while the private landowner opposes designation of his land. Therefore, I recommend that the 41.6 mile river abutted by public lands and as described in the enclosed report be designated a component of the System. Seminole Creek could be added if the adjacent landowner should change his mind or if this land is ever purchased by an interested conservation agency who does not object. The tributary is not centrally located in the area proposed for designation.

I further recommend that legislation designating the Wekiva and eligible tributaries specify that on-the-ground management responsibilities remain with the existing land manager and not the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. This is in accordance with expressed State wishes and is logical. Responsibilities of the Secretary should be limited to working with State and local partners in developing a comprehensive river management plan, providing technical assistance, and reviewing effects of water resource development proposals in accordance with section 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

We look forward to working with the Congress to designate this worthy addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON  


Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 524 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 524

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule provides that the bill will be considered for amendment by paragraph, and waives clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill) against provisions in the bill, except as otherwise specified in the rule.

The rule also waives clause 2(e) of rule XXI (prohibiting non-emergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill during consideration in the Committee of the Whole) against amendments offered during consideration of the bill.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce the voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if a vote follows a recorded vote.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4578 is to provide regular annual appropriations and the Department of the Interior, except the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other related agencies, including the Forest Service, the Department of Energy, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundations of Arts and Humanities.

H.R. 4578 appropriates $14.6 billion in new fiscal year 2001 budget authority, which is $303 million less than last year and $1.7 billion less than the President's request. Approximately half of the bill's funding, $7.3 billion, finances Department of the Interior programs to manage and study the Nation's animal, plant, and mineral resources, and to support Indian programs.

The balance of the bill's funds support other non-Interior agencies that perform related functions. These include the Forest Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture; conservation and fossil energy programs run by the Department of Energy; the Indian Health Service, as well as the Smithsonian and similar cultural organizations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as a Westerner, I applaud several limitations on funding contained in this bill. One, for example, would prohibit the use of funds for lands managed under any national monument designation executed since 1999. These lands are already in Federal ownership, and may still be managed under their previous land management status.

For example, just last week the Clinton administration designated 200,000 acres along the Columbia River in my district known as the Hanford Reach, designated that as a national monument. This action pulled the plug on an extended series of negotiations among local, State, and Federal officials seeking to develop a shared partnership to manage the Hanford Reach for future generations.

Unfortunately, the administration chose to unilaterally assign management responsibility to those lands with the Department of the Interior. Unfortunately, that left State and local citizens and officials with no real role except to comment periodically on plans and decisions of Federal regulators.

H.R. 4578 would prohibit the expenditure of funds to issue a record of decision or any policy implementing the Interior-Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, or ICBMP, as we call it in the Northwest, unless a regulatory flexibility analysis is completed.

This project amazingly enough started in 1993 without congressional authorization, and affects a huge area of...
the West, including 63 million acres of Forest Service and BLM lands in six States, including much of my district in the state of Washington.

The administration appears to be rushing to complete this project before the end of President Clinton's tenure, and the committee is concerned that such haste will expose the project to high-risk litigation for failure to comply with the requirements of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. I applaud the committee's decision in that regard.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the Members of this committee for their willingness to address both the Hanford Reach National Monument and the ICBMP project, two issues that are of great concern in central Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, like most legislation, is not perfect. Individual Members will no doubt take issue with one or more provisions of this bill. Those wishing to offer amendments should be pleased that the Committee on Rules has granted the Committee on Appropriations' request for an open rule.

Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to support not only the rule but the underlying bill, H.R. 4578.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule that will allow the Members of the House to work their will. But the underlying bill fails to honor Congress' obligation as steward of America's lands and history for future generations.

The measure contains several anti-environmental riders that continue the attack on our natural resources.

The first major rider would stop the management and protection of lands designated as national monuments by the President, the right of every president since Theodore Roosevelt.

The second blocks the management and protection of lands along the Columbia River, which contains a threatened species of salmon.

The third rider would prohibit the establishment of the North Delta National Wildlife Refuge near Sacramento, California.

Still other riders in the bill would limit funding for protection of endangered species, allow grazing on public lands without an environmental review, and delay national forest planning.

In addition to the numerous policy riders, H.R. 4576 contains deep cuts that will harm our national parks, our forests, and the protection and enforcement of environmental laws.

The funding in H.R. 4576 is $300 million below last year's level and $1.7 billion below the President's request. Such deep cuts will have a devastating impact on Indian health, on national park maintenance, which has consistently been underfunded, and on energy research and conservation.

Even though the House overwhelmingly passed the land and water conservation bill in May by a vote of 315 to 102, this bill is $736 million below the amount authorized in that bill. At a time of record surpluses, this bill cuts funding for key national priorities in order to fulfill the majority's commitment to fund huge tax breaks for the wealthy.

The bill's funding level is simply not realistic. Moreover, the majority had a failed yet again to restore some of the unwise cuts made 5 years ago in funding for those agencies responsible for the country's small but critically important arts and humanities education and preservation efforts.

The bill funds the National Endowment for the Arts at $38 million, a level 48 percent below the 1995 funding level; the National Endowment for the Humanities at $115 million, 33 percent below the level in 1995. These funding levels fundamentally ignore the successfully efforts by both NEA and NEH to broaden the reach of their programs and to eliminate controversial programs, the two reforms that were requested by the President's senior advisors to reach the broadest of their programs and to eliminate controversial programs, the two reforms that were requested by the President's senior advisors.

The bill however did not receive an adequate allocation to start with now faces an even greater hurdle with the inclusion of these riders.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. It is time to recognize the success of these reforms and give these agencies the resources they need to meet their critical needs. Unfortunately, the amendment offered by a Democrat subcommittee to raise funding for both agencies was defeated.

Because of the inadequate funding levels, the President's senior advisors are recommending that he veto this bill, making this another on the floor a redundant act in our continuing theater of the absurd when it comes to spending bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York. I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the open rule for the subcommittee's bill for Fiscal Year 2001 which protects what the Committee reported.

I want to commend our Chairman, Mr. REGULA, on the difficult task he was faced with writing this year's spending bill. Unfortunately, the subcommittee was given an unrealistic allocation and as a consequence, this bill simply fails our constituents and I will be forced to oppose it on the floor.

I know that it would have been extremely difficult to provide all of the increases requested by the Administration, but I am frustrated that the allocation this bill received was so inadequate. With these levels, we will not even be able to provide fixed costs for all of the agencies within our jurisdiction. We are severely under-funding critical programs within our jurisdiction.

When this bill was considered by the full Appropriations Committee, the Administration sent a letter to the Chairman expressing deep concern over not only the spending levels provided in the bill but also several "riders" which were added at the last minute. The letter threatened a veto if substantial changes were not made.

Each of these legislative provisions jeopardizes passage of this bill on the floor, and guarantees another confrontation with the White House this fall. These riders deal with complex policy concerns and should be addressed by the authorizing committees of jurisdiction, not attached to an annual spending bill.

I do however appreciate that the Rule provided for this bill will enable Members wishing to offer amendments to these provisions the ability to do so.

I am forced to oppose this bill because I do not believe we have adequately funded dozens of important priorities within our jurisdiction, and I oppose the inclusion of these controversial riders. I do however appreciate the bipartisan cooperation and responsible manner with which our Subcommittee works. This bill however did not receive an adequate allocation to start with now faces an even greater hurdle with the inclusion of these riders.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. It is balanced, fair, and adequate for the job. I only wish I could say the same for the President.

I do not blame the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio. I do not think he is the villain in this situation. In fact, in my opinion he has been given an impossible task, because his own leadership has made it basically impossible for his bill to adequately provide for the important environmental and other programs that it covers.

As a result, the overall bill falls short of what is needed, even though it does include some good provisions. If I might, I would like to just touch on a few of those provisions.

The bill does provide some funds for the acquisition of a tract in the Beaufort area in Beaufort County, part of the district I represent, owned by the city of Golden, Colorado. I requested inclusion of funds to enable these lands to be acquired for Forest
Service management. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman for inclusion of $2 million for that purpose.

The total for such acquisitions, is simply inadequate to meet this and other urgent conservation needs.

In a similar fashion, the bill sets up a pilot project under which the Forest Service can arrange for Colorado State foresters to assist with fire prevention and improvement of watersheds and habitat on national forest lands that adjoin appropriate State or private lands.

I have had an opportunity to discuss this with Jim Hubbard, our State Forester, and I believe this can be very valuable, especially in the Front Range areas of Colorado where residential development is spreading into forested areas. Again, I would like to see the inclusion of that provision, especially since it states that all the environmental laws will continue to apply.

Again, the bill does not provide enough important support for many other Federal land management agencies, including not just the Forest Service but the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Park Service.

It also fails to adequately address matters of concern to Native Americans. In fact, I think it takes a step backwards. The total funding for the Indian Health Services and the Bureau of Indian Affairs is cut by $520 million. I think in effect the bill sends the message that we are no longer willing to meet our trust responsibilities to our American Indian tribes.

There can be no denying the need. Information I have seen indicates that in 1997, the Indian Health Service could provide only $1,397 dollars per capita for Indian health spending. In 1999, it was $1,397 dollars per capita health spending by all Americans.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Deutch) for his comments on the Everglades issue, and I regret, too, that there will be a point of order on the importance of language that would give the Department of Interior a voice in the way the water is distributed, because the whole mission of the Everglades restoration is to have adequate water supply so that the ecosystem will flourish.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairman for the Committee on Appropriations to have a constructive and final wrap-up on this bill. Hopefully, in the process of a conference and final wrap-up on this bill, we can get some language that will accomplish this goal in perhaps a somewhat different way, because I think all the parties on the Everglades restoration need to be at the table.

The great interest on the part of most of the people across this Nation would be restoring the asset and preserving the asset known as the Everglades.

So we will try to address that. I do not want to take time to get into the other merits. We will have time during the debate to discuss those. I simply want to say that I think the Committee on Rules did a great job here. They gave us a balanced rule. It is fair, and it is fair to all of my colleagues those that talk about will be cuts from the President's proposals. It was easy for the President to propose 1.7 million additional dollars without having to identify a source for those dollars.

We have tried to work within the confines of the allocation that was provided to our committee, recognizing that it is $300 million under last year. But in the process, we have addressed as the needs of the land agencies in every way.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Deutch) for his comments on the Everglades issue, and I regret, too, that there will be a point of order on the importance of language that would give the Department of Interior a voice in the way the water is distributed, because the whole mission of the Everglades restoration is to have adequate water supply so that the ecosystem will flourish.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairman for the Committee on Appropriations to have a constructive and final wrap-up on this bill. Hopefully, in the process of a conference and final wrap-up on this bill, we can get some language that will accomplish this goal in perhaps a somewhat different way, because I think all the parties on the Everglades restoration need to be at the table. The State of Florida, the Southeast Florida Water District, the mako sica Indians, but also the Federal Government, because we are putting a billion dollars of Federal money from 50 States into this restoration.

The great interest on the part of most of the people across this Nation would be restoring the asset and preserving the asset known as the Everglades.

So we will try to address that. I do not want to take time to get into the other merits. We will have time during the debate to discuss those. I simply want to say that I think the Committee on Rules did a great job here. They gave us a balanced rule. It is fair, and it is fair to all of my colleagues those that talk about will be cuts from the President's proposals. It was easy for the President to propose 1.7 million additional dollars without having to identify a source for those dollars.

We have tried to work within the confines of the allocation that was provided to our committee, recognizing that it is $300 million under last year. But in the process, we have addressed as the needs of the land agencies in every way.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Deutch) for his comments on the Everglades issue, and I regret, too, that there will be a point of order on the importance of language that would give the Department of Interior a voice in the way the water is distributed, because the whole mission of the Everglades restoration is to have adequate water supply so that the ecosystem will flourish.