million full-time jobs in States, cities, towns, and villages across the country providing \$3.4 billion in income taxes to the Treasury. I do not think we make any investment here with a greater return.

Mr. Speaker, while I am pleased that the committee allowed a \$5 million increase to the NEH, I cannot support legislation shortchanging the NEA for yet another year. This is not about budget caps. The benefits that we receive for our economy, for our children, and for our communities far outweigh the small financial investment we are making.

This is not about public support. As opinion polls show, without a doubt the American people are overwhelmingly in favor of a Federal role in the arts. And this is not about support in this body that was demonstrated on the

floor of this House just 17 days ago. This is about a small number of individuals who want to run against the NEA at election time.

Mr. Speaker, let us put those campaigns to rest and put to rest the campaign of misinformation which is keeping the NEA from continuing and expanding its valuable work. I urge my colleagues to send this legislation back to the conference committee so that we can give our leaders another opportunity to finish the job that we have asked them to do on numerous occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the resolution.

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 gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend yielding this time to me. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his fine leadership on our committee.

I rise in very strong support not only of the rule but of the stellar work that has been done by our friend from Ohio, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior (Mr. REGULA). Every year there are millions of Americans and foreign tourists who come from all over the world to take advantage of what is clearly the best park system on the face of the Earth, whether it is the Everglades in Florida, part of which is represented by members of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), or the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss), or the Angeles National Forest, which I am privileged to represent along with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN). Incidentally, the Angeles National Forest happens to be the most utilized of our national forest system.

These are very, very important, very, very precious items that need to be addressed; and I will tell my colleagues that the work that has been done by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is very key to the continued success of that important system.

I want to specifically express my thanks for dealing with the problem that we in southern California regularly face, and that is fires. We know that as we approach the fire season, we have now seen \$24 million for the National Forest Service state fire assistance program, which is a \$3.2 million increase over last year; and I want to again express my thanks for the attention that has been focused on that important problem that we have.

Now I finally would like to raise one issue of concern that the gentleman from Ohio and I have discussed on more than a few occasions, and I would like to say at this point I offer what is at

best sort of wavering support for the adventure pass; and it is in large part due to some of the issues which I suspect the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) will raise during debate on this issue, and that is the question of whether or not people who are in the area paying into the adventure pass are actually seeing any kind of tangible benefit from the fact that they have put dollars into that adventure pass.

In the Angeles National Forest, as I said, the most utilized of all in our Nation's system, many of my constituents have been obviously in, just going through, been forced to pay for the adventure pass; and yet they do not see any kind of real tangible benefit, and that is why I am pleased that there is an additional \$1.1 million that has been added for the Angeles National Forest to improve the basic infrastructure there, which is a concern. So I will say that we look forward to further reports on the pilot program of the adventure pass, and I am going on record, as I have before, raising the concerns that many of my constituents have pointed to; and I hope that we are able to work closely with the Forest Service so that we can see real tangible benefits from that.

So, having said all of those things, I strongly support the rule, urge my colleagues to vote for it, and I also urge strong support for what I think is the best possible conference report that we could get at this juncture.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all could I ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) a question about this bill. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman:

The latest report on the revised allocations of budget authority and outlays filed by the Committee on Appropriations is dated October 12 and is printed in the House as Report 106-373. That is the 302 allocation. The document indicates that the discretionary budget authority allocation for the Subcommittee on Interior is \$13.888 billion and that the discretionary outlay allocation for the subcommittee is \$14.354 billion.

Is it the understanding of the gentleman that the number I just mentioned, that the numbers do in fact represent the latest target allocations for the subcommittee?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's figures are correct; however, the gentleman also knows that before we complete the appropriations process totally, there may be needed some additional.

Mr. OBEY. Right. So at this point that is the latest published allocation to the subcommittee; is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is my understanding.

Mr. OBEY. I have a table prepared, Mr. Speaker, by the Committee on Appropriations dated October 15, which indicates that the discretionary budget authority included in the interior conference agreement totals 14,506,491,000 and that the discretionary outlays total 14.523 billion. If these are the correct numbers for this conference report, it appears that the conference agreement exceeds the latest budget authority allocation by \$618.491 million and exceeds the latest outlay allocation by \$169 million, and that being the case, that is why a number of us are dubious about the wisdom of proceeding with this bill at this moment.

□ 1600

The problems within this bill, in addition to some of the others that I will mention in just a moment, another major problem is that we simply do not at this point know where this bill fits into the overall budget scheme. We do know that bills that have passed the House to date have exceeded the President's budget request by almost \$20 billion.

Given that fact, we know that there is a squeeze on the remaining bills, and at this point, given the meeting that we saw at the White House where we thought there was going to be an arrangement on how to proceed between the White House and Congressional leaders (they being the four-star generals in this place, we being the light colonels), it seems to me it is very difficult even to justify proceeding on this bill when we do not know whether this is going to further add to the excess of spending that is being alleged in the budget process or whether it is not. That is why I raised the question that I just asked of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), because all we know at this point is that this bill exceeds the spending authority which was allotted to it the last time the Committee on Appropriations met under the requirement of the Budget Act.

In addition to that concern, Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out the following problems with this bill. It excludes funds for many unique and ecologically important land parcels which can be lost forever to development if they are not purchased now. This bill falls way short of where it ought to be in the Lands Legacy proposal. It rewrites the 1872 mining laws to allow mine operators who are paying next to nothing to extract minerals from public lands to inflict even more environmental damage on those lands. It requires that western ranchers who enjoy the privilege of grazing permits be

granted automatic 10-year renewals without completion of the review of the impact of current grazing practices. It includes \$5 million not requested by the President to facilitate additional timber sales from the Tongass National Forest. It blocks an Interior Department regulation requiring major oil companies to finally pay something approaching market value for the taxpayers' land that they are pumping oil out of. It has a number of other problems. It rejects any added funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

I would simply say this in closing: None of what I am saying is in any way critical of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) or the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) who chairs this subcommittee. In fact, in that subcommittee, and I am sure anybody who was there will verify this, he tried mightily to prevent some of these riders from being attached. We think that he did make a strong effort. The problem is that we still do not believe that this will meet the standards that would be required to defend the public interest. So for a variety of reasons that I have just listed, we feel constrained to oppose this bill and would hope that by the time it finally becomes law, that it will be in far better shape.

I know that if this bill reaches the White House it will be vetoed. The White House has made that quite clear to us and the press. Under the circumstances those circumstances, I think it is ill-advised for this bill to even be here in light of the meeting that took place at the White House. But we have no choice, if the majority is going to bring the bill to the floor, we have no choice at this point to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for honestly answering my question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to respond to the gentleman from Wisconsin. As usual, his numbers are correct.

However, I want to highlight a difference in how we are proceeding this year. The Office of Management and Budget would like us to package up all of these appropriations bills and put them into one package so that we could have another disaster like the omnibus appropriations bill that we had last year. We are determined not to do that.

It is our intention and our plan, and we are on course, to send the individual bills to the President's desk for his consideration. The reason we want to

do that is that we would like to know if he has specific objections to those bills. We would like to know what they are, not in generalities, but specifically, so that we can actually focus on what the differences really are. Our experience has been that the only way we find exactly what the President's opposition is, is in a veto message where he must be specific and he must put it on paper so that we can read it and understand it.

But I want to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin that whether we have an omnibus bill such as the Office of Management and Budget wants, or whether we are going to have individual bills the way that we want, we will not go above the budget agreement. We will not use any money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. The Sequestration would not be triggered unless all bills were signed into law and exceeded the budget agreement. That is not going to happen. But we are going to deal with these bills one at a time so that they retain their identity and so that we can deal with specific objections from the White House rather than generalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the conference report on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000. This is the twelfth fiscal year 2000 appropriations conference report to come before the House. Number 13 should be ready soon.

This is a good conference agreement. It provides important funding for the highest priority needs of operating and maintaining our existing national parks and wildlife refuges. It includes funding to manage our Federal lands. Important to my State is funding for the Everglades restoration.

At this point, I want to make note of the fact that this is the anniversary of the enactment of last year's omnibus appropriations bill. Because the terms and conditions of many of the appropriations bills that were included in that legislation still have effect today because of the terms of the continuing resolution we were operating under, I take this time to highlight one such provision that is important to the Office of Management and Budget and to the administration. That is that the continuing resolution will preserve the President's authority under section 540(d) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999, to waive section 1003 of Public Law 100-204.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for clearing up the question with respect to the Public Law. I think that is a very useful clarification.

But I do want to take issue with his interpretation of why we should not have an overall approach to resolve our remaining budget differences. The gentleman said that the majority party does not want to go into an omnibus meeting because last year when they did, we wound up with all kinds of gimmicks. Let me point out that last year, we wound up with \$21 billion worth of so-called emergency spending. Now, if spending is called emergencies, under these crazy budget rules, it does not count in total spending. So it is, in fact, hidden.

The problem is, this year, without going into those meetings with the President, bills passed by this House already contain \$25 billion in emergency spending. So we have already gone far beyond where the gentleman was concerned we would go if we ever sat down with the President.

This second chart demonstrates that there are \$45 billion in gimmicks already contained in the budgets that have been passed by the majority through this House. My colleagues can see the categories for themselves: \$25 billion in phoney designation of the emergency spending, \$17 billion that we hide by telling the Congressional Budget Office to pretend that programs are going to cost less than, in fact, the Congressional Budget Office has told us they are going to cost. Then they move billions of dollars into the next year in order to hide the fact that we are actually appropriating it this year. And what we have really done is we have a menu, we have a multiple choice menu. We have column A, which is the OMB, the White House numbers; column B, which is the Congressional Budget Office which we are supposed to adhere to in determining how much money is spent. And instead of deciding one or another, we have picked one from column B, one from column A. They always pick the numbers that are the lowest, and that is the way they hide the fact that they are spending billions of dollars more than we are actually spending. That is why we think we need to get together.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me just express the great respect that I have for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the absolutely difficult job that he has done. I do not know of a harder thing to work out than he has done on this legislation. I fully intend to vote for the rule and for the conference report.

However, I do have one concern. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, we had a hearing and this hearing was about the Everglades Recovery Plan. In that area, there are 8.5 square miles,

and there are farms in that area, Mr. Speaker, and there are people who came from Cuba, and they came from Cuba, most of these people, because Fidel Castro was taking away their property, just abstractly taking it. So they came to America so that they would not have to have that.

Now, a lot of people said, oh, the only way we can ever recover this Everglades thing is to take that 8.5 square miles. That was in 1989. In 1999 in my hearing, the Corps of Engineers, the State of Florida, the Federal South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force all said they do not need 8.5 square miles.

So here we are putting these people in the same condition they were in and saying all right, we are taking away your ground now, and just imagine how they feel at this point.

I am sure we can probably work this out, and I hope we can. But, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that it seems kind of the most ironic thing I have seen in a long time to think here they are in Cuba having their land taken away from them, and then we are in this bill taking it away. So I am sure the people of the stature of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and others can do their very best not to do this, and I would hope the other Members of the other body would not do this. Because it seems to me that on this piece of legislation that we are truly legislating on an appropriations bill, but because I think it will be worked out, I fully intend to support this bill and support the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) whose late father, Morris Udall, chaired the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with great distinction.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, funding for the Interior Department and the Forest Service and the other agencies and programs covered by this appropriations bill is very important for our Nation and especially for the West, which is my area of the country. So I regret that I cannot support this conference report. There are many problems with the report, but they can be summed up pretty easily. It does not do enough of the right things, and it does too many bad things.

It does not do enough to respond to the urgent need for protecting open space threatened by growth, sprawl and development. It does not do enough to properly manage our Federal lands and the fish, wildlife, and ecosystems that

they support. It does not do enough to meet our national responsibilities to our Native Americans. It does not do enough to support arts and arts education. And it does not do enough to help us make progress in making more efficient use of our valuable energy supplies.

But in other areas, it does too much. It does too much to revise certain parts of the mining law of 1872 through the appropriations process. Instead of letting the Mill site issue be considered in the context of other aspects of that 125-year-old law, including the question of whether the taxpayers get a fair return for mineral development on our and their public lands. It does too much to block efforts to reform the accounting methods to determine how taxpayers and our public schools will share in the proceeds from oil and gas taken from Federal lands, and it does too much to legislatively interfere with sound and orderly management of Federal natural resources and the protection of the environment.

□ 1615

It would undermine the established processes for a rising national forest plan, for managing the public lands managed by the BLM and for protecting the peace and quiet of the national parks.

It would unduly restrict our efforts to work with other countries, to work on the problems of global warming and climate change and would weaken our commitment to those communities that want to work hard to make sure that the natural, environmental, and cultural resources found along America's heritage rivers are preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and the other House conferees. I recognize there are important and good things in this bill but, on balance, it falls short and so I cannot support it.

INTERIOR BILL—OBJECTIONABLE RIDERS

1. OIL VALUATION MORATORIUM

Conference Agreement: Continues the moratorium for an additional 6 months while GAO studies the regulations proposed by the Department. This would be the fourth moratorium on these regulations. As requested by the Congressional supporters of the moratorium, the Minerals Management Service has conducted extensive outreach to the industry during the prior moratoria.

2. MINING WASTE

Conference Agreement: Prevents the Department from implementing for many mining operations a provision of the Mining Law of 1872 that limits the mine operator to one 5 acre millsite per mining claim. Millsites are typically used to dump mine waste.

3. HARDROCK MINING SURFACE MANAGEMENT

Conference Agreement: Imposes a one year moratorium on issuance of regulations to improve environmental compliance in the operation of hardrock mines. Requires that

the 2001 budget include legislative, regulatory and funding proposals to implement recent recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences concerning surface management of hardrock mines.

4. EVERGLADES

Conference Agreement: Makes the FY 2000 grant to Florida for land acquisition in support of Everglades restoration contingent on a binding agreement between the Federal Government, the State and the South Florida Water Management District providing an assured supply of water to the natural system of the Everglades and water supply systems for urban and agricultural users.

5. WILDLIFE SURVEYS

Conference Agreement: Gives the Forest Service and BLM discretionary authority to conduct wildlife surveys before offering timber sales.

6. MARK TWAIN

Conference Agreement: Suspends for one year the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to segregate or withdraw land in the Mark Twain National forest from hardrock mining. Also prohibits issuance of permits for hardrock mineral exploration in the Forest for one year. Funds a study to assess the impact of lead and zinc mining in the Forest.

7. GRIZZLY BEAR REINTRODUCTION

Conference Agreement: Prohibits reintroduction of grizzly bears into the Selway-Bitterroot Mountains in Idaho and Montana during FY 2000. The Fish and Wildlife Service has been working for several years on an innovative, collaborative process with local stakeholders.

8. GRAZING

Conference Agreement: For FY 2000, automatically renews expiring grazing permits for which NEPA has not been completed for new 10 year terms.

9. INTERIOR COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Conference Agreement: Requires publication of a report describing goods and services in the 144 million acre Interior Columbia River Basin prior to the release of the final environmental impact statement on the Administration's effort to develop a coordinated strategy for management of Federal lands in eastern Washington and Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana.

10. AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS

Conference Agreement: Prevents agencies and offices funded in the bill from using funds to support the American Heritage Rivers program administered through the Executive Office of the President and the Council on Environmental Quality.

11. BIA/IHS CONTRACTING MORATORIUM

Conference Agreement: Continues the 1999 moratorium on tribes assuming additional duties through new or expanded P.L. 93-638 contracts, grants and self-governance compacts. The continued moratorium applies only to contracting and compacting by BIA and HIS and exempts two programs: education construction and IHS programs to Alaska Tribes.

12. NPS/GRAND CANYON NOISE

Conference Agreement: Prohibits the Department from spending funds to implement sound thresholds or standards in the Grand Canyon until 90 days after the NPS provides a report to Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—TITLE I APPROPRIATIONS: KEY BUDGET NUMBERS—CONFERENCE ESTIMATE**

[Current BA in millions of dollars]

	1999 enacted*	2000 President's budget request	2000 conf. estimate	2000 estimate difference from 1999 enacted		2000 estimate difference from 2000 pres. budg. request	
				Millions of dollars	Percent	Millions of dollars	Percent
				Total, Interior & Related Agencies	6,940	7,769	7,277
BIA/Indian Trusts Total	1,786	2,002	1,912	+126	+7.0	-90	-4.5
Land Management Operations composed of	2,665	2,856	2,825	+159	+6.0	-32	-1.1
BLM Operations	716	743	743	+27	+3.8	+1	+0.1
FWS Operations	661	724	716	+55	+8.3	-8	-1.1
NPS Operations	1,288	1,390	1,365	+77	+6.0	-25	-1.8
Wildland Fire Management	287	306	292	+5	+1.9	-14	-4.4
Interior Science	798	838	824	+26	+3.3	-15	-1.7
Interior Land Acquisition composed of	211	295	187	-24	-11.3	-108	-36.7
BLM Land Acquisition	15	49	16	+1	+6.2	-33	-68.3
FWS Land Acquisition	48	74	51	+2	+5.2	-23	-31.4
NPS Land Acquisition	148	172	121	-27	-18.4	-52	-30.0
Interior Construction composed of	415	420	437	+23	+5.5	+17	+4.1
BLM Construction	11	8	11	+0	+3.9	+3	+36.8
FWS Construction	50	44	55	+4	+8.2	+11	+25.3
NPS Construction	230	194	224	-5	-2.3	-30	-15.7
BIA Construction	123	174	147	+23	+19.0	-27	-15.7
Departmental Offices (w/o OST)	214	229	222	+9	+4.1	-6	-2.8
All Other Funds	689	997	725	+36	+5.2	-272	-27.3

*Does not include supplemental funds, special appropriation for King Cover, Glacier Bay, subsistence. Does not include Y2K mitigation transfers.

**Does not include any billwide reduction.

FY 2000 ANNUAL APPROPRIATED (CURRENT BA) BY BUREAU: ESTIMATED CONFERENCE OUTCOME

[In millions of dollars]

Bureau	1999 Estimate	2000 Request	Con. Estimate Amount	Outcome change from 1999*	Percent change	Outcome change from req.*	Percent change
Bureau of Land Management	1,190	1,269	1,234	+44	+3.7	-35	-2.8
Minerals Management Service	124	116	117	-7	-5.6	1	0.9
Office of Surface Mining Recl'n & Enforcemr	279	306	287	+8	+2.9	-19	-6.2
U.S. Geological Survey	798	838	824	+26	+3.3	-14	-1.7
Fish and Wildlife Service	802	950	871	+69	+8.6	-79	-8.3
National Park Service	1,748	2,059	1,809	+61	+3.5	-250	-12.1
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,746	1,902	1,817	+71	+4.1	-85	-4.5
Departmental Office:							
Departmental Management (99 comp.)	60	63	63	+3	+5.0	0	0
Insular Affairs	87	89	88	+1	+1.1	-1	-1.1
Office of the Solicitor	37	42	40	+3	+8.1	-2	-4.8
Office of the Inspector General	25	28	26	+1	+4.0	-2	-7.1
Office of Special Trustee	39	100	95	+56	+143.6	-5	-5.0
NRDAR	4	8	5	+1	+25.0	-3	-37.5
Departmental Office	252	330	317	+66	+26.2	-13	-3.9
Subtotal, Interior Bill (current BA)	6,939	7,769	7,277	+337	+4.9	-492	-6.3
Bureau of Reclamation	781	857	769	-12	-1.5	-88	-10.3
Central Utah Project Completion Act	42	39	39	-3	-7.1	0	0
Adjustments for Mandatory Current Accr	-57	-57	-57	0	0	0	0
Adjustment for Discretionary Offsets	-100	-47	-47	+53	0	0	0
Total Net Discretionary BA	7,605	8,560	6,981	+376	+4.0	-580	-6.8
Total Current BA	7,763	8,665	8,085	+323	+4.2	-580	-6.7

Note: Does not include 1999 supplemental, appropriations or transfers, Glacier Bay funds, subsistence funds.

ANTI-ENVIRONMENTAL RIDERS ON THE FY 2000 INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL AS OF 10/19/99

This list was compiled by Defenders of Wildlife using write-ups received from numerous groups in the conservation community.

(*) indicates a provision that has been deleted or amended and no longer objectionable.

— indicates new provisions added in conference.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2466)

(1) Sec. 122: Special Deal For Washington Grazing Interests—would renew and extend livestock grazing within the popular Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area in Washington. This provision undercuts a National Park Service decision that livestock grazing was not an authorized activity within the Recreation Area, and benefits 10 ranchers at a cost to the thousands of visitors using the National Recreation Area. Unlike the Senate provision the House language places no limits on how long the renewals could last. Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area is a popular destination spot for water-sports enthusiasts and recreationists along the Columbia River in Washington. The National Park Service found that livestock grazing should not be authorized within the Recreation Area in 1990, and gave the existing ranchers using the National Park

Service lands several years to transition out of the use of this area. In 1997, all livestock grazing ceased within the National Recreation Area. The rider re-instates the grazing practices to the benefit of a small handful of ranchers on 1000 acres of National Park System lands within the National Recreation Area.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99.

(2) Sec. 123: Allow Grazing Without Environmental Review—requires the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to renew expiring grazing permits (or transfer existing permits) under the same terms and conditions contained in the old permit. Expanded by Senator Domenici (R-NM) in full Committee, this automatic renewal will remain in effect until such time as the BLM complies with "all applicable laws." There is no schedule imposed on the Agency, therefore necessary environmental improvements to the grazing program could be postponed indefinitely. This rider affects millions of acres of public rangelands that support endangered species, wildlife, recreation, and cultural resources. The rider's impact goes far beyond the language contained in the FY 1999 appropriations bill, in which Congress allowed a short-term extension of grazing permits which expired during the current fiscal year. As written, this section undercuts the application of

any environmental law, derails both litigation and administrative appeals, and hampers application of the conservation-oriented grazing "standards and guidelines" that were developed under the "rangeland reform" effort. Because BLM will be required to reissue (transfer) grazing permits under the old terms and conditions, the agency will have no reason to consider public comments or to allow administrative appeals of permit-related decisions. As written, the language covers permits that expire "in this or any fiscal year" and may therefore undercut existing litigation and administrative appeals brought by the conservation community to protect wildlife and improve rangeland protection. To make matters worse, because it has been restated to apply to the Department of Interior and not just the BLM, it will actually undercut efforts by the NPS to apply NEPA and change grazing permits to protect the environment in places like the Mojave Desert National Preserve. This section provides a perverse incentive for the BLM to delay its NEPA and related environmental analysis, as it will be politically easier to simply extend permits.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. The provision was amended to make minor changes in conference but essentially retains the same objectionable provisions in the original Senate rider. The reference to "this or any fiscal year" was deleted but the bill language is still

unclear as to the duration of the rider. Weakly-worded report language was also added calling for a non-mandatory permit schedule to be developed absent a specific time frame. Sen. Durbin (D-IL) offered an amendment on the Senate floor on 9/9/99 to limit the scope of this rider and establish a schedule for the completion of processing expiring grazing permits by the BLM. The amendment was tabled (rejected) by a vote of 58-37 and remains in the bill.

(3) Sec. 133: Give Away 2,500 Acres of Public Land in Nevada for Development—would direct the Secretary of Interior to convey over 2,500 acres of public lands in Eastern Nevada to the City of Mesquite free of charge. There are no restrictions on the uses of this land, and the city is apparently contemplating creating or expanding an airport corridor. The rider exempts the land conveyance from applicable administrative procedures and would likely preclude a full environmental review of the environmental impacts of this action. Development of this land could affect endangered fish species inhabiting the Virgin River, including the wondfin minnow, Virgin River Chub, Virgin River Spinedace and other species which live nearby such as the southwest willow flycatcher. This rider also provides for about 6,000 acres to be sold to the city for development. The Department of Interior opposes this amendment, because it gives away land that is currently being used by the Interior Department without any compensation to the federal government. Also, the Federal Aviation Administration has not completed a suitability assessment for the airport site to determine whether it is appropriate for aviation.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99. This provision was inserted into the bill as part of a managers amendment on the Senate floor on 9/14/99 on behalf of Senator Reid (D-NV).

(4) Sec. 135: Prevent Restoration of Glen Canyon and the Colorado River—would prevent land managers from studying or implementing any plan to drain Lake Powell or to reduce the water level in Lake Powell below the range required to operate Glen Canyon Dam. This effectively prevents any restoration efforts for Glen Canyon and the Colorado river near the Utah-Arizona border. Glen Canyon, one of America's greatest natural treasures, was flooded in 1963 by the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Powell. The dam has also caused environmental damage to fish and wildlife downstream on the Colorado River. This rider would tie the hands of land managers, prevent full consideration of restoration options, and prohibit meaningful scientific review of the dam.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99. This provision was inserted into the bill as part of a managers amendment on the Senate floor on 9/14/99 on behalf of Senator Hatch (R-Utah).

(5) Sec. 136: Expand Exemption for Fur Dealers to Include Internationally Protected Species—would effectively amend and expand an already controversial exemption for fur dealers approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service by including internationally protected species under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and expanding the scope of the exemption to include all fur traders. This rider, offered as part of a group of "non-controversial" manager's amendments, goes dramatically beyond the existing exemption which was itself strongly opposed by a number of

conservation organizations. Specifically, the provision would: (1) increase the existing exemption from 100 to 1000 furs—a 10-fold increase; (2) include shipments involving internationally threatened and endangered species (CITES-listed) such as lynx, river otter, bobcat, and black bear in the exemption; and (3) expand the existing exemption to apply to any person or business, whereas the current exemption is restricted to the person who took the animals from the wild, or an immediate family member. The practical effect of the amendment is that each and every fur shipment imported or exported will be crafted to fit this exemption in order to avoid paying user fees (ie, a shipment of 5000 furs will simply become 5 shipments), causing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to forego a significant amount of revenue used to support an already underfunded wildlife inspection program, and further endangering species already shown to be threatened by trade.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. After being passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99, the provision was amended in conference to cap the annual volume of fur shipments per person under this exemption at 2,500. This change does not substantively address the major concerns articulated above. This provision was inserted into the bill as part of a managers amendment on the Senate floor on 9/14/99 on behalf of Senator Murkowski (R-AK).

(6) Sec. 137: Delay Efforts to Reduce Noise Pollution in the Grand Canyon—would prohibit the National Park Service from expending any funds in FY 2000 to implement sound thresholds or other requirements to combat noise pollution in the park until a report on such standards is submitted to Congress. Years of public discussion have resulted in agreement that the natural sounds of the Canyon need to be restored and protected from air tours and other sources. This amendment was introduced on behalf of the air tour industry that wants to delay the implementation of those agreements and force the National Park Service to spend additional time and money defending its decisions in an additional study on the subject.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and reported from the House-Senate conference committee on—. This provision was inserted into the bill as part of a managers amendment on the Senate floor on 7/14/99 on behalf of Senators Bryan (D-NV) and Reid (D-NV).

(7) Sec. 141: Allow the Oil Industry to Continue Underpaying Royalties—would delay the implementation of an oil valuation rule by the Minerals Management Service (MMS) for the fourth time. The MMS' rule would force the largest oil companies to stop underpaying, by \$66-\$100 million a year, the royalties they owe the American public for drilling on public lands. These royalties would otherwise go to the federal treasury, to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to state public education programs. This rider was attached by Senators Domenici (R-NM) and Hutchison (R-TX) in full committee mark up.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. After being passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99, the provision was amended in conference to delay the new rule for 6 months pending a study by the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office (GAO). The GAO has already released a study on the oil valuation rule in 1998 and it is unclear what further study would yield. On 7/27/99, this provision was stricken from the Senate bill in order to comply with Senate Rule XVI, which was reinstated after a four-year suspension by a Senate floor vote of

53-45 one day earlier. Rule XVI restricts the addition of unrelated policy riders to appropriation bills on the Senate Floor. However, the provision was re-offered by Sen. Hutchison (R-TX) on the Senate floor. To keep the provision out of the bill, Senator Boxer (R-CA) and others filibustered the amendment until the Senate leadership forced a vote on cloture. On 9/13/99, that vote failed to get the required 60 votes (55-40) which should have spelled the end of the amendment. However, proponents of the rider demanded a re-vote due to the absence of 5 senators. On 9/23/99 the revote on cloture succeeded by a margin of 60-39. The Senate immediately voted to add the amended Hutchison's rider which is limited to FY 2000 to the bill by a vote of 51-47.

(8) Title II: Increase Timber Subsidies for the Tongass National Forest—would allocate an extra \$11.55 million to the Alaska Region of the Forest Service to force a three year supply of timber. This rider creates a special fund to ensure that Alaska's Tongass National Forest will continue to offer far more timber for sale than will be purchased. In Fiscal Year 1998 the Forest Service sold only 25 million board feet of the 187 million offered. When the public's old-growth trees were re-offered for sale at rock-bottom rates, still only have the volume sold. This rider guarantees that the Tongass remains the nation's largest money-losing timber sale program. The rider's supporters hope the flood of taxpayer-subsidized timber will spur the creation of a highly automated veneer slicer. Veneer slicers provide even fewer jobs per tree than the region's defunct pulp mills. To add insult to injury, this comes on top of the \$34 million increase the Senate added nationwide to the Forest Service's timber request for FY 2000.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. After passing the full Senate on 9/24/99, the provision was amended in conference to reduce funding for this program by \$6.55 million for a final total of \$5 million. Unfortunately, most of the reduction was used to increase funds for a damaging and unnecessary powerline through Alaska's Tongass National Forest (See write up at end of the Interior section). This provision was originally inserted into the bill as part of a managers amendment on the Senate floor on 9/14/99 on behalf of Senator Stevens (R-AK).

(9) Title II: Lead Mining in Ozark National Scenic Riverways—would prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from taking any action to prohibit mining activities in the watersheds of the Current, Jacks Fork, and the Eleven Point rivers in the Missouri Ozarks until June 2001. Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the Secretary of the Interior may remove federal lands from access by mining companies. This provision, added by Senator Bond (R-MO) in full Committee, would block the Secretary from exercising that authority. Missouri conservation organizations, Missouri's Attorney General Jay Nixon, and the National Park Service had requested that Secretary Babbitt begin procedures to prohibit mining activities in these critical watersheds. The Doe Run Company had targeted the area for exploratory drilling, but withdrew the applications under protest. These lands were purchased for watershed and forestry resource protection—and the groups and entities requesting the withdrawal are concerned that lead mining would conflict with these purposes.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99. On 7/27/99, this provision was stricken from the Senate bill in order to comply with

Senate Rule XVI, which was reinstated after a four-year suspension by a Senate floor vote of 53-45 one day earlier. Rule XVI restricts the addition of unrelated policy riders to appropriation bills on the Senate Floor. However, the provision was re-offered on 9/9/99 on the Senate floor by Sen. Bond (R-MO) (for Sen. Lott (R-MS)). The amendment passed by a vote of 54-44 and remains in the bill.

(10) Sec. 321: Delay National Forest Planning—would impose a funding limitation to halt the revision of any forest plans not already undergoing revision, except for the 11 forests legally mandated to have their plans completed during calendar year 2000, until final or interim final planning regulations are adopted. There is concern that this provision will put pressure on the Forest Service to hastily promulgate new regulations, rather than carefully incorporating recent recommendations developed by an independent Committee of Scientists. Sec. 322 in the bill would halt funding to carry out strategic planning under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (RPA).

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99.

(11) Sec. 327: Divert Trail Fund for "Forest Health" Logging—would allow the ten percent roads and trails fund to be used to "improve forest health conditions." Since there are no restrictions limiting the use to non-commercial activities, and logging is considered a "forest health" activity, this fund could be used to fund timber sales. It also represents a back door method to fund more logging roads for salvage and commercial timber operations. This rider also eliminates the requirement that the roads and trails fund be spent in the same state the money is generated when used for these purposes. This opens the distribution of these funds to the political process, allowing all the funding to go to one state or region with more political clout. Since there is a salvage fund and other sources such as vegetation management monies already available for this type of use and considering the consensus that exists regarding the great financial needs of the agency's road maintenance program, this rider is unnecessary and potentially destructive.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the Full House on 7/14/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99.

(12) Sec. 328: Block Restoration of the Kankakee River—would prohibit use of funds made available in the act from being "used to establish a national wildlife refuge in the Kankakee River watershed in northwestern Indiana and northeastern Illinois." The Grand Kankakee Marsh was once one of the largest and most important freshwater wetland ecosystems in North America, providing essential habitat to a spectacular variety of waterfowl, wading birds and other wildlife. Today, however, 95-percent of the Grand Kankakee Marsh has been drained for agriculture and development. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has proposed establishing the Grand Kankakee National Wildlife Refuge along the Kankakee in order to restore and preserve 30,000 acres (less than one-percent of the land within the river basin) of wetlands, oak savannas, and native tallgrass prairies. The proposal is currently undergoing an Environmental Assessment. Although the public overwhelmingly support the proposed refuge, for the second year in a row, certain members of Congress are attempting to derail the proposal by including a legislative rider in the House Interior Appropriations bill.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the Full House on 7/14/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99.

(13) Sec. 329: Undermine Consensus-based River Management—would prohibit Federal resource agencies such as the Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, National Park Service and others, from participating in the American Heritage Rivers Initiative (AHRI). This voluntary presidential initiative was designed to coordinate the efforts of federal, state, and local agencies with interests in the economic, cultural, and ecological management of our nation's most heralded rivers. AHRI's purpose is to streamline management of river resources and facilitate efficient allocation of federal, state, and local funds. This program explicitly did not include any additional regulations or funding but instead relies on coordination of existing programs, staff, and funding. Last year, ten rivers were selected from around the nation that reflected broad political support. This rider would essentially prohibit these agencies from coordinating with other river managers at a time when citizens are working toward improving local/federal coordination. This would cripple the management funds of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)/Executive Office of the President for the American Rivers Initiative and sent a dangerous precedent for coordinating other environmental cross-agency programs.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. After being passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99, the provision was amended in conference to allow for "headquarters or departmental activities" to be associated for with the AHRI program but still specifically prevents funds from being transferred or being used to support the management fund at the Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) for this program.

(14) Sec. 331: Limiting Preparation for Climate Protection—would limit the federal government's ability to address the international implications of climate change and help other countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, thereby prolonging the emissions of dangerous carbon dioxide and other global warming pollutants. The rider ignores the United States' existing commitments to reduce emissions under the 1992 Senate-ratified Rio Treaty. Specifically the provision, offered by Representative Joseph Knollenburg (R-MI) in full committee, would prohibit use of federal funds by federal agencies "to propose or issue rules, regulations, degrees, or orders for the purpose of implementing, or in preparation for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol." Similar language has been inserted in the House versions of the FY 2000 Commerce/State/Justice, Energy and Water, VA-HUD, Agriculture, Foreign Operations, and Interior Appropriations bills.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99.

(15) Sec. 333: Tongass Red Cedar Rider—would continue the failed policy of exporting wood and jobs off the Tongass National Forest by leveraging the amount of Western Red Cedar available for export to the lower 48 and international markets against the percent of the Tongass' allowable sale quantity (ASQ) that is actually sold. Alaska's Western Red Cedar is a valuable export item and has become scarce in the forest as it only grows in the southern Tongass. The remaining old-growth Red Cedar provides important habitat for brown bears and wolves. The rider stipulates that the only way in which interested manufacturers in the lower 48 can have access to all of the surplus Alaska Red Cedar

logged in FY 2000 is if the forest's entire allowable sale quantity is sold. Moreover, the rider requires that the sold timber must have at least a 60 percent guaranteed profit margin for the purchaser, continuing to maintain the Tongass's timber program as our National Forest System's largest money loser.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99.

(16) Sec. 334: Undermine Science-based Management of National Forest and Bureau of Land Management Lands—would attempt to provide the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior broad discretion during FY 2000 to choose whether or not to collect any new, and potentially significant, information concerning wildlife resources on the National Forest System or Bureau of Land Management Lands prior to amending or revising resource management plans, issuing leases, or otherwise authorizing or undertaking management activities. This section (formerly "Section 329") seeks to overturn a February 18, 1999 decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit that the Chattahoochee National Forest in Georgia had violated the law by not maintaining population data on management indicator species as required under 36 C.F.R. 219.19, or sensitive species as required under its own forest management plan. However, the implications of Section 329 extend far beyond any single national forest. For example, the Forest Service could attempt to use the language of Section 329 to undercut full implementation of, and accountability under, the NW Forest Plan. This section's "don't ask, don't tell" approach may invite the Forest Service to take a shortcut around the information collection and analysis required by the plan—undercutting the basis on which Judge Dwyer upheld the plan, as well as recent Ninth Circuit case law. Beyond seeking to undermine existing law, Section 329 directly contradicts the overall direction recommended by the recent findings of the Committee of Scientists for land management planning on national forests. Its attempt to provide agencies the discretion to bypass existing information gathering requirements on wildlife resources prior to making land management planning and activity decisions undermines the very ability to arrive at scientifically credible conservation strategies. Section 329 is not the first "don't ask, don't tell" rider offered in an attempt to allow the government to forego the collection and consideration of important scientific information. The 1995 salvage logging rider also adopted this approach in some significant ways with harsh results for government accountability and ultimate credibility.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. After being passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99, the provision was slightly amended in conference but still seeks to waive the requirement that the USFS and BLM survey for wildlife before authorizing timber sales, grazing permits, and other activities on public lands. The revised language in Section 334 is further exacerbated by a new provision that seeks to grandfather in Northwest Forest Plan timber sales that were illegally authorized without wildlife surveys. Sen. Robb (D-VA) offered an amendment to strike the provision on the Senate floor on 9/9/99. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 45-52.

(17) Sec. 336: Weaken 1872 Mining Law—would weaken the 1872 Mining Law by removing toxic mining waste dumping limitations on federal public land. The rider was attached by Senator Larry Craig (R-ID) in

full committee. In the only provision of the 1872 Mining Law that protects the environment and taxpayers, the millsite section states that for every 20-acre mining claim, mining companies are allowed one, and only one, 5-acre mill site for the processing or dumping of mine wastes. Craig's rider would strip the millsite provision entirely, legalizing unlimited mine waste dumping on public lands. The Craig rider represents a sweeping change to the 1872 Mining Law, and in the process it removes the only incentive the mining industry has to seriously negotiate environmental and fiscal reform to one of the most destructive public lands laws on the books.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. As currently written, the conference language would exempt from the millsite waste dumping limitation: existing mines, expansions to existing mines, grandfathered patent applications and mines proposed before May 1999. It also could be viewed as rescinding Congress's 1960 acknowledgment of the millsite provision as law. On 7/27/99, Senators Patty Murray (D-WA), Richard Durbin (D-IL), and John Kerry (D-MA) offered a floor amendment to strike this rider. That amendment was tabled (i.e., rejected) by a vote of 55-41 and the rider was retained. Additionally, Nick Rahall (D-WV), Christopher Shays (R-CT), and Jay Inslee (D-WA) offered an amendment to the House Interior Appropriations bill (H.R. 2466) on 7/14/99 to prevent the unlimited dumping of toxic mining wastes on public lands. The amendment, which passed on the House floor by a vote of 273-151, and was followed by a successful motion to instruct the house conferees to keep the Rahall language, directly contradicted the Senate provision which would eliminate the millsite provision of the 1872 Mining Law. Despite these votes, the House capitulated to the Senate in conference.

(18) Sec. 341: Stewardship and End Result Contracting Demonstration Project—would permit the Forest Service to contract with private entities to perform services to achieve land management goals in national forests in Idaho and Montana, and in the Umatilla National Forest in Oregon. A similar provision was inserted and passed as part of the FY 1999 Interior Appropriations bill. Land management goals include a variety of activities such as restoration of wildlife and fish habitat, noncommercial cutting or removal of trees to reduce fire hazards, and control of exotic weeds. While the stated land management goals, provision for multi-year contracts, and annual reporting requirements are worthy, there are three major drawbacks contained in the language of the FY 1999 law: undefined community roles, the lack of provisions for monitoring and oversight, and the funding mechanism for desired work. This provision was added at the request of Senator Conrad Burns in Subcommittee.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. After being passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99, the provision was amended in conference but does not substantially address the concerns articulated above.

(19) Sec. 343: Delay Critical Land Acquisition—would significantly compromise the public land acquisition process in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and would establish a dangerous precedent for land protection elsewhere. This provision would require duplicative appraisals for leach land purchase and add unnecessary bureaucracy, delays, and complexity to the process. Moreover, it would foster an unjustified presumption that the existing land valuation process is flawed, creating a basis of hostility and antagonism likely to frus-

trate willing-seller negotiations. As a result, this extreme departure from longstanding acquisition policies would be a substantial impediment to continued conservation in the Columbia Gorge and would set the stage for similarly unproductive "reforms" in other conservation areas.

Status: Amended but remains objectionable. After being passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99, the provision was amended in conference to but does not substantially address the concerns articulated above.

(20) Sec. 346: Effectively Waives NEPA requirements for Interstate 90 Land Exchange (WA)—would require the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange in Washington State with Plum Creek Timber Company within 30 days. Such mandate could circumvent the National Environmental Policy Act's public participation and environmental review requirements. The proposal to give Plum Creek the Watch Mountain roadless area and old growth groves in Fossil Creek (both now parts of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest) has sparked significant opposition. The rider could cut short full consideration of the public's concerns and block judicial review of the adequacy of the environmental analysis that has been done. The rider also orders the Forest Service to identify further lands to be traded to Plum Creek.

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and reported from the House-Senate conference committee. This provision was originally inserted into the bill as part of a managers amendment on the Senate floor on 9/14/99 on behalf of Sen. Slade Gorton (R-WA).

(21) Sec. 350: Prevent Grizzly Bear Reintroduction—would be disastrous for grizzly bear recovery and sets a very dangerous legislative precedent. This language prohibits the Department of the Interior and all other federal agencies from expending funds in any fiscal year to introduce grizzly bears anywhere in Idaho and Montana without express written consent of the governors of those two states. The language requires federal agencies to get state permission to implement a federal law on federal lands and sets a broad precedent, both for other endangered species recovery actions and for all other federal laws. Moreover, this provision would derail a five-year collaborative effort initiated by local timber, conservation, and labor interests to restore grizzly bears to the Selway-Bitterroot ecosystem in Idaho and Montana, the largest roadless area remaining in the lower forty-eight states. This reintroduction is vital to grizzly bear recovery in the lower forty-eight states. Finally, both Idaho and Montana have existing populations of grizzly bears outside the Selway-Bitterroot ecosystem. This restrictive language is so unclear and broad that it could prohibit actions such as population augmentations or the movement of problem bears within existing recovery populations (e.g. Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks).

Status: Unchanged as passed by the full Senate on 9/24/99 and negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99. On 7/27/99, this provision was stricken from the Senate bill in order to comply with Senate Rule XVI, which was reinstated after a four-year suspension by a Senate floor vote of 53-45 one day earlier. Rule XVI restricts the addition of unrelated policy riders to appropriation bills on the Senate floor. However, on 9/14/99 Sen. Burns (R-MT) and Sen. Craig (R-ID) successfully re-offered the provision which still prohibits funds for the physical relocation of grizzly bears into the Selway-Bitterroot ecosystem, but limits the pro-

hibition to fiscal year FY2000. Although amended, the provision remains objectionable.

(22) Sec. 355: Delays Improvements to White River Forest Plan—would further delay the revision of the forest plan for Colorado's White River National Forest by extending the comment period on the revised plan for another three months. The Forest Service has already granted a 90-day extension making the comment period six-months long more than ample time for all interests to make their views known. This forest is one of the most popular national forests in the country, containing the world-famous Maroon-Snowmass Wilderness along with Vail, Aspen and several other ski areas. In its draft management plan, the Forest Service has proposed for the first time trying to better manage rampant recreation by limiting it to its current levels to the outrage of the motorized recreation and ski industries. The rider is a thinly veiled attempt to delay the new forest plan until the next Administration in hopes of permanently sandbagging any attempts by the Forest Service to rein in corporate ski area expansions and rampant off-road vehicle use.

Status: Unchanged as negotiated by the House-Senate conference committee as of 10/18/99. This provision was added in conference by Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell (R-CO).

(23) Sec. 357: Blocks Stronger Hardrock Mining Environmental Regulations—would further delay the Department of Interior's attempt to strengthen environmental controls applicable to hard rock mines (the so-called "3809 regulations"). Specifically, the rider would extend the moratorium on stronger hardrock mining regulations through the end of fiscal year 2000.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the Interior conference report, and I wanted particularly to commend the Committee on Appropriations, particularly the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), for including funding increases in areas such as the Park Service and the wildlife refuge system, particularly in this difficult year.

This bill is critically important to my home State of Florida. It is not just my home State. It is the destination of many visitors as well. Since it serves as the main vehicle for Everglades restoration funding, I am pleased that this year as in past years the committee has made sure that Congress continues to lead the charge in restoring the Everglades, unquestionably a unique national treasure which gives great enjoyment to a great many people.

In addition, I am grateful that the committee was able to make available land acquisition fund for the J.N. Ding Darling National Wildlife Refuge which happens to be in my district and in fact comprises about 50 percent of my hometown of Sanibel, another area

that is enjoyed by literally millions of visitors.

Some of my colleagues have expressed some concern about certain riders in this conference report before us. I know that I generally share the opinion of my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations when I say these issues really are best handled through the authorization process, which is why we have authorizers and authorizing committees.

Of course, as my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), is well aware, however, that since 1983 Florida has benefited from a legislative rider on this bill that protects our coastal areas from offshore oil and gas drilling. We have been trying to deal with the issue in the authorization committee, but so far we have been unable to get the job done so I want to express my appreciation and I think the appreciation of the full Florida delegation that the committee has once again included this stop-gap rider to protect Florida offshore waters from oil and gas drilling, which is a position our State holds very strongly and some other States do as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, which is fair and traditional for this type of legislation. I urge them to consider the conference report carefully and support it, because it is a compromise conference report; but I believe it is a very good one under the circumstances.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. This legislation defies the will of the American people by severely underfunding our national effort to protect and preserve the national lands and because it contains anti-environmental riders that interfere with the proper management of the public's resources.

This report drastically underfunds the President's land legacy initiative that is designed to protect the endangered lands and resources that are threatened by development. It is ironic that this legislation should take such an extreme and anti-environmental position on such an issue at a time when we are working mightily to fashion on a bipartisan basis a resource initiative.

Throughout this country, hundreds of thousands of people from soccer moms to sporting goods manufacturers, from environmentalists to hunters to park professionals to inner-city police organizations have come together to reach and support legislation that would expand, not constrict as this legislation does, the amount of investment we in Congress would make with the resources of this country.

The President requested \$413 million for his land legacy and the land water conservation fund for the year 2000.

The conference report provided less than \$250 million. The administration sought \$4 million for urban parks programs. The conference report provided half of that amount of money. We have to understand that the people of this country want these resources protected. They want the opportunities expanded. Ninety-four percent of all Americans support more funding for the land and water conservation fund. That is a Republican pollster taking that poll. Eighty-eight percent of the American people agree we must act now or we will lose these special places.

This bill does not act now, and it does so in the riders. In the riders it continues to give away public land for the mining companies to dispose of their waste and their toxic waste on these lands, and it overrides the limitations in the 1872 mining law; but they will not override those limitations to try to get the American people the royalties and rents for the use of those public lands.

This land also continues to allow the oil companies to underpay the royalties that my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), has worked so hard on. This continues to let them underpay \$60 million in royalties that they owe the people of this country, \$6 million in the State of California that goes to the education system in our State for young people.

This report continues to let the oil companies have a royalty holiday on lands that they drill oil from, that they take from the American people, and they underpay the resources. That should not be allowed to continue.

This bill also fails to provide the kind of support that is necessary so the Indian tribes of this Nation can continue to take over the functioning of those programs where the Government acted on their behalf in a most paternal manner, that the Indians can now run those programs of the Indian health service from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and they can do it more efficiently. They do it with greater enrollment and greater care for the members of their tribes, and yet this legislation does not speak to those in a proper manner.

This legislation is bad for the environment. It is bad for the taxpayers. It is bad for school children. It is bad for the public that supports our parks and public lands, and we ought to reject it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Interior and was part of the conference

committee that worked so hard with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), a tremendous chairman in this case, trying to craft a measure that would be balanced and sensible under the limitations that we have funding-wise.

We worked hard in the conference committee with Senator GORTON, our colleague from Washington State in the other body, who worked very hard on behalf of the Senate to try to craft a measure that makes some sense.

What I have heard the speakers on the other side say in the last 15 minutes or so defies reality; it defies logic. On the one hand, they say this bill is inadequate and they want to spend more money. On the other hand, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) says we are spending too much money in this bill; that we are over our allocation.

Well, the lands legacy program that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman just spoke of, is \$413 million.

My point is, they want to spend more money and they want to frustrate this bill. They do not want this conference report to pass under any circumstance because they know that if it passes and goes down and the President has to address the issue of whether it is adequate, then they are going to have a problem because they want this to go in an omnibus bill. They do not want to have any allocation made on the merits of this particular bill.

One had to be there, Mr. Speaker, to understand the diligence that went into trying to craft this measure and have it be acceptable. We are \$77 million over last year on the National Parks Service. We are \$50 million over the Bureau of Land Management for last year. We are \$55 million more for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; the Indian Health Service, \$2.4 billion, a \$130 million increase. When is enough enough?

We are trying to balance this bill, meet the objections of the other body, meet the objections of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and also their preferences. So I must say, with respect to the mining issue and the patent issue, what we tried to do was have agreement between the two sides on the issue and come up with something that is acceptable to both as best we could.

Was it perfect? Is it a perfect bill? Certainly not, but my goodness let us be reasonable in adopting this rule, moving this process along, not frustrating it and waiting until the end so that then we are down to the White House with millions and millions in more dollars in the final package. That is not acceptable.

So I must say, I think the objectors in this case are not thinking it through carefully in terms of what is good for this country and what is good in this bill. It is a good bill. It is a bill that

was crafted by a very diligent chairman in conference committee on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Let me say the gentleman has misconstrued what I said. I did not say that this bill had spent too much money. What I said was under the rules of the House, the rules prohibit this bill from being considered at this point because it exceeds the budget ceiling that the gentleman's party assigned to the subcommittee; and, therefore, under those circumstances a vote for this rule is a vote to exceed the ceiling that the gentleman's party itself imposed. What we are suggesting is that that needs to be fixed and a lot of other things need to be fixed, and the only way to do that is to sit down and fix it, rather than send a bill to the President that we know is dead on arrival.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate yielding to the gentleman but these ceilings are adjustable and the gentleman realizes that, I believe, that they are adjustable. They have to be adjustable based on our conditions.

Mr. OBEY. They sure are.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. That is the nature of this process, it is, and the bottom line, though, with regard to those who object is that they want to spend millions and millions and millions of dollars more. That is really what is happening here. I guarantee if we do not pass this bill and send it down to the President and let him make his judgment as he should under the Constitution, either veto it or sign it and then tell us why he has vetoed it, if he will, then we are going to be in an omnibus and all of those of us who care deeply about preserving Social Security and all of those on the other side of the aisle who profess that they do are going to be breaching their own commitment to that goal.

So I urge my colleagues, vote for this rule. Vote for this bill. Support the conference committee's best efforts to make this work and let us get the President to either accept or reject that under the Constitution, which is his obligation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. I would say to my friend on the other side of the aisle, who says that we want to spend more money. Actually we are trying to save money. One of the terrible, anti-environmental riders is also very anti-taxpayer. It is an undisputed

fact that the oil rider that is attached costs the American taxpayer \$66 million a year. This is money that could go to education, to our schools.

We just had a bill on the floor where people talked about the need for more money for education. This is where we could save some money, where we could save some money by doing what is right. I would just like to say that what basically has happened is for decades the oil companies have underpaid the Government for oil extracted from federally owned lands. They got caught by the Department of Justice, by the Department of Interior, and I would say by the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology headed by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), who held many hearings on the underpayment of oil royalties, the royalty holiday of the oil companies stealing money from the American taxpayer.

They had to pay \$5 billion in penalties for what they ripped off in the past.

So what we have before us is a number of anti-environmental riders that are terribly unacceptable. I must say that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), who is the ranking member, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) did a wonderful job keeping them off of the House version, but we need to keep them off the conference report, too. So I hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle will join us in voting against this rule, against the unacceptable oil riders and other riders that hurt the environment, that steal money from the taxpayers that could be going to education. It is just a bad bill. We need to stand up for America's schools, for the American taxpayers, and stand up against the anti-environmental rip-off and oppose this conference report.

□ 1630

There is no reason why we should continue paying big oil companies \$66 million that they do not deserve, because they pay themselves market price. But when it comes to paying American schoolteachers and the government for federally owned land, they underpay to the tune of \$66 million a year. It is wrong. It is terribly wrong.

If my colleagues are fiscally conservative, vote against this bill just on the oil rider alone.

Mr. Speaker I rise in strong opposition to this conference report.

Because it contains an unacceptable rider, that will let big oil companies, continue to steal money from our nation's schoolchildren, to fatten their own wallets.

Mr. Speaker, these oil companies, have been caught cheating, on the royalty payments they owe, for drilling oil on federal land.

Royalty payments, that benefit our schools, our environment, and the American taxpayer.

As a result, they have to pay almost five billion dollars in settlements.

But now, every time that the Interior Department has tried to fix the rules so that they pay the money they owe.

The supporters of big oil, have come to this Congress, and blocked them from doing it.

This time, they were a little more creative, they decided to delay the rules until the General Accounting Office, can audit Interior's rulemaking process.

But we all know, that this is just another delay, designed to get us to the next must-pass appropriations bill, when they'll attach another rider, so we can start this process all over again.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, GAO has already issued a report on Interior's rulemaking process, and found that Interior has been extremely thorough, and gone out of its way to respond to the comments of the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, I listened yesterday as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle promised to do everything they could, to save every penny in the social security trust fund.

So I cannot understand why when we're cutting the COPS program: Cutting the NEA; cutting the Land and Water Conservation Fund; When we're cutting all these vital programs—we're telling deadbeat oil companies, that owe the American taxpayer millions. "It's OK—we really don't need the money."

Mr. Speaker, this is absurd and illogical.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the American taxpayer.

Stand up for America's schools. Stand up against this anti-environmental rip-off. And oppose this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following documents:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1999]

THE SENATE'S OILY DEAL

Though it was little noticed at the time, a donnybrook over Senate rules last week illustrated the outsized role of special interests in government. The issue was a money grab by oil businesses, which want to lower the royalties they have to pay the Government for drilling on Federal land. When Senator Russell Feingold of Wisconsin tried to block an amendment that would let them keep their royalty payments artificially low and pointed out that oil-sector campaign donations were calling the shots, several senators objected. Their reason? Mr. Feingold's recitation of campaign donations was not "germane" and therefore not allowed during the debate.

How quaint of the senators to disparage the germaneness of campaign contributions. In fact, nothing could be more relevant than the power of donors to call the tune in Congress. Fortunately, Mr. Feingold was allowed to continue, in spite of complaints from Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas, the amendment's sponsor, and Senator Craig Thomas of Wyoming. Unfortunately, the measure passed. The bill to which it is attached contains objectionable anti-environmental features, and President Clinton should veto it.

It is perverse for the Senate to cut school aid, housing and other domestic programs on the ground that the budget needs to be balanced, and then to cut revenues even more by handing out a big break to oil companies. Mr. Feingold, in raising the campaign reform issue, knew that simply pointing out what everyone knows is true would be embarrassing. If embarrassment moves the senators to act, it should be not to stop someone

from telling the truth, but to pass the ban on unlimited "soft money" to parties sponsored by Mr. Feingold and John McCain of Arizona.

Mr. Feingold likes to point out that he is an heir to the Senate seat of Robert La Follette, the progressive hero of nearly a century ago, who used to "call the roll" of railroads and other big donors who got their way in government. La Follette's ability to embarrass his colleagues led eventually to the ban on corporate donations to individual candidates of 1907, a ban that is now being undone by the "soft money" scam whereby the money is given to parties, not candidates. Mr. Feingold's "Calling of the Bankroll" has pointed out how health insurance donors influenced legislation governing health-maintenance organizations, how the tax-cut bill got packed with treats for businesses, and how big donations by Chevron, Atlantic Richfield and BP Amoco led to the break on oil royalties.

This season of Republican-touted budget restraint was enlivened by the influence of a different special interest in the defense area. Trent Lott, the majority leader, wants a half billion dollars to start building a ship, the LHD-8. The Navy says it does not need the money or the ship. Naturally, the Senate has approved the money. Not all spending restraint is healthy, at least to some senators. Perhaps it is germane to point out that the ship would be built at a shipyard in Mr. Lott's home state of Mississippi.

Oil royalty settlements, July, 1999

Alaska	\$3,700,000,000
California	345,000,000
Louisiana	250,000,000
Private owners	180,000,000
Federal Governments	45,000,000
Texas	30,000,000
Alabama	15,000,000
New Mexico	7,000,000
Florida	2,000,000
Total	4,600,000,000

Note: This list includes financial settlements from oil royalty valuation lawsuits and government investigations. Figures may include taxes paid to state governments resulting from the settlements.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL ON THE BIG-OIL RIDER

PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF REP. CAROLYN MALONEY

The current Senate version of the Interior Appropriations Bill contains a rider that would prohibit the Department of the Interior's Minerals Management Service (MMS) from implementing its new oil-valuation rule. The rule governs the royalty payments made by private oil companies that drill oil on federal land.

All companies that drill on federal land are required to pay the government a royalty—generally 12.5 percent of the value of the oil—to the taxpayer. Money from royalty payments helps to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Historic Preservation Fund, and the U.S. Treasury. In addition, states and Indian tribes received a share of the royalty payments. Many states, including California, put the money directly into their public school system.

For decades, states and independent observers have accused oil companies of deliberately undervaluing their oil in an effort to reduce their royalty payments. As a result, several states and private royalty owners have filed suit against several major companies, and have collected over five billion dollars in settlements to date. The Justice Department recently decided to sue several

companies for underpayment of federal royalty payments; one company has already settled, and several others are rumored to be nearing settlements.

MMS has attempted to fix this problem permanently by introducing a new rule which will link royalty payments with the fair market value of the oil. It is estimated that the new rule will save taxpayers at least \$66 million per year. Furthermore, MMS estimates that the new rule will impact only 5 percent of all oil companies—primarily large, integrated companies. Ninety-five percent of companies, including all independent producers, will not be affected.

On three separate occasions, oil-industry allies in the Senate have attached rides to must-pass appropriations measures to block the new rule. The current rider expires at the end of this fiscal year, and oil industry supporters, led by Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON (R-TX) attached a rider to the Senate Interior Appropriations Bill that would extend it until October 1, 2000. The rider passed on a narrow 51-47, after supporters barely mustered the 60 votes to beat a filibuster led by Senator BARBARA BOXER (D-CA).

Attachments: Editorial dated 9/27/99 from the New York Times, Editorial dated 9/15/99 from the Washington Post, New York Times article from 9/21/99, Floor Statement by Congresswoman MALONEY, Press Release from Congresswoman MALONEY, Recent settlements against the oil industry for underpayment for royalties, Letter to the President from Congresswoman MALONEY and Senator BOXER, Disbursement of Royalty Revenues, 1982-1998.

BUDGET VALUES

To stay within spending limits, most House Republicans and some Democrats voted last week to squeeze federal housing programs for the poor. This week House Republican leaders acknowledged they were considering deferring billions of dollars in income support payments to lower-income working families as well. But congressional zeal in behalf of budget savings appears to extend only so far.

The Senate currently faces the question of ending what amounts to income support, not for low-income families but for oil companies. The Interior Department would require the companies to begin paying royalties based on the open market value of oil and gas extracted from the federal domain. Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison has an amendment to the Interior appropriations bill that would allow them in many cases to continue to pay less. On a test vote Monday, she was able to marshal 55 of the 60 votes she needs to cut off debate and put the amendment in place. The remaining votes are said to be at hand: all 54 Senate Republicans, the lone independent, former Republican Bob Smith, and five wayward Democrats.

In the end, it is well understood that Congress will breach the spending limits, which are artificially tight. In the meantime, we have pretense to the contrary. But even the pretense produces winners and losers. Oil wins, poor people lose; those are the values of this Congress.

The spending caps represent no one's idea of the true cost of government. They were set in the 1997 budget deal between the president and congressional Republicans to make it appear that the politicians could, too, balance the budget while granting a tax cut. Now it's time to adhere to them, and there aren't the votes. Nor should there be, given the long-term damage that adherence would

do. The question isn't whether they'll be exceeded but by how much, how honestly, and who will bear the blame.

To avoid the appearance of breaching them, Congress has been using all manner of gimmicks. Ordinary expenditures for such things as the census and defense have been classified as emergencies, because under the budget rules, emergencies don't count. Various devices have likewise been used to alter not the amount of spending but the timing of it, to move it out of next fiscal year. That's what the House leadership is contemplating with regard to the earned income tax credit, which provides what amount to wage supplements to the working poor. They should be the last victims of budget-cutting, not the first.

A third device has been to avoid deep cuts in the smaller domestic appropriations bills by "borrowing" funds from the larger final ones, for veterans' affairs, housing, labor, health and human services and education. But that has merely concentrated the problem, not solved it. Meanwhile, the housing programs are essentially frozen in a period in which the general prosperity masks increasing need.

The president and Congress knew the appropriations caps they set in 1997 were unlikely ever to be met. The caps were set for show; they were an official lie to which both parties put their names, and from which they continue to try to extricate themselves. The projected surplus in other than Social Security funds over which they have been fighting all year—the one Republicans would use to finance their about-to-be-vetoed tax cut—exists only if you assume that most domestic spending will be cut by more than a fifth in real terms, as the caps require. But the votes don't exist for even the first of these cuts, much less the full mowing; nor is it just Democrats who are turning away. They're living a lie, both parties; that's the reason for the gimmicks. Only the oil subsidy seems unaffected. Are there really no Republicans in the Senate who think it wrong?

[From the New York Times, Sept. 21, 1999]

BATTLE WAGED IN THE SENATE OVER ROYALTIES ON OIL FIRMS (By Tim Weiner)

Oil companies drilling on Federal land have been accused of habitually underpaying royalties they owe the Government. Challenged in court, they have settled lawsuits, agreeing to pay \$5 billion.

The Interior Department wants to rectify the situation by making the companies pay royalties based on the market price of the oil, instead of on a lower price set by the oil companies themselves.

A simple issue? Not in the United States Senate. Instead, it has become a textbook example of how Washington works. The battle over royalties shows how a senator can use legislation to right a wrong, in the view of Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, a Texas Republican who is blocking the Interior regulations. Or it shows how Congress does favors for special interests, in the view of Senator Hutchison's opponents.

The issue could come to a vote this week, and it appears as if the Senate might side with the oil companies.

Senator Hutchison, who has received \$1.2 million in contributions from oil companies in the last five years, has been winning the battle to block the pricing regulations since the Interior Department imposed them in 1995. The department estimates that oil companies are saving about \$5 million a month,

money that would otherwise be flowing to education, environmental programs and other projects.

Senator Hutchison calls the regulations a breach of contract and an unfair tax increase. She says she represents "the overwhelming majority of the Senate who want to do the right thing, who want fair taxation of our oil and gas industry."

For 4 years, she has placed amendments and riders into annual spending bills to keep the Interior Department regulations from taking effect. To do otherwise, she argues, would be "to let unelected bureaucrats make decisions that will affect our economy."

Senator Hutchison's chief antagonist has been Senator Barbara Boxer, a California Democrat who has condemned the underpaying of royalties as a scheme intended to "rob this Treasury of millions and millions of dollars."

"We shouldn't have a double standard just because an oil company is powerful, just because an oil company can give millions of dollars in contributions," Senator Boxer said.

The Senate has never actually voted on Senator Hutchison's measure. It has been inserted into must-pass spending bills that provide a perfect vehicle for controversial measures that might attract public notice if they were openly debated.

This year, however, the Senate decided it would stop attaching such riders to appropriations bills. Now the Hutchison amendment has turned into a running battle on the Senate floor.

The Interior Department first proposed the regulations in December 1995, nearly 10 years after the State of California first began to suspect that energy companies were underpaying the royalties they owed on oil pumped from Federal and State land. The royalty is 12.5 percent for onshore drilling and 16.67 percent for offshore production.

For the industry's giants, the royalties are a small fraction of earnings. For the Exxon Corporation, they represent about one-eighth of 1 percent of company revenues. According to Interior Department figures, the new regulations would cost Exxon \$8 million, an additional one-hundredth of a percent of revenues.

The money goes to the Treasury, which sends it to environmental and historic-preservation projects, and to 24 states, many of which use the money on education.

But instead of basing their royalties on the actual market price of oil, the energy companies have been using a price they set that has run as much as \$4 a barrel less than the market price.

According to the sworn testimony of a retired Atlantic Richfield executive in a California lawsuit in July, the policy of his company and others was to pay royalties based on a price "at least four or five dollars below what we accepted as the fair market value." The retired executive, Harry Anderson, said his company's senior executives had decided "they would take the money, accrue for the day of judgment, and that's what we did."

The testimony was first reported by Platt's Oilgram News, a trade publication.

This practice allowed 18 oil companies, including Shell, Exxon, Chevron, Texaco and Mobil Oil, to avoid paying royalties of about \$66 million a year, according to Interior Department figures published in the Congressional Record.

Sued by state governments, and now under investigation by the Justice Department, most of the major oil companies have signed settlements totaling about \$5 billion with seven states.

But Ms. Hutchison says forcing the companies to pay royalties based of the true market price of oil amounts to an unfair tax increase.

"They are breaking a contract and saying: 'We are going to raise your taxes,'" she argued on the Senate floor this week.

"If we allow that to happen, who will be next?" the Senator asked. "Who is the next person who is going to have a contract and have the price increased in the middle of the contract? Contract rights are part of the basis of the rule of law in this country, and we seem to blithely going over it."

If the Hutchison amendment comes to a vote—and it might this week—it appears likely to pass, with support from almost all the Senate's 55 Republicans and a few oil-state Democrats.

If the Senate lets the regulations take effect, says Senator Frank Murkowski, an Alaska Republican who supports the amendment, the message will be clear: "We will be saying, 'Go ahead. Raise royalties and taxes. We, the U.S. Senate, yield our power.'"

HTTP://WWW.NYTIMES.COM

Graphic: Photos: Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, left (Stephen Crowley/The New York Times), is seeking to protect companies that drill on Federal land. Senator Barbara Boxer says they are underpaying. (Ed Carreon for The New York Times)

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE CAROLYN B. MALONEY ON THE BIG-OIL RIDER IN THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL—JULY 13, 1999

I rise today in support of this legislation. I would like to applaud the Appropriations Committee for wisely rejecting efforts to load this bill up with controversial anti-environmental riders. Unfortunately, the version of this bill passed by the Appropriations Committee in the other body contains numerous riders that would never pass on their own and have no place in this legislation.

One of these riders, in particular, robs the American taxpayer of over 66 million dollars per year. This rider would permit big oil companies to continue to underpay the royalties they owe to the Federal Government, States and Indian tribes, cheating taxpayers of millions of dollars. It would do this by blocking the Interior Department from implementing a new rule which would require big oil companies to pay royalties to the Federal Government based on the market value of the oil they produce.

Earlier this year, I released a report demonstrating how these companies have cheated the American taxpayer of literally billions of dollars of the past several decades. They do this by complex trading devices which mask the real value of the oil they produce. By undervaluing their oil, these companies can avoid paying the full royalty payments they own.

The Justice Department investigated these practices and decided that they were so egregious that it filed suit against several major companies for violating the False Claims Act. As a result, one company decided to settle with the government, and paid 45 million dollars. Numerous other companies have settled similar claims brought by states and private royalty owners for millions—and in one case billions—of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the rule that the Interior Department is proposing is simple. It requires that oil companies pay royalties based on the fair market value of the oil they produce. But these oil companies that have been cheating the American taxpayer for years are now trying to block the Interior Department from implementing a new rule, using every excuse imaginable.

Mr. Chairman, this rider robs money from our schools, our environment, and our states and Indian tribes. It does this to benefit the most-narrow special interest imaginable—big oil companies with billions of dollars in profits.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee for leaving this issue to the experts at the Interior Department, and I call on my colleagues to reject these efforts to benefit big oil at the expense of the American taxpayer.

MALONEY EXPOSES OIL COMPANY FRAUD ALLEGATIONS TO BE DISCUSSED AT HEARING TODAY

Congresswoman CAROLYN B. MALONEY (NY-14) today released a report exposing how several major oil companies have defrauded the U.S. government of millions of dollars by undervaluing oil produced on federal land for royalty purposes.

"This report confirms what we knew all along," said MALONEY. "It proves that big oil companies have stolen money from our nation's taxpayers, our schools, and our environment, only to fatten their own bottom line."

These allegations, along with the Interior Department's efforts to make oil companies pay the money they owe, will be discussed at a hearing held today by the Government Reform Committee's Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology. The hearing will be held at 2:00 p.m., in room 2247 of the Rayburn House Office Building.

Under federal law, all companies which drill oil on federal and state land are required to pay a royalty based on the value of the oil they produce (generally from 12.5% to 16%). Big oil companies under report the value of the oil they produce, thus allowing them to pay less in royalties than they owe. It is estimated that this scam costs taxpayers between \$66 million and \$100 million each year.

In 1974, the State of California and the City of Long Beach sued several major oil companies for underpayment of oil royalties. This report is based on an exhaustive analysis of material obtained by Congresswoman MALONEY from the Long Beach litigation. Representative MALONEY requested the material in her role as Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, a post she held during the 105th Congress. Most of the documents date from the 1980's and cover a wide variety of trading practices. None of the information contained in the report is proprietary or could be damaging in any way to any individual company.

Congresswoman MALONEY has repeatedly pressured the Department of the Interior's Minerals Management Service (MMS), as well as the Justice Department, to expose the fraudulent practices of many major oil companies. This report is the first comprehensive analysis of internal company documents that reveals exactly how major oil companies engaged in suspect trading practices to reduce the amount of royalties.

The report reaches the following conclusions:

Companies regularly traded California crude oil with each other at one price—the market price—and reported royalties based on another (called "posted prices") which were lower than market. As a result, they paid less in royalty than required under the law.

Companies were aware that market prices were actually much higher than posted prices.

Companies used complex trading devices to conceal the fact that posted prices were often well below the true market price of the oil. These included:

Inflating transportation costs, which are then deducted from the sale price of the crude oil to lead to a royalty basis which is far below market value.

Engaging in "overall balancing arrangements" between companies to sell each other undervalued crude. These arrangements are complex trading schemes in which companies sell each other equivalent amounts of oil at reduced prices in such a way that neither company loses money on the transaction.

Selling oil at prices above posted prices without making any attempt to explain the discrepancy between posted prices and the sale price.

Companies recognized that Alaska North Slope Crude Oil (ANS) is traded at prices much higher than California posted prices, even when adjusted for relative quality. As a result, they considered California oil a bargain.

The ability of the major oil companies to trade at prices below actual value reveal that the California oil market in the 1980's was dominated by a few major players with substantial market power. This situation can only get worse in the wake of the recent wave of oil mergers, as the recent rise in California gas prices demonstrates.

The totality of this evidence reveals that major oil companies engaged in a deliberate

plan to defraud the U.S. government of royalty money it was entitled to under the law.

The report is particularly timely because the Interior Department's Minerals Management Service (MMS), the agency which oversees royalty collection, is attempting to implement a new rule which would require that oil companies pay royalties based on the fair market value of the oil they produce, however, the Supplemental Appropriations Bill, which passed the House last night, contains a rider added at the request of big oil companies which prohibits implementation of the new rule prior to October 1, 1999.

Copies of the report can be obtained by contacting the office of Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY at (202) 225-7944.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 13, 1999.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge you to veto any legislation passed by the Congress which prohibits the Interior Department from implementing its proposed oil-valuation rule. If this new rule is blocked, big oil companies will continue to cheat American taxpayers and schoolchildren by deliberately underpaying the royalties they owe.

When oil companies drill on federal land, they are required to pay a royalty to the federal government. A share of this royalty is given to the state, and the remaining money is used by the federal government for the

Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Historic Preservation Fund. In many states, including California, the states' share provides much needed funds for public education.

For years, big oil companies have deliberately undervalued the oil produced on federal land in order to avoid royalty payments. To fix this problem, the Interior Department proposed a fair and workable rule that will simply require major oil companies to pay royalties based on the fair market value of the oil.

On three separate occasions, legislative riders included on appropriations bills have prevented the Interior Department from implementing this fair rule. If the supporters of big oil companies are successful again, they will have managed to block implementation of this rule for two and a half years, at a total cost to taxpayers of over one-hundred and fifty million dollars.

We urge you to stand up to this special-interest rider and veto any legislation that would prevent American taxpayers from getting the oil royalties to which they are entitled.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Member of Congress.
BARBARA BOXER,
United States Senator.

ROYALTY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Disbursement of Federal and Indian Mineral Lease Revenues—Fiscal Years 1982–98
(Revenues in Thousands of Dollars)

	Historic Preservation Fund	Land & Water Conservation Fund	Reclamation Fund	Indian Tribes & Allottees	State Share	U.S. Treasury General Fund	Total
1982	\$150,000	\$825,095	\$435,688	\$203,000	\$609,660	\$5,476,020	\$7,700,318
1983	150,000	814,693	391,891	169,600	454,359	9,582,227	11,562,770
1984	150,000	789,421	414,868	163,932	542,646	5,848,044	7,908,911
1985	150,000	784,279	415,688	160,479	548,937	4,744,317	6,803,700
1986	150,000	755,224	339,624	122,865	1,390,632	4,983,055	7,741,400
1987	150,000	823,576	265,294	100,499	990,113	4,030,979	6,360,461
1988	150,000	859,761	317,505	125,351	767,621	2,627,721	4,847,959
1989	150,000	862,761	337,865	121,954	480,272	2,006,837	3,959,689
1990	150,000	843,765	353,708	141,086	501,207	2,102,576	4,092,342
1991	150,000	885,000	368,474	164,310	524,207	2,291,085	4,383,076
1992	150,000	887,926	328,081	170,378	500,866	1,624,864	3,662,115
1993	150,000	900,000	366,593	164,385	543,717	1,945,730	4,070,425
1994	150,000	862,208	410,751	172,132	606,510	2,141,755	4,343,356
1995	150,000	896,987	367,284	153,319	553,012	1,541,048	3,661,650
1996	150,000	896,906	350,264	145,791	547,625	2,866,509	4,975,095
1997	150,000	896,979	442,834	196,462	685,554	3,867,865	6,239,694
1998	150,000	896,978	421,149	191,484	656,225	3,663,532	5,979,368
Total	2,550,000	14,482,414	6,327,561	2,667,027	10,903,163	61,344,164	98,274,329

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 11 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to listen to this debate, because this bill passed the House by about 380 votes, and a majority of the Members from the other side of the aisle voted for the bill. Essentially, it is the same bill, only with some extra funding in. I will address the issue of

the riders. Perhaps we should do that right up front.

Now, we have good riders and bad riders. The good riders are, one cannot drill offshore. Everybody likes that one. The good rider is that patents giving away mining lands are on a moratorium. That is a good rider.

But the riders that were in the Senate, we found objectionable. But in the conference, with the support of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and other Members on both sides of the House team, we got those riders modified. Let me take each one in order.

The mill sites question. Basically the responsibility for mine reform rests with this body and not the Solicitor General. I think that the issue of how we deal with mill sites should be solved by our authorizing committees

and by this legislative body. It is a legislative issue. We cannot very well have attorneys, such as the Solicitor, making law; otherwise, we might as well close up shop.

Now, of course I think the Senate provision overturned the Solicitor's opinion indefinitely. That is too long. So we modified it with give and take in the conference. My colleagues have to remember that we have a two-house system here. When we go to conference, and this is a conference report, it has to be worked out. There has to be some degree of compromise and negotiation.

What the conference agreement does is water down the Senate provision. We say that the Solicitor's opinion which, in effect, he is in the mode of writing legislation, cannot impact on existing mining plans. One cannot very well look back. One cannot even legislate

ex-post facto, after the fact. So we said one cannot possibly change the rules. A lot of people have made a lot of investments.

We also provide that plans in operation submitted prior to May 21, 1999, are exempt. We went back as far as we thought was appropriate, and patent applications grandfathered pursuant to the current patent application moratorium in place since 1995, at this time this committee, under the leadership on our side of the aisle and support from the minority, did put in a moratorium on patents. So it is substantially less. Keep in mind this is a 1-year bill.

Oil valuation. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) just talked about that. The Senate included a provision prohibiting the Minerals Management Service from implementing a new rule on oil valuation throughout the year 2000. We said that is too long. There is a problem here that needs to be addressed.

So the conference agreement prohibits the rule from being implemented for a period not to exceed 6 months or until the comptroller general, that is GAO, reviews the proposed regulation and issues a report. Let us get the expert opinion from the GAO. This is a nonpartisan group. They can give us an unbiased opinion. We say it can only be in place 6 months or until we get the GAO report, and then we need to address it legislatively. That is our responsibility.

The grazing issue. The Senate included a provision which would have extended all expired Bureau of Land Management grazing permits based on existing terms and conditions. These permits are currently for 10-year periods. What did the conference agreement do? It continues a 1-year provision similar to the last year's law, similar to what we had last year. This provision clearly states that the authority of the Secretary of Interior to alter, modify, or reject permit renewals following completion of all required environmental analyses is not altered.

We have also included additional funding for the BLM to accelerate the processing of these permits. We said, let us get on with the job. We know that there has to be an EIS on every permit. Under the conference compromise worked out by both parties, the agreement is that they can renew the permits for 10 years; but if the EIS shows that there is any violation of the standards established in the law and by the regulations, immediately, the Secretary can terminate those permits.

This is a question of fairness. We have got to treat people fairly whether they live in the West or whether they live in the East. What we have done in modifying what I thought were too strenuous conditions imposed by the Senate language, we have modified to make the conditions fair. But I think they are reasonable, and I think they

protect the interest of the American people.

On the hard rock mining, we have said, as soon as the National Academy of Science, again, a nonpartisan, independent group, as soon as they give us the report, we can take action. In the meantime, we have a moratorium. All these things are a matter of fairness.

Now, let me just tell my colleagues what a vote yes for this bill will do. A vote yes will give the parks \$77 million more than they had last year; the Bureau of Land Management, \$50 million more; an additional \$55 million to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

We continue the recreational fee program. I am advised by the Park Service that that will generate over \$100 million which they get to put right back in the park where the fee is generated.

Do my colleagues know what the law was before we worked on this? If the parks collected a fee, they sent it to the Treasury. Not much incentive to be out there collecting fees; paying one's team to collect a fee so one can send it to Washington. Now they get to keep it. They have done many improvements with the fee money.

I have been visiting the parks. Without exception, and I think the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) was with us when we visited the parks, we heard this from the team at Olympic how much that meant to them to have the fees to fix up different things that have been neglected.

Speaking of that, we address backlog maintenance. When we started here, we were told it was up to anywhere from \$12 billion to \$14 billion of backlog maintenance. Most of us have homes. We fix the roof. We fix the driveway. We fix it if there is a problem with the plumbing.

Yet, we were allowing our parks, our forests facilities, the Smithsonian, many others to be neglected. On their own testimony, backlog maintenance was up to almost \$14 billion. We decided, as a policy, that we need to address the backlog problem. We need to take care of maintenance. We have been putting in probably twice as much money as was going into maintenance simply to ensure that we are taking care of what we have. We all understand how important that can be.

The conference report ensures environmental protection for the Everglades, including a national park in Biscayne Bay. There is a lot of money in this report to restore the ecosystem and the water flow in the Everglades. How important that is in preserving this great system for the future generations.

Funding for the Forest Service is \$10 million over the administration's request and \$16 million over the administration's request in trail maintenance. Trails, people love trails. If one has a trail in one's area one knows how much it is used. We recognize that even to a

greater extent than the administration did.

This bill is designed for people. It is designed to allow them to use the forest for recreation, to make the parks safe, to make sure they have nice conditions when they go there to visit. So we maintain the sewage systems. We maintain the camp sites. We maintain the things that are important to people.

Funding for the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund continues at \$15 million. We increased Indian Health Services by \$130 million, very important in the Indian community. Again, a concern for people. We have tried to address that throughout the bill.

We have the money to buy the Baca Ranch in New Mexico which will add a great piece of land to the base of this Nation, some 95,000 acres with an elk herd of 6,000 that just roam. Think of what that will mean for people to have an opportunity to visit. That is what my colleagues are going to vote yes for if they vote for this bill.

We, earlier today, had an amendment on science. I have seen open pieces on how important science is in our schools. We provide in this bill for science and research at the USGS, one of the premier science agencies of this Nation. It gets a total \$824 million.

How about this one, a vote yes on this bill is a vote to clean up abandoned mine sites. We really neglected this country and our land when we allowed the rape of lands with mining, open pit mining. We have \$191 million, a \$6 million increase, to address the problems of open-pit mines, to stop the acid rain runoff that goes downstream and goes far beyond the mine site.

Well, there are a lot more things in here that I can talk about. I only can say this, that a vote yes for this bill is a vote for the people of this Nation.

We have done the best we could with the money we have had. We tried to be fair. I think our friends on the other side of the aisle will recognize that, in terms of projects, programs, that each side was treated equally, and that we made our judgments on the merits of the programs and the projects rather than any political decisions.

In view of that, I think we should get support from all the Members, as we did on the original bill. This bill is not that much different. It is, maybe, better in some respects, more funding because of what the Senate did. I certainly urge the Members here to respect the people of this Nation and support this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say at the outset how much I respect the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his

work in this Congress and for his concerns about the environment. But let me also say to him, as much as I hold him in high esteem for his abilities and for his care, he talked about this bill having some equity in it, and the only equity that I see in it is that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was able to get about \$87 million worth of projects for his State in this bill, a lopsided number to say the least, at the expense of, of course, many other Members. So there is no equity in that formula.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the interior of our country is blessed with some of the most precious lands and forests in the world. Sometimes we take for granted Glacier and the Shendoah and the Grand Canyon and Yellowstone and all these marvelous jewels that we have. We do not understand that somebody had the foresight years ago to make them a special place. It did not happen by accident. Legislators protected them from exploitation.

I am sensitive to this exploitation issue because, in my home State of Michigan, we have had a history of exploiting what I think is the most beautiful State in the Union. It occurred in the 18th Century when the folks who wanted to trap came into Michigan, and they took everything that ran on four legs with fur on it, and almost made, in fact, did make extinct the wolverine and the martin, and took pelts in prodigious numbers, beaver. You name it, they went after it and basically took the fur in the State in a very short time and exploited it.

□ 1645

And then in the 19th century, when the Erie Canal opened up and my colleagues' ancestors from New York came over to Michigan, they went after the trees, in the biggest rush of natural resources this country has ever seen. Michigan had unbelievable growth of pine forests and other virgin old growth forests. Seven-tenths, eight-tenths of our State was forest, and by the end of that century it was virtually all gone.

And they took with them the woodland caribou, they took with them the grayling fish, and they took with them the grey fox. The State was devastated. And it has taken us 100 years to recover as a result of that exploitation. We lost some of our special places due to lack of foresight.

In the year 2000, as we do this appropriations bill for the Interior, we should reflect on some of these misguided policies of the past, and we should offer a vision for a better future. Unfortunately, the bill we have before us today lacks in very important areas. It provides less than half of the funding requested by the President's Land Legacy initiative, and it has the riders that we have been debat-

ing here allowing for the unrestricted dumping of toxic mineral waste and in placing a 1-year freeze on the hard rock mining regulation.

The worst riders would grant grazing permit renewals without concern for the environmental impact, and it would also subsidize the oil industry by allowing them to pay, as the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) mentioned, below-market prices for royalties extracted from Federal lands and waters.

And like much of 19th century Michigan, it even allows the trees in our national forests to be raided without any consideration given to the wildlife and the soil erosion and the human health concerns. So this bill lacks vision. It lacks vision. It cannot see the trees or the forests, and we should send it back to the dark ages, especially with respect to the riders. That is where this bill belongs.

This bill is opposed by every major environmental organization in the country for the reasons we have enunciated on the floor today. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this conference report.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we are playing catchup ball. We are rushing to conclusion trying to finish the budget because we are 20 days into a new year without a budget. And as these bills whirl past us, I think it is fair to stop and ask what is the score right now. Just where are we? How much have we spent against what we have got?

To get an answer to that question we have only to look on page H10596 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We can see that we are \$599 million in this bill alone above where the House was, and that is why this rule is required, because we are above the 302(b) allocation. We split the available resources into 13 different bills early in the year, and now this bill comes to us \$600 million more than the allocated share it is entitled to.

This continues a trend that has gone on here repeatedly with the bills that are coming to the floor. The three largest bills in the 13 appropriation bills are Defense, which is \$8 billion more than the President requested; HUD-VA is \$2 billion more than the President requested; and I am told Labor-HHS, which comes here tomorrow, is \$2.2 billion more than the President requested. And, of course, we have passed an Ag emergency bill that was not in

the original calculus at \$8.7 billion more than we originally contemplated. Those alone, back of the envelope, come to 20.7, and the surplus for next year is 14.4.

That means, just on the back of the envelope analysis, that we are \$6 billion into the Social Security surplus. We have spent the on-budget surplus, and we are \$6 billion into Social Security. But it is worse than that. If we take all the bills, according to the Committee on the Budget's analysis, we are \$36 billion right now above what was allocated for discretionary spending. Thirty-six billion.

Now if my colleagues are asking themselves, how did we do this, two gimmicks, basically. Number one, emergency spending. We have taken it to new heights. We have expanded the definition of an emergency to unprecedented extremes this year; \$18.8 billion by our calculation, \$24.9 according to the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. And then we have used creative scorekeeping. We have discarded, dispensed with, the scorekeeping that our own budget shop, a neutral nonpartisan CBO, congressional budget shop, would render of the budget authority we have provided, and said, no, it is at least \$18 billion, \$17.1 billion less than what you say. That is how we got \$36 billion over the caps and into Social Security.

So where are we, if we adopt this bill? If we back out the gimmicks, we are over, way over, the discretionary spending caps we set; and we are well into the Social Security surplus. If we pass this bill, we will be \$600 million over the caps and in BA, \$200 million more in outlays into Social Security. That is why this bill is not a good idea.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have 30 seconds to just raise one issue, and that is compact-impact aid for Guam.

This is an unfunded mandate which, according to a Department of Interior report, costs the people of Guam \$17 million a year. We were asking for only about 50 percent of that in this Interior appropriations measure. We were not able to get it.

This is an unfunded mandate on citizens that are not fully represented here and stems from a series of treaties signed by the United States in the 1980s with three independent nations which are allowed free migration into the United States and they end up in Guam.

So I rise in opposition to the conference report.

I rise in opposition to the Conference Report on H.R. 2466, the Interior Appropriations bill. It is apparent from our on-going debate that this report does not meet the concerns important to our nation. The inadequate funding of

both the Land's Legacy Initiative and the National Endowment for the Arts will weaken our efforts to protect our national parks and forests and jeopardize our nation's appreciation for the diversity of arts and cultures. I also oppose this bill because it does not ensure that the smallest of concerns from our furthest American citizens in the Pacific are addressed. This causes me great concern because for my district, the Territory of Guam, an agreement made in 1986 between the U.S. and the Freely Associated States of Micronesia placed a federal mandate on our territory which costs the island nearly \$17 million annually in public services for immigrants from the Freely Associated States of Micronesia.

As background, the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) and the Republic of Palau (RP) are Freely Associated States with the United States. The FSM and RMI began their respective Compact agreements with the U.S. in 1986 while the Compact relationship with the RP began later in 1994. A provision of the Compact agreements allows Freely Associated State citizens unfettered travel within the U.S. to seek employment or education. As the closest American territory to these independent nations, Guam is their primary destination. The resulting immigration has placed greater demands to provide social, health care, public housing, educational, and public safety services to FAS citizens residing on Guam. Without the proper attention and assistance from Congress, this unfair situation placed on a territory with a limited economy will only contribute to the continuing depletion of Guam's financial resources. This is not only an unfunded federal mandate—it is worse—it is an unfunded federal mandate upon U.S. citizens who are not fully represented here in Washington.

Compact-impact aid assistance for Guam has been recognized by both the Congress and the Administration, but has not been fully addressed. In 1996, Congress authorized annual payment of \$4.58 million to Guam until 2001 to offset costs associated with compact migration. A year later, a study paid for by the Department of the Interior calculated the annual cost to Guam for providing social and educational services to Compact migrants was approximately \$17 million. As you can see, Guam shoulders more than two-thirds of the cost of providing public services to FAS immigrants.

The budget requests from Delegates of the U.S. Territories in Congress are perhaps the greatest challenges we face during our terms in office. Without doubt, we have less influence in the appropriations process due in large part to our non-voting status in the Congress. Our needs are often misunderstood because our distances from the mainland U.S. are great. Apart from federal programs that both states and territories can participate in, any other requests outside of the norm can be a frustrating ordeal. We are vulnerable to federal interagency differences about how to treat the territories as well as having no leverage during the appropriations process.

I am appreciative for the collaboration and support of the President for including Compact-impact aid increase for Guam as part of his Administration's priorities during the appro-

priations process. I remain confident that the President is committed to increasing Compact-impact aid for Guam and I remain committed to working with my colleagues to ensure that this issue is addressed this year.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have found this discussion interesting. When we look back at the House vote of 377 to 47, and then hear the debate that we have heard in the last few minutes here on the rule, we would think this was a totally different bill.

I sat on the conference committee, and I can tell my colleagues that I want to give it high marks. When I want somebody to negotiate for me with the Senate or anybody, I am going to send the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), because I think he did one real fine job. He stood tough and fought for the House position again and again and again, and won.

Now, sure, there is compromise. The President has some things that were added that he wanted changed so he might sign the bill. And the Senate had to have some victories. That is the process. Is it perfect? No. Do we ever pass a perfect bill? No. But this is a good bill, very, very similar to the bill that drew 377 votes. I think there is something good here.

I have heard five different reasons, none related, as to why this bill is bad all of a sudden, but no evidence. This bill has \$1.4 billion for national park operations, a \$77 million increase; \$1.2 billion for Bureau of Land Management, a \$50 million increase; national wildlife refuge, a \$30 million increase. The issues that are important to our environment, the agencies that are important to our environment have been thoughtfully funded.

Some new initiatives: the Recreational Fee Demonstration program that allows our public lands to keep the fees and help with the backlog of maintenance. Everglades restoration, a new initiative. This bill, in my view, has been a very thoughtful, tough bill because we had constraints.

I personally think there is a move here to just stop the process. Because when we listen to the evidence that we have heard today, it does not make much sense. It is not very clear and convincing. Because this is basically the same bill we passed, and 377 House Members supported it, rightfully so, and only 47 voted against.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is one that our committee fought hard for, our chairman worked hard for in the conference committee, and it is one that deserves our support so we can send it to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Archer	Ganske	Morella
Armey	Gekas	Myrick
Bachus	Gibbons	Nethercutt
Baker	Gilchrest	Ney
Ballenger	Gillmor	Northup
Barr	Gilman	Norwood
Barrett (NE)	Goode	Nussle
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Ortiz
Barton	Goodling	Ose
Bass	Goss	Oxley
Bateman	Graham	Packard
Bereuter	Granger	Paul
Berkley	Green (WI)	Pease
Biggert	Greenwood	Peterson (PA)
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Petri
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Pickering
Bliley	Hansen	Pitts
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Boehlert	Hayes	Porter
Boehner	Hayworth	Portman
Bonilla	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bono	Herger	Quinn
Boucher	Hill (IN)	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Hill (MT)	Ramstad
Bryant	Hilleary	Regula
Burr	Hobson	Reynolds
Burton	Hoekstra	Riley
Buyer	Horn	Rogan
Callahan	Hostettler	Rogers
Calvert	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Hulshof	Ros-Lehtinen
Canady	Hunter	Roukema
Cannon	Hutchinson	Royce
Castle	Hyde	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Isakson	Ryun (KS)
Chambliss	Istook	Salmon
Chenoweth-Hage	Jenkins	Sanford
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer
Combest	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Kasich	Sessions
Cooksey	Kelly	Shadegg
Cox	King (NY)	Shaw
Crane	Kingston	Shays
Cubin	Knollenberg	Sherwood
Cunningham	Kolbe	Shimkus
Davis (VA)	Kuykendall	Shows
Deal	LaHood	Shuster
DeLay	Largent	Simpson
DeMint	Latham	Skeen
Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Smith (MI)
Dickey	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Doolittle	Leach	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Dunn	LoBiondo	Stenholm
Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Stump
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Sununu
Emerson	McCollum	Sweeney
English	McCrery	Talent
Everett	McHugh	Tancredo
Ewing	McInnis	Tauzin
Fletcher	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)
Foley	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Fossella	Metcalf	Terry
Fowler	Mica	Thomas
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Thune

Tiaht
Toomey
Trafaicant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden

Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—196

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

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Camp
Coburn
Jackson-Lee
(TX)

Jefferson
Linder
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)

Scarborough
Towns

□ 1718

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1180. An act to amend the Social Security Act to expand the availability of health care coverage for working individuals with disabilities, to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide such individuals with meaningful opportunities to work, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1180) "An Act to amend the Social Security Act to expand the availability of health care coverage for working individuals with disabilities, to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide such individuals with meaningful opportunities to work, and for other purposes" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROTH, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. MOYNIHAN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2466, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 337, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 20, 1999, at page H10517.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2466, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, for the next several minutes, I wish all the Members would

forget about partisan politics, forget about some of the personal things that they might not totally agree with and think what is good for the people of the United States of America. Two hundred seventy million people are depending on us to ensure that they have a park to visit, to ensure that when they go to a national forest they will be safe, that the facilities will be good, to ensure when a group of children go out in a bus to a fish and wildlife refuge to learn about the ecology of this Nation that there will be somebody there to tell about it, to ensure when they visit the Smithsonian, it will be open, that it will be well cared for, that the people will be there to serve them.

I could go through a whole list of things. Millions of Americans will go to our facilities over the next 12 months, and the quality of their experience is being decided here. Likewise, think about the generations that are here and yet to come, because the legacy we leave them in terms of our national lands is being decided not by them but by us. Let us forget partisanship for a minute and let us say, what kind of a legacy do we want to leave for future generations as well as for those of today's world. What kind of opportunities do we want them to have.

For example, in this bill will be funds to do long distance learning through the Smithsonian, the National Gallery of Art, the Kennedy Center, an opportunity to tell the story of these marvelous institutions to all the young people of America, many of whom cannot travel to Washington. We have a responsibility to them that should transcend our own personal prejudices on this day. We did that on this bill earlier this year, by overwhelming majorities on both sides. We supported this bill. Sure there have been a few changes, some probably better, a little more money being spent, but the basic bill is the same. The basic bill provides the kind of services that the American people expect us to deliver. That is why we are sent here. And we have an opportunity today to reaffirm that judgment that we made several months ago.

To vote yes, we are voting for a lot of positive environmental things. We are voting to clean up the streams of America through the abandoned mine law. We have increased it. We are voting to spend \$77 million more dollars on the parks as well as allow them to keep the \$100 plus million that they earn with the fee program. We are voting to diminish vandalism because through the fee program we have discovered that vandalism in the public facilities, the public lands, is reduced. We have in our hands today 30 percent of the land in this Nation, and we are responsible, each of us are responsible with our vote as to how we treat this wonderful, wonderful asset. It is a legacy that has been provided for us.