CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit hereewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

Pursuant to House Resolution 524 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4578.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4578, 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.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4578.

In the Committee of the Whole

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further 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, with Mr. LAFOURRETE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 13, 2000, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5 minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has previously been printed in the Congressional Record. Those amendments will be considered read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce the time for voting of 5 minutes for the purpose of voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, providing that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to advise Members about the schedule, at least as we best know it for the time being. We are planning to go forward on the amendments and pass some votes prior to 6:30, if we can get some of these out of the way; and then it is my understanding that we will roll votes until about 9:30 because of the Members that are going to the Kennedy Center for an event.

I would hope we can keep going and then finish tonight, because I know if we can get finished with this bill, we will do a great deal to expedite the time of getting out of here tomorrow. I know many Members would like to get on their way at a decent hour tomorrow night. So if everybody will help and cooperate, I think we can get this bill finished tonight.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4578

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 1701(j) and 1702(b), and use of the mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96–487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), $674,571,000, to remain available until expended.

That such sums recovered from any party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or in reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended.

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation and hazardous fuels reduction by the Department of the Interior, $9,300,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $9,300,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: Provided, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the “Fire Protection” and “Emergency Department of the Interior Firefighting Fund” may be transferred and merged with the appropriation: Provided further, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: Provided further, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1506d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1506 et seq., may be credited to the United States property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or in reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended.

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation and hazardous fuels reduction by the Department of the Interior, $9,300,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and related facilities, $5,300,000, to remain available until expended.
PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of September 30, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901-6907), $134,385,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided, That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than $100.

AMENDMENT No. 30 OFFERED BY MR. SUNUNU

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 30 offered by Mr. SUNUNU

Page 5, line 17, after the first dollar amount insert the following: (‘‘increased by $10,000,000’’).

Page 15, line 15, after the first dollar amount insert the following: (‘‘increased by $10,000,000’’).

Page 17, line 7, after the dollar amount insert the following: (‘‘increased by $10,000,000’’).

Page 17, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: (‘‘increased by $10,000,000’’).

Page 17, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: (‘‘increased by $10,000,000’’).

Page 54, line 25, after the dollar amount insert the following: (‘‘increased by $10,000,000’’).

Page 67, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: (‘‘reduced by $126,500,000’’).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of this amendment which I have cosponsored with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS). This amendment strikes $126 million from the Partnership for the Next Generation Vehicle and takes the funds and uses it I think in a much more fiscally responsible way.

We put $86.5 million into debt repayment; and then we take $40 million, $10 million to the Forest Service operation and maintenance accounts, $10 million to the Park Service maintenance account, $10 million into land and water conservation, and $10 million into the payment in lieu of tax program. Anyone that has public lands in their district knows how important these programs are. They really make a difference to communities; they really make a difference in preserving public lands throughout the country.

Why are we striking $126 million from the Partnership for the Next Generation Vehicle? There are a number of important reasons.

First of all, that program provides subsidies, research and development subsidies to profitable firms. I think if you go to any community at the local level in this country and you look at the stress and the burden on the property tax base of that city and town that might be caused by public lands, they would think it is wrong to be subsidizing corporations that are profitable. In this case the automotive manufacturers, the Big Three, they are successful companies. They are great companies. But, let us face it, their profits last year were over $20 million in the aggregate, and these are not the kinds of firms that need Federal subsidies from hard-working taxpayers.

Second, a program like this tries to pick winners and losers within an industry. It invests in solar cells, but perhaps at the expense of investments in fuel cell technology, or reinvests in battery technology or in diesel combustion or internal combustion engine technology. But who is the Federal Government to say which one of these technologies really deserves a Federal subsidy? And even within these subcategories, batteries, do we invest in lithium batteries, do we invest in nickel batteries, do we invest in photovoltaics?

It is wrong for the Federal Government to try to pick winners and losers in these industries. It is bad policy from a technology perspective, and it is fiscally irresponsible as well.

Third, this kind of a corporate welfare subsidy picks winners and losers among different companies. How qualifies? If the Federal Government is going to subsidize diesel combustion engine research, which of the dozens of companies, firms large and small that might be involved in this kind of technology, is going to get the Federal handout?

The Federal government actually has to choose. There are going to be winners and losers. Who is to say which company really has the technological capability to finance a breakthrough? No Federal bureaucrat knows. We should not be second-guessing the markets. We should not be manipulating and distorting markets for technology. We should not be playing one company off against another.

Moreover, this program has failed to produce. I have a GAO study here from March of this year. It states clearly that it is unlikely that the technology focused upon in this program is ever likely to come to market.

Supporters will say, well, this program has created jobs. If I spent $1 billion over 7 years, as this program has, I would certainly hope we might have a few jobs to show for it. But even if this program created a thousand new jobs, and I doubt that, that would come at a public cost, a taxpayer cost, of over $1 million per job. It just is not worth the subsidy.

Supporters might also argue that this has resulted in incremental technological improvements. Again, I might agree to that. But if we are spending $1 billion in our State or district back home over a 7- or 8-year period, giving that money to the brightest minds in our districts, I would hope they would have some kind of incremental innovation to show for it. But it is not going to bring a breakthrough to the marketplace.

We are distorting the marketplace of ideas. We are subsidizing one company at the expense of another. The taxpayers should not stand for it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is supported by a wide range of groups, and my cosponsor, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) will speak to that, such as the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth; but fiscally responsible groups as well: Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union. They recognize that it is simply a poor use of taxpayer funds.

Supporters of the program I recognize will say it is well-intended, it has fair-minded objectives. I do not deny that. There are a lot of well-intended programs at the Federal level, but it is just not the appropriate use of taxpayer money to distort markets, to subsidize corporate profits.

This is a responsibly written amendment that sets aside $55 million for debt reduction, that gives back to the Park Service and the Forest Service that is so important in maintaining our public lands, and it sets the right course for our technology policy, as well.

Fundamental research through the National Science Foundation, through the National Institutes of Health, are critical to the underlying scientific foundations of this country, but we should not be going into product development areas where the markets are mature and where the capital markets know what a good deal is and what a good deal is not. We are distorting our capital markets as well as the technological markets.

Let us do the right thing for the taxpayers and the Partnership for the Next Generation Vehicle: Pay down some debt and invest in our public lands.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the objective of the PNGV program is to produce ultimately an 80-mile-per-gallon five-passenger automobile by the year 2004. This is not something on which the Federal Government is carrying the burden alone. For every dollar we put in, the auto industry is investing, about 3 of private funding.

Particularly at this point in time we recognize how vitally important it is to improve mileage on our motor vehicles. The American people love their cars. We are not going to get people out of their cars. In fact, I think there will be even more and more automobiles, and it is quite evident that the highway departments recognize this. In Ohio, many two-lane highways are being made three-lane highways. Outer beltways are adding to it.

I am simply saying there are going to be more automobiles. The only way we can address the fuel consumption issue, recognizing we are now
dependent on importation of fuel beyond 50 percent in terms of petroleum, is to lower that profile and to reduce our dependency. Because of the foreign policy and the defense implications, I think it is important that we continue the research to develop these fuel efficient vehicles.

Of course, the reason that we are involved with Federal money is because it is a national policy issue that transcends the question of the private owner of the automobile. It goes to our national security as an essential part of prospective energy policy, and recognizing the fact that we need to decrease the use of petroleum.

The strike that we have experienced in prices lately illustrates how much our pricing is dependent on those who make those decisions, i.e., OPEC, that is totally beyond our control. We have invested quite a lot of money already, something like 600 million Federal dollars, and probably double that amount of private dollars. I think to stop at this point and not finish that research would be a mistake in terms of the utilization of our research.

For these reasons, I oppose the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire. Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment my friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and I have offered.

Some of my dearest friends for whom I have the greatest respect are on the other side of me on this issue. I would just say that governing is about choosing. On this issue, I respectfully believe that we have made the right choice, and the ones who oppose this made the wrong choice.

This is about how we should spend $126.5 million of the taxpayers' money. We say, those of us who support this amendment, that the right priority for that money is to put $96.5 of it toward reducing our national debt; to put $10 million of it toward property tax relief in communities that have federally-owned lands in the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program; to put $10 million into the State Land and Water Conservation Fund; to help States in their effort to preserve green space and promote clean water; to put $10 million into forest maintenance programs that help us protect the integrity of our Federal forest lands; and finally, $10 million into the maintenance of our national parks, the disrepair of which, despite the very excellent efforts of the chairman of this committee and the ranking member, has become a major problem, despite their very diligent and excellent efforts.

The opposition would tell us that this money would be better invested in a partnership with corporate America to develop cars that would get 80 miles to a gallon. I fervently hope and believe that we will one day have cars that can get 80 miles to a gallon. We could use that money to given the spiralling price of gasoline. But I would argue that the spiralling price of gasoline is precisely the reason why we do not need 126.5 million taxpayer dollars to do this. Someone is going to make an awful lot of money developing and selling automobiles to the American public that can get 80 miles to a gallon. God bless them. I have great faith that they will. But I think the $1.25 billion that we have already invested between fiscal 1985 and 1999 in this project is really quite enough.

We hear that we would not get these cars without this public investment. My research shows that in fiscal 1999, they have spent $2.5 billion of their own money on research and development. I commend the industry for that, but I do not think they need our help to do that.

Then we hear that the money does not mean very much. It goes to the big auto makers, it goes to those who are subcontractors in universities and pass-throughs. With all due respect, that is pass-through money and services that are being performed for the auto makers. That is like saying, if you paid someone to mow my lawn, that I did not benefit from that. I did not pay them to mow my lawn, but I am the one who got my grass cut. It is the auto makers who are benefiting from that.

That is why our amendment is supported by the Sierra Club, because we should not be subsidizing vehicles that would add to our pollution problem. It is supported by U.S. PIRG; by Friends of the Earth. It is supported by the National Association of Counties because it helps them out because it provides, and it is supported strongly by the Taxpayers for Common Sense and Citizens Against Government Waste.

Governing is about choosing. The right choice for this $25.5 million is reduced debt, reduced property tax relief, environmental protection, and not subsidies of the mightiest and most profitable, powerful corporations in this country.

I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are few people in this House that I have as much respect for as I do for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), one of the truly great Americans here. But I have to support the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) on this amendment.

If I may say so, Mr. Chairman, when I look at my home in New York, they are 94 owned by the Federal government. We almost have to get to the West to see those that are really owned by the Feds. In my State, it is 73 percent. Nevada is about 90 percent. We have authorized $250 million to be called Payment in Lieu of Taxes.

Garfield County, that is 7 percent owned by private, is asked to take care of them. They pick them up, haul them in, take care of that kind of thing. Where do these poor little county commissioners get their money? They put every dime in Payment in Lieu of Taxes, but they do not get it all. They get a very small percent, so they are actually losing money.

What the gentleman's amendment does is it tries to bring this up to what we authorized. It will not even come close, but it helps a little bit.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, I would like to have some of the Members look at the backlog we have in infrastructure of our parks. We are talking about restrooms, these basic things; we are talking roads, parking places.

Talk to the American public and ask, what do you like in America? What is the best thing the American government does? They will come right back and say, the national parks. Ask them what is the worst thing, and they will say the IRS. But anyway, they love the national parks. This is putting a few more dollars in national parks.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, I would like to have some of the Members look at the backlog we have in infrastructure of our parks. We are talking about restrooms, these basic things; we are talking roads, parking places.

Talk to the American public and ask, what do you like in America? What is the best thing the American government does? They will come right back and say, the national parks. Ask them what is the worst thing, and they will say the IRS. But anyway, they love the national parks. This is putting a few more dollars in national parks.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, I would like to have some of the Members look at the backlog we have in infrastructure of our parks. We are talking about restrooms, these basic things; we are talking roads, parking places.

Talk to the American public and ask, what do you like in America? What is the best thing the American government does? They will come right back and say, the national parks. Ask them what is the worst thing, and they will say the IRS. But anyway, they love the national parks. This is putting a few more dollars in national parks.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, I would like to have some of the Members look at the backlog we have in infrastructure of our parks. We are talking about restrooms, these basic things; we are talking roads, parking places.

Talk to the American public and ask, what do you like in America? What is the best thing the American government does? They will come right back and say, the national parks. Ask them what is the worst thing, and they will say the IRS. But anyway, they love the national parks. This is putting a few more dollars in national parks.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, I would like to have some of the Members look at the backlog we have in infrastructure of our parks. We are talking about restrooms, these basic things; we are talking roads, parking places.

Talk to the American public and ask, what do you like in America? What is the best thing the American government does? They will come right back and say, the national parks. Ask them what is the worst thing, and they will say the IRS. But anyway, they love the national parks. This is putting a few more dollars in national parks.
amendment is the elimination of funding for basic research for vastly improved fuel efficiency. We should find other ways to fund these other programs.

PNGV is a public-private partnership to develop a family sedan that is affordable and can achieve 80 miles per gallon. This 10-year program recently reached its 6-year goal to release a concept vehicle that can achieve utility and fuel efficiency as desired. The next phase of the program is an effort to make these cars affordable.

To suggest that new progress has not been made is not accurate. We are simply in the middle phase of the partnership. I strongly support this program because it works to achieve an important goal: fuel efficiency and environmental protection without losing utility, safety, or affordability. In other words, we can achieve the results we want and give consumers the vehicles they want.

Some will say this is corporate welfare. However, there is a broad consensus that the Federal government should encourage basic research. PNGV was not created as a new program, it was actually created by channeling existing funding. The result is more focused research and significant advances in vehicle technology. We cannot complain about fuel economy and then offer no resources to develop new science.

This option works toward our goal without artificially manipulating the supply of vehicles on the road. With gas prices of $2 per gallon and higher in the Midwest and other parts of the country, it seems unwise to eliminate a program designed to reduce our need for fuel.

I support immediate responses to our current fuel crisis, such as releasing the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. But I also support a long-term strategy for our energy program, to decrease our dependence on foreign oil. This program achieves those results. I strongly urge a no vote.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) wants to aid some valuable programs; programs, programs I hope will indeed fund them by totally eliminating another valuable program, the PNGV program. This is a shortsighted cut for the Big Three auto makers. It is an investment in American jobs, our transportation system, our environment and our national security. Let us not jeopardize our program by eliminating the PNGV program. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Sununu-Andrews amendment.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman raises a couple of important points, and I just want to respond briefly. First, the concern of the gentlewoman about gas prices. I think everyone shares that concern. We have had a debate here on the floor about gas prices and what might be done about the situation, but I want to reaffirm that nothing in this program will directly affect the price of gasoline.

The second point the gentlewoman makes is about fuel efficiency, and there to be sure that was the stated objective of the program, but the GAO, in its March report, has said that at this point it does not appear likely that such a car will be manufactured and sold to consumers.

Even if we can agree that this is a lofty and well-founded goal, it simply looks at this point that the $1.25 billion that is put into the program has missed the mark.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) wants to aid some valuable programs; programs I hope will indeed gain additional funding as the appropriations process moves forward, but he wants to totally eliminate another valuable program, the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, and therefore I must oppose the amendment.

Opponents of the partnership attack the program as corporate welfare, but that betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the Federal Research Enterprise and its history. The Federal Government funds a wide variety of research at universities, at Federal labs, and at commercial labs. They that will help American industry over the long term but that market forces will prevent the private sector from investing adequately in the short term.

To take one prominent example, the Federal Government spends billions of dollars on research through the National Institutes of Health, a research that helps hugely wealthy, multinational pharmaceutical companies develop new methods and products, but few attack this as corporate welfare. Indeed during yesterday’s appropriations debate, Members were tripping over each other trying to claim to be the most ardent supporter of NIH funding and with good reason.

Well, the research being funded through PNGV on cleaner more efficient, yet affordable transportation will also have a major impact on our Nation’s health, and on our national security and is even less likely to be fully funded by the private sector than drug research is, and yet this program is under attack.

Maybe that is because this is technology and engineering research rather than something that seems more like pure science, but funding such research is nothing new. Back in the 19th century, the Federal Government offered money to promote the development of the railroads and at the beginning of the 20th century the Federal Government set up programs to help develop civilian aviation. The government continues to pump money into aviation research and into space technology, which can be used by the private sector.

In short, the kind of government involvement in technology represented by the PNGV is nothing new and it has always been a good idea. Given the impact of the transportation sector on our economy, on our energy use and on our environment, PNGV is a particularly wise investment.

I hope my colleagues will look past the simplistic slogans of corporate welfare and will instead consider the government’s historic and necessary role in filling the gaps in R&D left by market failure. PNGV is a well-run program that deserves continued support. I urge opposition to the Sununu amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by expressing great affection and respect to the authors of this amendment. They are fine Members of this body. They are good friends of mine. They deserve respect. But in this instance, my two good friends who offer this amendment are entirely in error. First of all, this is not a program that was sought by the auto industry. Second of all, it is not a program which benefits the auto industry directly. This benefits all Americans.

I applaud the fact that somebody should want to put more money into programs which would pay the kind of benefits that this amendment would pay in rural areas, but this is
not a place where that money should be sought. Let me point out some facts that are well thought out.

First of all, this proposal was not sought by the auto industry. This is a proposal which was put together by this administration. It was supported, believe it or not, in this Congress enthusiastically. It was also supported by the organizations outside that were just cited as now being opposed to the expenditure of this money, because they recognized that this program, which has been in place now for about 10 years, was going to make a Federal contribution to more fuel-efficient, safer, better and more desirable automobiles for the American public, which would clean the environment, which would reduce the wastage of fuel and gasoline, and which would produce safer and better vehicles for the American people.

Now, the comment has been made how this is benefiting the auto industry. The auto industry does its own research on automobiles and products that are going to be sold to the American people in the immediate future. That is not done under this legislation. In point of fact, let me read some facts that I think need to be known about what this legislation is doing. First of all, over 90 percent, in fact 99.8 percent, of Federal PNGV funds went to the national labs and to the universities; over 1,200 projects at over 600 sites, including 21 Federal labs.

So everyone has a Federal lab or university in their district. This is a piece of legislation which probably benefits my colleagues, their people, their universities and their Federal labs in their districts. Some 51 universities in 47 States have participated in this program and are deriving significant benefits to themselves and contributing significant benefits in terms of the research which they are doing. It should be noted in 1999, the most recent year, less than .2 percent, that is .002, of Federal funds actually went to the manufacturers. Does that say who is getting the benefits out of this program? The answer is, the colleges, the universities, the Federal research institutions are getting the money, but the ultimate benefit is derived by the American public, which is going to drive safer, better, more fuel-efficient vehicles, and vehicles that produce less pollution.

This is a program that works. It was sought by this administration. It has been supported by this Congress time and time again as conferring a significant benefit on the country, upon the environment, and upon the American people. I see no reason why this should change at this particular time or any information that would indicate that this program is less in the national interest. PNGV has helped to align the research direction of the national labs and has contributed to keeping them open, and as the industry moves towards high opportunities to stretch reach goals for the benefit of everybody, including people not in the areas where automobiles are produced. The $980 million which has been spent by the industry is indicative to its commitment towards the goals that are set out in this program, and that money is spent in addition to and to match Federal industry cooperative research programs to better this country, to better the environment, and to save fuel and energy for this.

It is indeed something which moves towards long-range research which goes far beyond that which would normally be committed by American industry in this ordinary course of events. This is research which moves far into the future and which significantly benefits everyone and does not confer a significant benefit on the auto industry.

I would remind my colleagues, the industry did not seek this. It was sought by the administration. It is money which the private research sector, the universities and the research institutions, but it also benefits the Federal lab. I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment. It is well intentioned, but it is mischievous and poorly thought out.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for clearing up some of the myths about this program. This is one of the better programs, I believe, the Department of Energy has. It is a program where we are working on these advanced technologies and anyone can participate. So I think it is a tremendous effort.

Just this year, the year 2000, marks a major milestone in the PNGV program, the unveiling of the proof of concept vehicles that demonstrate up to 80 miles per gallon fuel economy. Earlier this year, the three auto makers presented their PNGV vehicles at several events, including the Northern American International Auto Show in Detroit and the PNGV 2000 Concept Roll-Out on March 30 in Washington, D.C. All three vehicles, the Ford Prodigy, the General Motors Precept the DaimlerChrysler ESX–3, feature advanced hybrid propulsion systems, high efficiency diesel engines, and extensive use of lightweight materials. Each vehicle is a significant technological achievement and the auto makers each credited the government contribution to that achievement. It is estimated that industry has spent, on its own, a billion dollars of its own money on these concepts which would not have been included in the absence of the PNGV program.

So I think this program is working. And at a time when energy prices are at the $2.50, finally doing something with innovative technology to bring on these more efficient cars seems exactly the right thing for the Federal Government to be doing in a partnership with the private sector.

I commend this administration for what it has done. And I also want to reiterate that the $2 billion was supported by the Department’s PNGV efforts in fiscal year 1999, less than 3 percent, $3 million was sent to General Motors, Ford, and DaimlerChrysler. Most of the funds were passed through to subcontractors. The majority of the appropriation, as mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), approximately 63 percent was distributed to the Department of Energy national labs and only a small portion passed through the laboratories to other businesses. About 30 percent of the appropriations supported large automotive suppliers and approximately 7 percent supported small businesses and universities.

By technologies, fuel cells rank first with $53 million, or 26 percent of the total. Lightweight materials accounted for $19 million. In comparison, the research efforts aimed solely at compression ignition diesel cycle totalled $6 million. In fiscal year 2004, General Motors and DaimlerChrysler receive less than 1 percent of the appropriation.

So this is hardly corporate welfare. What this is is a very smart program between the Department of Energy and the auto makers of this country to try and come forward with advanced technologies with these advanced engines, with the hybrid vehicles, with lighter materials which are crucial to this effort. So I think we should keep this program. I think we should reject the amendment and move on.

Mr. KNOBLENZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I have a high regard for the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and the others that I have seen or heard that mentioned something about this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition because, frankly, as much as it is, it is very difficult to take away from one area and give to another, and that is what they are doing here; but they are actually striking a program that does work, as has been pointed out by a number of people.

This amendment would eliminate the funding to continue the partnership, a public-private sector plan that has worked. This is a program that has delivered proven technological results. It engages both the auto industry and the Government to develop the
vehicles for the future, vehicles which are less polluting. I would remind every- one that, in the last 25 years, the emission reduced substantially and the economy has more than increased by 100 percent. That is on automobiles. On trucks, it is over 60 percent.

So I think what we should look at is what is happening within the industry and why it is so important right now that we look at delivering that performance and the comfort that the American consumer desires but in a vehi- cle that is more economical.

Via the PNGV program, there have been great strides that have been reached on the development of these hybrid vehicles, vehicles by the way that combine so-called hybrid vehicles, the internal combustion with the battery pack. That is in the pipeline. It is beginning to work well. So I would just say the timing, I think, is out of touch with the current events.

We have heard from individuals who talked about the price of gasoline. I do not have to point this out again. It has already been mentioned about the costs have skyrocketed in the Midwest, in particular, well above $2 a gallon.

We as a country, as has been pointed out, are overly reliant on foreign petroleum supplies. So it is imperative that Congress do something to help the persons most affected by these price increases, and that is the American worker. The PNGV program is exactly one such program that will develop the technology that will stop our reliance on foreign oil and will improve the en- vironment in the process.

So with the funds appropriated in this bill, we can continue the vitally important research and development associated with this program.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentle- man from Michigan (Mr. Upton).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to underscore what the gentleman indicated that is in my district now in the last 2 weeks, we have seen gasoline go over $2 a gallon. I would think that now, more than ever before, that we need this provision in the bill. It provides which would allow the PNGV, in essence, to support the technology that will, indeed, improve fuel effi- ciency.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior, for recog- nizing this important benefit for PNGV.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Sununu amendment, which would strike the important funding for it in the bill. If not now, when? This is the time that we ought to do it. Our con- stituents are screaming about the high cost of gasoline.

We need to help the universities and other researchers provide the adequate funding so we have more fuel efficient and less polluting cars to what this provi- sion does. Obviously, an amendment to strike it would take away that ability for all consumers across the country. I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Sununu amendment. Unfortunately, this amendment short-sight- edly overlooks the enormous benefits our wise investment in the Partnership for a New Gen- eration of Vehicles—PNGV—makes to im- prove technologies to increase fuel economy and improve emissions without sacrificing af- fordability, utility, safety and comfort in today’s family cars.

Investment in PNGV for agency programs most directly relevant to its technical objectives amount to about $130 million annually— that is the provision in this bill. It is beginning to work well. So I would just say the timing, I think, is out of touch with the current events.

We have heard from individuals who talk about the price of gasoline. I do not have to point this out again. It has already been mentioned about the costs have skyrocketed in the Midwest, in particular, well above $2 a gallon.

As a country, as has been pointed out, we are overly reliant on foreign petroleum supplies. So it is imperative that Congress do something to help the persons most affected by these price increases, and that is the American worker. The PNGV program is exactly one such program that will develop the technology that will stop our reliance on foreign oil and will improve the en- vironment in the process.

So with the funds appropriated in this bill, we can continue the vitally important research and development associated with this program.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentle- man from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I think that a car will be manufactured and sold to consumers. I do not know whether that is really all that impor- tant here today. I hope that this kind of a car is developed. But it is going to be developed whether the Federal Gov- ernment puts tax dollars into it or not. That is why this is corporate welfare.

We are supporting something that the private marketplace is doing on its own. We should let the market decide.

These three big companies are trying to develop hybrid engines that combine gasoline or diesel motors with electric motors. Honda and Toyota are doing the same. We should let the market decide.

The Congressional Budget Office has said, if Honda and Toyota do succeed in the marketplace, our auto makers will have every incentive in the world to try to meet that competition and con- tinue this research and development. If these Japanese hybrid cars do not suc- ceed in our marketplace, our addi- tional dollars are unlikely to change or revoke that judgment of the market.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentle- man yield?

Mr. HOEFFEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire. Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very prescient point, because we can look back in time from three particular areas where we either as a Nation did try to second guess the mar- kets or we nearly tried to second guess the markets and look at what the histor- ical results were.

First case in point, synthetic fuels. We put billions of dollars into trying to develop oil from coal in the synthetic fuels program, trying to second guess technology that is in the energy marketplace; and that money was essentially wasted because the technological feasibility of success in that area was so limited.
A second example, back in the 1980s, the silicon industry, the chip industry was bargaining for subsidies for static memory. We need Federal subsidies to maintain our static memory markets. It was a question of competitiveness. We heard it from all corners of the country. Today, the static memory business is a terrible business to be in. The margins are razor thin. We put about $400 million into subsidy for that industry. But in retrospect, it would have been a terrible industry to subsidize.

A third example, high definition television. Thank goodness we did not put tens of billions of dollars into subsidizing that technology as some of our European and Asian counterparts did, because, by allowing markets to determine where the technology went, the American companies have the winning standard. So we have to be careful about distorting these technical markets.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for offering this amendment. We do not need to subsidize something that the market-place is already doing. I urge strong support for the Sununu-Andrews amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of offering my amendment No. 37, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 2, line 13, I was in the Chamber at the time we were on that item. I was on my feet, but I was not recognized. The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) was recognized.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Page 2, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: "reduced by $6,000,000." Page 54, line 4, insert after the dollar amount the following: "increased by $1,000,000."
hundreds of Coloradans to be evacuated from their homes. As we know, this year’s fire season has just begun. This morning’s Colorado newspapers are reporting that yesterday the “Hi Meadow” fire near the town of Bailey has gotten much worse and forced people to evacuate from Buffalo Creek. As all Coloradans know, Buffalo Creek was the scene of another devastating fire just a few years ago.

Our governor has declared a state of emergency in affected areas, and this morning FEMA told me they are responding to our State’s request for aid. It is too late to prevent these fires. Now they must be fought. But it is still true the best time to fight a fire is before it starts, and that is the purpose of the Healthy Forests Amendment.

This is important for all Coloradans. It is especially important for Boulder, which I represent, and the other communities along the Front Range that are at risk from wildland fires. The additional funding provided by the amendment will help make sure the Forest Service will continue to cooperate with its Colorado partners to reduce the risk.

Already those partners are hard at work in places like Winiger Ridge near Boulder, the Upper South Platte watershed, and the Seven-Mile area near Red Feather Lakes. Our amendment would help make sure those efforts can continue.

Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Committee on Resources, I followed with great interest some of the debates about the health of our forests. I suspect some may want to link this amendment to those debates. But I want to make clear this is not a forest health amendment, it is not an amendment about timber sales. This amendment is about fighting fires and fire prevention. And while prevention often requires reduction of the volume of hazardous fuels, it does not require removal of old growth timber or clearing of large areas.

This is also not a big-spending amendment. All it would do is bring the wildland fire management account back near the level of the current fiscal year. The desirability of this amendment was actually spelled out in the report of the Committee on Appropriations. Speaking of the very fire prevention measures affected by this amendment, the committee report says, “Additional funding in this activity, were it available, would provide much more than a dollar-for-dollar saving in wildland and wild-fire suppression operations and loss of valuable resources.”

I agree with my colleague that this is a high priority matter, and I urge the adoption of our amendment.

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

Though I am sympathetic to this amendment, I rise in opposition. I believe that we have tried to address the overall problem of fire by adding $350 million in emergency wildland fire funds. This amendment would bring back about $67 million to the bill. And we also have $907 million in nonemergency wildland fire funds for these agencies.

I would say to both the gentlemen from Colorado that if the circumstances are exacerbated between now and conference, we would make every effort to provide some additional funding there, because I know that this is a serious problem both in Colorado and in New Mexico.

By the same token, I am reluctant to see $1 million taken out of the Wild Horse and Burro program, because we are on the threshold of implementing the research program that has been developed by the University of Arizona to reduce the number of wild burros in public lands and this would go a long way, if the research that has been developed is implemented, in reducing the impact on the health of the land in Colorado and all the western States that have a problem with the wild horses and burros.

So I would like to keep that $1 million in there because this money basically will implement what we now know by way of science as a way to address this, but I will give the gentlemen from Colorado the assurance that if the situation becomes more critical as we get to conference, that we will look with favor on adding some additional money.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to all of our colleagues, and the chairman worked with us on this, that we are very concerned that because we have not passed the supplemental appropriations bill through both bodies down to the President that there was not enough money in these accounts for wildland fire management. So we put in for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, $200 million to remain available until expended for emergency rehabilitation and wildfire suppression activities.

The other amendment we had in our bill, this is on page 109, is $150 million for wildland fire management for the Forest Service. So there is a total in this bill of $350 million for what I think the gentlemen from Colorado rightfully want.

I will say here today that if there is additional money needed, as the chairman has just said, in the conference we will put additional money in. I am sure the administration will request it.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment, and I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado Springs, Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), for his work on the more than four times Colorado’s land’s carrying capacity. And according to the BLM, a reduction of $4 million here will do serious damage to their program.

So I stand committed to helping the Colorado Members and the New Mexico Members, and whoever else is affected, and I am out from the West myself and realize the terrible conditions that are out there, but I would like to see us, if we could do it, without taking it out of the money for the wild burro program.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman has said.

But I want to give assurance again to the Colorado Members that we are very sensitive to the problem. As has been pointed out, the wild burro program is on the threshold of a breakthrough that we desperately need.

I commend the gentlemen from Colorado for bringing this to our attention. As the ranking member indicated, and as we get to conference, that we will be addressing the problem in conference if the conditions continue to warrant that.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and then this $350 million is for emergency money. So if we add it all up there is $1.2 billion in total.

So I want to help, but I do not think we should beat up on the other program. And just to give a little information, it is estimated that about 35,000 animals are going to do serious damage to the watersheds all over the West. And it is estimated that at current funding levels and adoption demand, populations will increase to 126,000 animals by 2000, the more than four times that land’s carrying capacity. And according to the BLM, a reduction of $4 million here will do serious damage to their program.

What I worry about is if we take money away from this program, that they are going to do terrible damage to the watersheds all over the West. And it is estimated that at current funding levels and adoption demand, populations will increase to 126,000 animals by 2000, the more than four times that land’s carrying capacity. And according to the BLM, a reduction of $4 million here will do serious damage to their program.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and then this $350 million is for emergency money. So if we add it all up there is $1.2 billion in total.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment, and I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado Springs, Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), for his work on the more than four times Colorado’s land’s carrying capacity. And according to the BLM, a reduction of $4 million here will do serious damage to their program.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.
United States over 44,000 fires, burning well over 1.5 million acres of land so far this year.

Now, why are we facing a growing problem like this with these forest fires, that are sure to incinerate some of the most beautiful land in the United States? I have heard a few explanations in the media over the past few weeks, but I believe that the forest fires are caused for a simple reason. Wood is flammable, and in Colorado we have more wood in our mountains than ever before in history. These forests are not healthy. They are overgrown, after years of fire suppression. They are not safe at this time of year. Our forests are tinderboxes. They are no longer in their natural state.

I urge my colleagues to acknowledge this fact because it is an extremely important one. As we consider the appropriations we provide to the forest managers. Fire prevention efforts, which this amendment would help fund, are a cost-saving strategy. I am told that if it were not for a prescribed fire that occurred last summer along the Buffalo Creek watershed by Jefferson County Open Space, the fire in Hi Meadow would have moved quickly south. If not for that prescribed burn, the fire may have jeopardized the supply of water that is used by thousands of Denver residents.

However, the biggest complaint I have heard this week was from the BLM and Forest Service that they do not have enough resources to combat the fire. Yesterday, the firefighters temporarily ran out of fire-retardant. They need equipment and they need funding for preventive measures. Fire prevention programs can save millions in damages to homes and buildings and water treatment.

Mr. HEFLEY. I wanted to thank my colleagues, especially my colleague from Colorado Springs, for bringing this amendment to our attention.

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

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Once again, Mr. Chairman, the ranking member and I have discussed this issue. We are going to take care of whatever has to be done out there, but we are reluctant to see the money come out of the Wild Horse and Burro Program because they are ready to move on that. We have been told by BLM that they need this money. To implement the recommendations of the University of Arizona study, that needs to stay there. So, again, I can only reiterate the fact that we are going to be very sympathetic in conference as the needs emerge.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REGULA

To make a helpful to us.

The Forest Service tells us that they are $3 million short of being able to do the kind of work that is needed to meet the need. This would put $4 million of that $5 million in it. At the same time, it would not in any way destroy the horse and burro program because that is something too that we need to solve. We have too many horses and burros on the range.

I would advise the gentleman from Ohio that I raise horses. I am sympathetic with the horse problem. I live in the West. I saw My Friend Flicka and Thunderhead. I understand about wild horses and burros. I have been in America for wild horses. But we have too many on the range, and we do need to solve it. I would not in any way want to take away all the money from that. That is why half the money is still there.

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

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

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

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to say that we do recognize that both the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), are not sympathetic about this. They have worked in their bill to try to provide a great deal of assistance in this area, and we appreciate that and understand that. And we understand if the problem intensifies that they will be there to be helpful to us.

The Forest Service tells us that they are $3 million short of being able to do the kind of work that is needed to meet the need. This would put $4 million of that $5 million in it. At the same time, it would not in any way destroy the horse and burro program because that is something too that we need to solve. We have too many horses and burros on the range.

I would advise the gentleman from Ohio that I raise horses. I am sympathetic with the horse problem. I live in the West. I saw My Friend Flicka and Thunderhead. I understand about wild horses and burros. I have been in America for wild horses. But we have too many on the range, and we do need to solve it. I would not in any way want to take away all the money from that. That is why half the money is still there.

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

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

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

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REGULA

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to say that we do recognize that both the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), are not sympathetic about this. They have worked in their bill to try to provide a great deal of assistance in this area, and we appreciate that and understand that. And we understand if the problem intensifies that they will be there to be helpful to us.

The Forest Service tells us that they are $3 million short of being able to do the kind of work that is needed to meet the need. This would put $4 million of that $5 million in it. At the same time, it would not in any way destroy the horse and burro program because that is something too that we need to solve. We have too many horses and burros on the range.

I would advise the gentleman from Ohio that I raise horses. I am sympathetic with the horse problem. I live in the West. I saw My Friend Flicka and Thunderhead. I understand about wild horses and burros. I have been in America for wild horses. But we have too many on the range, and we do need to solve it. I would not in any way want to take away all the money from that. That is why half the money is still there.

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

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

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

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 30 by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), and amendment No. 37 by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. SUNUNU

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will re-designate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.
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Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, was there enough people standing for a recorded vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counted for a recorded vote; and, a sufficient number having risen, a recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, did the Chair count?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair’s count is not subject to question.

RECORDED VOTE

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ays 214, noes 211, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—214

Gekas
Ganske
Fowler
Filner
Brown (OH)
Burton
Calvert
Bentsen
Morey
McNulty
Reid
Silvester
Young (FL)

Gosar
Green (TX)
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedorn
Hagedor
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LaFouette  Packard  Simpson
Mekk (FL)  Pastor  Taylor (NC)
Miller (FL)  Porter  Vislosky
Miller, Gary  Pryce (OH)  Walden
Molloy (NY)  Quigley  Wu
Moran (VA)  Regula  Young (AK)
Nader  Reynolds  Young (FL)
Nussle  One  Saso

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman  Danner  Rangel
Boyd  Greenwood  Ryan (WI)
Callahan  Richmond  Schakowsky
Campbell  Hoyt  Shuster
Cook  Logfren  Vento

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on rollover No. 275 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no.''

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for conservation, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California land-grant funds; $100,467,000, to remain available until expended:

[SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION IN THE HOUSE]

FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 103–448, the Agriculture Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001, funds otherwise available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities such as the release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181–1 et seq., and Public Law 105–66) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

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

Mr. Chairman, I assure Members that I will return that. I just wanted to make a statement. We have another appropriations bill on the floor, and I want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). There are no games played in this bill. The American public is going to be able to see exactly what is in there.

There is no sneaking in of advanced funding. There is no sneaking of emergency funding that comes right out of Medicare. This committee should be recognized for setting the example of what the agenda was when we finished the budget in this year. And I wanted to tell Members how much I appreciated it, and I know that there are several other Members in the House that appreciate it. And we would like to see more of it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the committee for its attention to Florida in this bill, and, more particularly, the Florida manatee. There are many here who probably have never seen a Florida manatee. Come to Florida and see one. It is an extraordinary thing, and there are not many left. Despite being listed as endangered for about a dozen years, the protection and recovery of the manatee population continues to be a matter of some concern.

I was pleased to see that the Interior bill contains an earmark of a million dollars for four-manatee doubling the amendment provided last year. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA), and Members of the Interior subcommittee have always been attentive to the needs and concerns of Florida, which is a vast and wonderful place.

This is always a tough bill, given the many worthy programs competing for a small amount of money. However, I do want to take this opportunity to discuss issues related to manatee protection.

In January of this year, 18 environmental organizations filed suit against the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Florida alleging they were not enforcing their own rules designed to help save the manatee. Specifically, the groups asked for a moratorium on permitting until a plan is in place to prevent increased boat traffic and development from harming manatees.

Although the Federal agencies involved deny it, since the lawsuit was filed, all permitting has ground to a halt. As a result, many landowners are caught in limbo, unable to complete development, and facing significant financial losses as a result.

Of serious concern is that these landowners find themselves being referred from one government agency to another, the quintessential governmental shuffle, catch-22.

These folks deserve an answer; the Government cannot continue to shuffle them back and forth. I have heard some express the concern that the Clinton administration is dragging its feet intentionally on this issue because it does not want to upset a particular constituency in an election year.

I surely hope that is not the case. The Florida manatee deserves better...
and so do the American people and so do the boat owners and users in Florida.

In the end, the question is how do we protect the manatee? A fair question. Some seem to see boats as the enemy. By banning boats or limiting boat traffic, the thinking goes, we can save the manatee. This is not a practical solution. About one-third of manatee deaths are attributable to boats. Clearly, there is more at play than just that.

On the boating question, it seems to me the solution is very simple, responsible use. I know that is a heretical thought for some, but responsible use should go with boat use. This will likely require more money for enforcement and a crackdown on those who behave irresponsibly, as it should.

I believe we must act quickly to devise a protection policy for the manatee. It is incumbent on the Fish and Wildlife Service to work with other agencies in the State of Florida to fashion a science-based consensus policy that protects the manatee in a reasonable manner. We are all for that.

The urgency of this situation became clear a few weeks ago with a report from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission indicating that 100 manatees died in the first 3 months of this year, up substantially from the 80 deaths in the first 3 months of 1999. Too many manatees dying for an endangered species.

Clearly, the approach of the Fish and Wildlife Service has shortchanged all parties to this debate. There have been no additional steps taken to protect the manatee, and landowners have been lost in this moratorium.

Solving this problem requires real leadership on the part of Fish and Wildlife Service. I hope they will begin to see the urgency of this situation and move quickly, and that is the reason I made this statement.

We must ask quickly to devise a protection policy for the manatee. This is not a practical solution.

The purpose of the Wu amendment, according to its supporters, would be to provide more funding for important wildlife programs by cutting funding for the Federal timber sale program.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATT).

Mr. GOODLATT. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATT).

Mr. GOODLATT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations on the Wu amendment that will be offered during the consideration of this bill.

The purpose of the Wu amendment, according to its supporters, would be to provide more funding for important wildlife programs by cutting funding for the Federal timber sale program.
program maintained adequate funding. That was a win-win result. This year, I proposed that we offer the same hand as an alternative to this controversial amendment. I am confident that, working together, we can achieve the same kind of balance this year that we achieved last year.

We do not need to reduce funding for the timber sale program and thereby reduce our fire risk prevention capabilities in order to fund wildlife programs. As we proceed through the appropriations process, we can, if we work cooperatively together, find a way to adequately fund both.

I ask the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA), would he be willing to work this year with me as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture with jurisdiction over forestry and the supporters of the Wu amendment to adequately fund important wildlife programs, just as we did last year?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, last year I made several efforts to work with Members to adequately fund wildlife programs. I am certainly willing to make that same commitment today.

I agree that working together to meet common objectives is a much better approach than having counterproductive floor fights over controversial amendments.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the chairman. I would say to my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and I are extending our hands again, just like we did last year.

We do not need the Wu amendment to help provide more funding for important wildlife programs. I urge Members to put the politics of this debate aside and continue instead to work together to meet our common objectives. That is a far better approach.

I urge Members to accept this offer in good faith. Vote no on the Wu amendment, and work with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and me to meet our common objectives to deal with wildlife programs, like we did last year, in a collegial and reasonable way.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 11, line 21, after the period add the following: "of the amounts made available under this heading, $500,000 shall be for preparing a report to the Congress on the scientific impacts of genetically engineered fish, including their impact on wild fish populations. In preparing the report the Secretary shall review all available data regarding such impacts and shall conduct additional research to collect any information that is not available and is necessary to assess the potential impacts. The Secretary shall include in the report a review of regulatory and other mechanisms that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service might use to prevent any problems caused by transgenic fish."

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment so that the Fish and Wildlife Service pay close attention to the ecological impacts from genetically engineered fish. This amendment asks the Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct a study that would examine the ecological effects of genetically engineered fish and anticipate regulatory actions. Although such fish are not on the market yet, the Food and Drug Administration is currently evaluating a genetically engineered salmon.

There is a scientific explanation that I would like to go over here, starting with chart 1. Genetically engineered fish are engineered to grow faster and bigger. Scientists from the University of Minnesota and University of Pennsylvania foresee harmful ecological impacts.

On chart 2, scientists have determined that a larger fish has an advantage in mating. This handsomely big GE fish is more successful than the lonely natural fish, and scientists have also determined that these GE fish may survive only for a limited number of generations in the wild.

Now, in chart 3, mutant fish are created as a way to escape into the wild and mate with natural fish. The mutant fish's larger size gives an advantage in mating, forcing new genetic traits to be spread into the wild. But these mutant fish may survive only for a limited number of generations in the wild, because when genetic engineering is performed, the opportunity to disturb or disrupt other genetic traits is possible, including disturbing the trait of longevity. The implications are serious.

Chart 4 speaks of the Trojan Gene Effect. These are serious implications, because many fish populations are under consideration for genetic engineering. After several generations, natural fish may go extinct because larger genetically engineered fish are much more successful than natural fish in mating. Such mutant fish may also go extinct because their mutant genes can decrease the survivability of the species. This is what is called the Trojan Gene Effect.

The end result is the loss of genetic diversity, disruption of ecological systems, possible extinction of important commercial fish species, and, of course, effect on the food supply.

I am requesting to withdraw this amendment, hoping that the chairman and the ranking member will work with me by advocating report language for a study to examine the ecological impacts of genetically engineered fish and anticipated regulatory actions that might be necessary.

I would let the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) know that I would appreciate any consideration in conference for any report language.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we share the gentleman's concern. I think we would like to work on this with the Biological Research Division of the USGS, and perhaps they could do a study or take a look at it to see how this impacts the fish population and work with Fish and Wildlife to address these concerns.

If the gentleman would withdraw the amendment, certainly we will work with the gentleman in trying to get Fish and Wildlife and the USGS that has the science responsibility, perhaps we can meet with them and discuss ways in which they can address your concerns.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his obvious work here and this presentation that he has made. I want to tell the gentleman that we have the same problem out in the Pacific Northwest with a variety of salmon species, that not only we have genetically engineered, but we have hatchery fish that compete with our wild salmon that reproduce naturally in the wild, and these crowding-out effects, a lot of the same issues that the gentleman is raising here.

The importance of preserving the gene pool of these species is critical. There is a lot of good work that is being done by the Fish and Wildlife Service across the country under the Endangered Species Act, but I think this is very important. I look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue and with the Fish and Wildlife Service to see if we cannot collaborate on this.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I include the following articles for the RECORD.

BIOSAFETY ASSESSMENT OF AQUATIC GMOS: THE CASE OF TRANSGENIC FISH

(By Anne R. Kapuscinski)

A growing number of groups around the world are pursuing research and development of transgenic fish, shellfish, and algae. Transgenic Atlantic salmon are poised to be one of the first transgenic animals farmed for human consumption. Ecological risk assessments of transgenic aquatic organisms have been comparatively underfunded and understudied. Comparisons of the few risk assessment studies on transgenic fish confirm the need to conduct case-by-case risk assessment of each line of transgenic organism. Risk assessment should focus on tests for intended and unintended changes in six components of aquatic viability, fecundity, fertility, longevity, mating success, and developmental time. Muir and
Howard have shown the critical importance of testing for effects of changes in these fitness components because disadvantages in one fitness trait can be offset by advantages in another fitness trait. For instance, the reduced viability of growth hormone (hGH) transgenic fish would be compensated by increased mating advantage of larger transgenic adults, possibly driving a wild population towards extinction (the Trojan gene effect). Risk assessments need to actively search for this and other biologically feasible off-setting mechanisms. The state-of-the-art approach, called the Net Fitness Approach, is to: (1) Test GMOs for altered fitness components in confined experiment; (2) quantify the net fitness of the GMOs and mathematically predict effects of escapes on wild fish; and, wherever feasible, (3) test mathematical predictions on multiple generations of GMOs and non-GMOs interacting in simplified, confined ecosystems.

Muir's lab recently produced two lines of transgenic medaka bearing a sockeye salmon growth hormone (hGH) transgene (sGH). We demonstrated dramatically faster growth rates and earlier sexual maturity, as previously shown in coho salmon and tilapia. Both this construct and another salmon GH construct that is in the transgenic Atlantic salmon being reviewed by the FDA yield dramatic increases in growth rates, earlier smoltification (ability to survive in saltwater), and growth promotion that overrides the natural environmental cue to slow growth in colder (winter) water temperatures. In one sGH medaka line, the transgenic fish are larger at sexual maturity and have a viability disadvantage (Muir et al., unpublished data). This is precisely the combination of traits predicted to expedite the Trojan gene effect! Empirical experiments are underway to test for this. In summary, the publicly available data on transgenic fish confirm the need to test ecological risks of all lines of GMOs on a case-by-case basis and in a manner that integrates data on all modified traits, not just the transgene. Standardized laboratory protocols used by the interdisciplinary Scientists' Working Group on Biosafety (1998) in designing the Manual for Assessing Ecological and Environmental Effects of Genetic modifications of Engineered Organisms (available at www.edmonde-institute.org). The Manual applies to small- and large-scale uses of any genetically engineered organism, including fish and other aquatic organisms. Users generate a specific trail of questions and responses that makes the scientific claim of risk or safety. The Manual follows the precautionary approach and encourages users to avoid type II statistical errors (i.e., concluding no adverse effect when the effect indeed occurs). Under the current state of inadequate information on fitness components of transgenic fish, application of the Manual leads the user to the conclusion that there is insufficient information to answer a key question and to the recommendation to apply several confinement measures (sterilization, mechanical barriers, physical barriers) to prevent ecological harm.

The take home messages for existing and future proposals to commercialize transgenic fish are: (1) The scientific data indicate that some line of transgenic fish will have a measurable ecological risk; (2) application of the Net Fitness Approach should be a minimum requirement for testing the ecological risk of all transgenic fish and (or other uses that could affect the environment); (3) any transgenic fish approved for aquaculture (or other uses that could affect the environment) and/or be preferred as a mate by the opposite sex (mate choice) (4) A recent review found that large body size conferred mating advantages in 40% of the 186 animal taxa surveyed (12). The potential for sexual selection to produce a rapid evolution of life history traits has long been appreciated (12); here we consider its potential to increase transgenic frequency and to eliminate population growth in wild individuals when a sexual trait is affected by transgenics.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Organism. As a model organism, we studied Japanese medaka (Oryzias latipes) (13) where the ecological constraints on transgenic release into natural populations. Medaka were convenient study organisms for obtaining data on fitness components. Individuals were readily bred in the lab, were easily cultured, and attained sexual maturity in about two months. We produced a stock of transgenic medaka by inserting the human growth hormone gene (hGH), with a salmon promoter, sGH (14). We then conducted several experiments to document survival and reproductive differences between transgenic and wild-type medaka. We categorized these differences into four fitness components: (i) viability (offspring survival to sexual maturity), (ii) developmental cost (paternal care, clutch size), and (ii) sexual selection (mate advantages). We modeled the introduction of a small number of transgenic individuals into a large wild-type population using recurrence equations (described below) to predict the consequences of the model, i.e., of increased male mating success but reduced offspring viability. We examined the results of model predictions in which GH transgenes influenced developmental and fecundity fitness components as well as offspring viability (unpublished data). Different transgene lines are likely to vary in fitness even when the same transgene construct is used, because of differences in copy number and sites of transgene insertion. To take such variation into account as well as to make our model generally applicable to other organisms and transgene constructs (we used parameter values for male mating success and offspring viability in our models. The range of parameter values encompassed the particular fitness component estimates that we obtained.

We conducted a 2 x 2 factorial experiment to assess the early viability of offspring produced from crosses involving transgenic and wild-type medaka parents (15). Each pairing combination consisted of 10 males and 10 females; eggs were obtained from each pair for a period of 10 days, producing a total of 1,910 fertile eggs. Viability was estimated as the percentage of 3-day-old fry that emerged. Results show that early survival of transgenic young was 70% of that of the wild type (15). Mating experiments using wild-type medaka were performed to measure the mating advantage that large over small males. We found that, regardless of protocol, large males obtained a 4-fold mating advantage (16). Such size-related mating advantages have been observed in a variety of fish species; they can result from mate competition or mate choice or both (12). We do not expect transgenic male medaka to have a mating advantage over wild-type males, because the hGH transgene we inserted increased only juvenile growth rate, not final adult body size (14); that is, the developmental differences and wild-type males disappeared by sexual maturity.

Nonetheless, we modeled the possible
effect of transgene release into wild-type populations. Transgenes that facilitate growth throughout adulthood, thus increasing transgenic male mating success, because these effects could occur with other transgenes constructs in other fish species. For example, continued growth enhancement of male salmonid growth throughout adulthood, thus increasing mating success and offspring viability. We also measured sex ratio and reproductive success with transgenic fish of both sexes, and determined sex-specific effects on fitness-dependent effects occurred. This as-

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the model, the initial population was structured with a stable age distribution giving a constant size (60,000), composed of wild-type fish with an equal sex ratio in each class. Based on experimental data (15), and adjusted by trial and error to achieve a stable age distribution, juvenile and adult mortality rates were set at 9.8% and 0.1% per day, respectively, for both genotypes, which resulted in an expected maximum life span of 150 days. Sixty homozygous transgenic fish of both sexes were then released at sexual maturity. We assumed that transgenic and wild-type individuals were similar in age (at sexual maturity), fecundity, fertility, susceptibility to predation, and longevity; the only differential effects caused by the GH transgene were male mating success and offspring viability. We also assumed that the viability of offspring was not frequency-dependent. For this model, population size was always assumed to be less than the carrying capacity; i.e., no density-dependent effects occurred. This assumption is known to be incorrect for some species. But for species that are declining in number because of heavy fishing pressure or other sources of mortality, the assumption is likely to be true. The above parameters were specified in the model, and genotypic frequency, gene frequency, and population size were assessed each day. We expressed time to extinction in terms of the generation interval, the average age when all offspring were produced, which, in our laboratory experiment, was expressed as 96.9 days.

Predictions of the model were straightforward when transgenes affected only one fitness component. If transgenes reduced only juvenile survival, transgenic individuals would be quickly eliminated from any wild-type population. Our model predicted that if transgenic medaka suffered a 30% reduction in viability relative to the wild type, the transgene would be eliminated after about 10 generations (15). In contrast, if the GH transgene increased only the mating success of transgenic males relative to wild-type males, the gene would spread quickly. If adult transgenic males were 24% larger than adult wild-type males and thereby achieved the 4-fold mating advantage that we had observed in our mating experiments (16), the frequency of the transgene would exceed 50% in about eight generations, and become fixed in the population in about 20 generations. In both of these situations, population size would remain essentially unchanged across generations. Transgene would either be eliminated or go to fixation.

In contrast, combining the effects of the transgene on mating success and offspring viability is predicted to result in the local extinction of any wild-type population invaded by transgenic organisms. The male mating advantage would act to increase the frequency of the transgene in the population; however, the viability of offsprings suffered by all offspring carrying the transgene would reduce the population size by 50% in less than six generations and completely elimi-
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Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA).

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula) shares my interest in ensuring that the Kyoto Protocol is not implemented without ratification and that unauthorized activities to implement the protocol are not funded. Likewise, I know that the gentleman shares my interest in developing fuel cells for building applications and specifically in proton membrane exchange technology for supplying residential electric power and hot water.

I am asking that the gentleman work with me to address appropriately the first issue in conference and to identify any additional funding that might be for the fuel cell program in the event that additional funds are made available in conference.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would commend the gentleman. I think that there has been a lot of progress on fuel cell technologies required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $48,380,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for those joint efforts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvement, acquisition, or removal of buildings and other facilities, or the use of funds required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $48,380,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) to engage in a brief colloquy with me.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula) knows, there is language in the committee’s report on this bill dealing with what is described as BLM wilderness reinventory activities. I just have some questions about the meaning and effect of that part of the report.

To begin with, the report says that BLM has completed all of its wilderness reinventory activities begun in prior years, but I understand that part of the language is inaccurate because there is an ongoing process in Colorado that has not yet ended.

Would respectfully ask the chairman, am I right in understanding that there is no intention to interfere with the ongoing reinventory process in Colorado?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, yes, the gentleman is correct. We do not intend to interfere with that ongoing process in Colorado.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

Am I also right in understanding that nothing in the committee report is intended to interfere with BLM’s normal process in revising its management plans or keeping its resource inventory current?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will continue to yield, he is correct. We are not intending to interfere with or obstruct process of revising management plans or keeping the resource inventory current.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for those joint efforts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authorities (not to exceed $7,000,000), to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531–1538), as amended, $23,000,000, to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 716s), $10,439,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 104–356, as amended, $15,499,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION FUND

For necessary expenses of the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund, $797,000, to remain available until expended.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. REGULA

On page 15, line 15 after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by $66,500,000)."

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds $66.5 million to address critical operational backlog needs in the National Parks.

Mr. Chairman, backlog maintenance is a critical problem in our National Parks, and, as we all recognize from testimony by the Director of the National Parks, this is something where we should, wherever possible, provide funding to overcome the serious deficit that exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order, and I recognize that what the gentleman from Utah is raising as a point of order is correct. I would like to just discuss the implications of this situation, because I think it is important for our colleagues to understand what is happening.

The Everglades restoration is a major project. It is probably going to involve an expenditure of $10 to $15 billion in the years ahead. I think it is vitally important that the United States government, through the Department of the Interior, have a voice in this project.

I regret that our attempt to provide assurances for a vital, high-quality water supply to the natural areas of the Everglades, including Everglades National Park, several national wildlife refuges, and Florida Bay have been dropped.

Restoration of the Everglades began 7 years ago as a true partnership among various interests. These interests, Federal, State, and local governments, Indian tribes, agricultural, urban, and environmental organizations, and the public at large, came together as the South Florida Ecosystem Task Force.

This entity meets to set priorities and make collaborative decisions on this massive restoration effort. Since the restoration effort began, the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee has provided nearly $1 billion in Federal funding with the understanding that critical scientific research, land acquisition, and water planning funding to achieve environmental restoration would be one of the end results of the enormous sums the American taxpayers are being called upon to commit.

The committee has provided this funding during a time of declining budgets and at the expense of numerous meritorious projects—projects that our Members here would like to have. Because we were committed to spending what has already been a total of over $700 million to this program, we...
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were not able to do some of the others that we should have done.

Mr. HINCHEY. The language being stripped from this bill ensured that the natural areas would receive equal treatment with other interests as important decisions about water flow and quantity are made.

Let me begin. Without assurances that the Secretary of the Interior, together with the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers and the South Florida Water Management District, has a voice in the decisions, we can no longer call this project environmental restoration. The Federal part of the money in this bill is the environmental restoration of the Everglades. Now, with the result of this point of order, we will not have that voice of the Federal government.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear, I bear no ill will toward the other goals of this effort: continued sugar and agricultural production, adequate potable water availability for the people of Florida, and sustainable growth for the region.

However, with the balanced fair language now being stripped from this bill, the effort is no longer an environmental restoration project. It is no longer a partnership. The project is solely a water development project between the Army Corps of Engineers and the local water management district in “Anywhere U.S.A.”, and should receive no further funding through the bill of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

I want to point out something else. We will hear that this water is owned by the State of Florida, but in 1970, under the River Basin Monetary Authorization and Miscellaneous Civil Works Amendments, the following language was incorporated in that bill and is now the law of the United States:

That as soon as practicable, and in any event upon completion of the work specified in the preceding provision, delivery of water from the Central and Southern Florida project to the Everglades National Park shall be not less than 315,000 acre feet annually.

In other words, the water belongs to the Everglades as part of the 1970 law. Our concern is that unless there is some way in which the Federal government has a voice in the distribution of the water that is going to be gained by the money that is spent, the possibility of the Everglades not receiving adequate water supply is very real.

I hope we can work out some language to ensure the fact that this is being stripped by the point of order, that will continue to ensure the protection of the United States’ investment.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to recognize what is happening here and to gauge the implications of it, to understand them and all of their ramifications, because they are broad and deep.

First, I want to assure you that the First of all, striking this language, $9 million, which is appropriated in this bill to the Department of the Interior, will now be spent by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Department of the Interior will have no say whatsoever in how that money is spent. It will be spent only by the Army Corps of Engineers for their purposes.

Mr. Chairman, that is contrary to everything that this Congress has done up to this point in this project. Our chairman has just outlined very carefully and accurately some of the profound difficulties that will ensue as a result of the striking of this language.

We have here a national resource. The Everglades are half owned by the United States government for all the people of the country. They are—that half of the Everglades is administered by the Department of the Interior. By striking this language, the Department of the Interior will have no say whatsoever in how this $9 million appropriated in this bill is to be spent.

The foundation which has been laid very, very carefully over a long period of time, and which has involved the appropriation and expenditure of several billion dollars so far, is undermined by the striking of this language.

What we have had up to now is a cooperative working relationship between the Army Corps of Engineers, the South Florida Water Management District, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the United States Department of the Interior. The United States Department of the Interior is involved here because of the fact that we have a number of ecosystems in those Everglades which are administered by the Department of the Interior, and appropriately so.

Striking this language is going to do extreme damage to the foundation that has been laid, the confidence that has been had by those agencies in working together. That confidence will no longer exist. The people around the country who have watched this enterprise go forward, and they, too, have watched it with confidence because of the cooperation that has been had between the various agencies, many people around the country are going to now withdraw that confidence. They are going to be very skeptical about what is going to happen with regard to the Everglades.

All of the environmental protection that is important in the Everglades restoration is now placed in jeopardy. The 68 threatened and endangered species that are in the Everglades now will be increasingly endangered because their manager, their overseer, the Department of the Interior, will no longer be active.

I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, finally, that the Members here understand what is being done. This is not simply an accurate but it is wholly mischievous. It is going to result in substantial damage. We will have to immediately find ways to correct the damage which has been done by the striking of this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) makes a point of order that the provision beginning with “Provided further” on page 18, line 6, through line 19 proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

The provision directly waives any other provision of law and assigns new duties to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to water allocation in Florida. It also states that the House Rules and Manual, a proposition to establish an affirmative duty on an executive officer is legislation. By establishing new duties on the Secretary of the Interior, the provision constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained and the provision is stricken.

Mr. JAGGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 21, line 13, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill from page 18, line 20, through page 21, line 13, is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 340 passenger motor vehicles, of which 273 shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed 319 for police-type use, 12 buses, and 9 ambulances: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to implement an agreement for the re-development of the southern end of Ellis Island until such agreement has been submitted to the Congress and shall not be implemented prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either house of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full and comprehensive report on the development of the southern end of Ellis Island, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the development.

None of the funds in this Act may be spent by the National Park Service for activities.

The National Park Service may distribute to operating units based on the safety record of each unit the costs of programs designed to improve workplace and employee safety, and to encourage employees receiving work-related injuries to return to appropriate positions for which they are medically able.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the United States Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340: classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); and publish and disseminate the results of ongoing investigations carried on in cooperation with topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340: classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); and publish and disseminate the results of ongoing investigations carried on in cooperation with other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gauging stations and observation wells; expenses of the United States National Committee and payment of compensation expenses of persons on the rolls of the Survey duly appointed to represent the United States in the negotiations and administration of interstate compacts:

Provided. That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in 31 U.S.C. 6302 et seq.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for minerals leasing and environmental studies, regulation of industry operations, and collection of royalties, as authorized by law; for enforcing laws and regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other minerals leases, permits, licenses and operating contracts; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements; including the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $127,200,000, of which $83,362,000, shall be available for royalty management activities; and an amount not to exceed $107,000,000, to be credited to this appropriation and to remain available until expended, from additional fees receivable from production rates in effect on August 5, 1993, from rate increases to fee collections for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities performed by the Minerals Management Service, to the extent the production rates in effect on September 30, 1993, and from additional fees for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities, including: Provided, That to the extent $107,000,000 in additions to receipts are not realized from the sources of receipts stated above, the amount needed to reach $107,000,000 shall be credited to this appropriation and to remain available until expended, from additional fees receivable from production rates in effect on September 30, 1993, and from additional fees for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities, including: Provided further, That $3,000,000 for computer acquisitions shall remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this Act shall be available for the payment of interest in accordance with 30 U.S.C. 1721(b) and (d); and Provided further, That not to exceed $3,000 shall be available for expenses related to promoting volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, $15,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 2000, shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Director of the Minerals Management Service determines that the amount of a claimed refund due, to pay amounts owed to Indian allottees or tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments: Provided further, That MMS may under the royalty-in-kind pilot program use a portion of the revenues from royalty-in-kind sales, without regard to fiscal year limitation, to pay for transportation and gathering expenses, processing, and any contractor costs required to aggregate and market royalty production taken in kind at wholesale market centers and insert “transportation to wholesale market centers and processing of royalty production taken in kind”.

MRS. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment, which will enable the Minerals Management Services to operate the royalty-in-kind pilot program more efficiently.

I first want to thank both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for their efforts to resolve this issue in a positive way. This amendment will strike language that would have given the royalties-in-kind program, as currently written, the ability to finance the gathering and marketing of oil and natural gas products.

It will continue to allow the Department of the Interior to finance the cost of transportation and processing of oil and natural gas.

Currently the Minerals Management Service is conducting three royalty-in-kind pilot programs located in Wyoming, Texas, and the Gulf of Mexico. We have worked in a bipartisan manner closely with the Department of the Interior to develop language that achieves their goals without affecting broader oil valuation policy or costing additional funds.

Amendment No. 44 offered by Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

Page 24, beginning line 6, strike “transportation and gathering expenses, processing, and any contractor costs required to aggregate and market royalty production taken in kind at wholesale market centers” and insert “transportation to wholesale market centers and processing of royalty production taken in kind”.

MRS. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I offer an amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Minerals Management Service. MMS is the agency charged with collecting royalties from mineral lessees of the federal government. Usually, the producer pays one-eighth of the value of the oil and natural gas from the wells on the lease to MMS to satisfy their royalty obligation, but the Secretary of the Interior is able to take royalty production in kind rather than in value, if he so chooses.

MMS has been conducting “R-I-K pilot programs” over the last several years, first for oil from leases in Wyoming and later for natural gas off the coast of Texas. Indeed, Mr. Chair, the MMS has reported to me that royalty natural gas taken in-kind from the Gulf of Mexico has been sold to the General Services Administration for heating federal buildings, including this very Capitol building last winter.

MMS is seeking to expand the scope of its natural gas R-I-K program to learn how best to add value for the taxpayer by aggregating significant volumes of gas from many leases throughout the Gulf and marketing those volumes to the highest bidders. This is known as
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Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer an amendment today on snowmobile use in certain national parks. Mr. Chairman, the national parks have more than 375 units. These units run from the historic homes here in Washington, D.C., the beauty of the Great Lakes, all the way up to Alaska. For all these units, their popularity is directly related to their access to the parks. As one generation immerses itself in the beauty and history of our national parks, so will the next.

This appreciation is often heightened by providing year-round access to parks. In some units, snowmobiles are necessary for traversing the isolated park lands of our northern States. In other units, like the Pictured Rocks in my district, snowmobiles are used for recreational purposes on restricted routes.

Unfortunately, on April 27, 2000, Interior Department Assistant Secretary Don Barry issued an announcement that many regarded as a ban of snowmobile use in the national park. The announcement said that the National Park Service must enforce existing regulations regarding snowmobile use; but please do not make a national announcement that undermines local involvement, ignores local concerns and bans snowmobile use when such an announcement is not enforceable and does not carry the weight of law.

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman is correct that a new regulation must be promulgated by the Park Service before a ban on snowmobile use can be enforced at Pictured Rocks. If the Park Service proposes such a regulation, the constituents of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) will be provided with ample opportunity to express their concern and interest.

Mr. Chairman, I implore the National Park Service, before it proposes such a rule, to go to my community and determine if snowmobiles are damaging the park; ask local residents if they want to continue with some controls on snowmobile use; but please do not make a national announcement that undermines local involvement, ignores local concerns and bans snowmobile use when such an announcement is not enforceable and does not carry the weight of law.

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman is correct that a new regulation must be promulgated by the Park Service before a ban on snowmobile use can be enforced at Pictured Rocks. If the Park Service proposes such a regulation, the constituents of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) will be provided with ample opportunity to express their concern and interest.

I agree with the gentleman that before proposing such a regulation that the Park Service should solicit the input of the park superintendent and the local community before following the Administrative Procedures Act.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for his support and for his understanding of what we are trying to do. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. Chairman, I will not offer my amendment. It will not be offered at this time or later tonight. I would withdraw that proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment as follows:

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4302 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 8201 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $13,000,000 which shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Regulation and Technology

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and
Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $97,478,000. Provided. That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations promulgated directly by the Secretary of the Interior, may make grants to States, monies collected in fiscal year 2001 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (25 U.S.C. 1308(m)), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended; Provided further, That such grants shall be subject to section 12.61 of the Council of Environmental Quality’s regulations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement and for any allegations of violation of such regulations, may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $97,478,000. Provided. That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations promulgated directly by the Secretary of the Interior, may make grants to States, monies collected in fiscal year 2001 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (25 U.S.C. 1308(m)), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended; Provided further, That such grants shall be subject to section 12.61 of the Council of Environmental Quality’s regulations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement and for any allegations of violation of such regulations, may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $97,478,000. Provided. That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations promulgated directly by the Secretary of the Interior, may make grants to States, monies collected in fiscal year 2001 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (25 U.S.C. 1308(m)), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended; Provided further, That such grants shall be subject to section 12.61 of the Council of Environmental Quality’s regulations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement and for any allegations of violation of such regulations, may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $97,478,000. Provided. That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations promulgated directly by the Secretary of the Interior, may make grants to States, monies collected in fiscal year 2001 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (25 U.S.C. 1308(m)), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended; Provided further, That such grants shall be subject to section 12.61 of the Council of Environmental Quality’s regulations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement and for any allegations of violation of such regulations, may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $97,478,000. Provided. That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations promulgated directly by the Secretary of the Interior, may make grants to States, monies collected in fiscal year 2001 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (25 U.S.C. 1308(m)), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended; Provided further, That such grants shall be subject to section 12.61 of the Council of Environmental Quality’s regulations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement and for any allegations of violation of such regulations, may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.
of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-413).

In the event any tribe returns appropriations made available by this Act to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for distribution on a per capita basis, or any other tribe shall not diminish the Federal Government’s trust responsibility to that tribe, or the government-to-government relationship between the United States and that tribe, or that tribe’s ability to access future appropriations.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds made available under this Act shall be paid to the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of any tribe having jurisdiction over a reservation in the State of Arizona, except that the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under Title I, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1231g et seq.), shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Arizona.

Appropriations made available in this Act or any other Act for funds provided by the Bureau of Indian Education, including funds available for the purpose of carrying out the requirements of sections 653 and 654 of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994, shall be paid to the Bureau, and are not available to the States, other than the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under Title I, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1231g et seq.), shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Arizona.

For expenses necessary for assistance to territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, $60,571,000, of which: (1) $55,076,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands; (2) $30,000,000 shall be available for operations, salaries and expenses of the Insular Affairs: Provided, That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such governmental expenditures and entitlements as are established or governed by such governments, may be audited by the General Accounting Office, at its discretion, in accordance with the provisions of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grant funding shall be provided according to those terms of the agreement among the governments under the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior, $62,466,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be for official reception and representation expenses and of which up to $1,000,000 shall be available for workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $40,196,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $26,086,000.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For operation of trust programs for Indian lands and expenses associated with determining and redistributing escalated interest in allotted lands by direct expenditure or cooperative agreement, $5,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds for trust management improvements may be transferred, as needed, to the Bureau of Indian Affairs “Operation of Indian Programs” account and to the Departmental Management “Salaries and Expenses” account: Provided further, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 2001, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantees: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the statute of limitations shall not commence to run on any claim, including any claim in litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, concerning losses to or mismanagement of trust funds, until the affected tribe or individual Indian has been furnished with an accounting of such funds from the tribe and the benefits determined whether there has been a loss: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not be required to provide a quiet title or perform any Indian trust account that has not had activity for at least 18 months and has a balance of $1.00 or less: Provided further, That the Secretary shall issue an annual account statement and maintain a record of any such accounts and shall permit the balance in each such account to be withdrawn upon the express written request of the account holder.

INDIAN LAND CONSOLIDATION

For implementation of a program for consolidation of fractional interests in Indian Land owned or held in trust for the purposes of determining and redistributing escalated interests in allotted lands by direct expenditure or cooperative agreement, $5,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement, which shall not be subject to Public law 93-638, as amended, with a tribe having jurisdiction to establish a reservation to implement the program to acquire fractional interests on behalf of such tribe:
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Provided further, That the Secretary may de- velop, coordinate and administer a system for the management of the areas designated by Congress to be emergency re- source assessment funds, for the conduct of offshore leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the President's moratorium state- ment of June 26, 1990, in the areas of north- ern, central, and southern California; the North Atlantic; Washington and Oregon; and the eastern Gulf of Mexico south of 26 de- grees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude.

S. 109. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities, on lands within the North Aleutian Basin planning area.

S. 110. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in the mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.

S. 111. Advance payments made under this title to Indian tribes, tribal organiza- tions, and tribal consortia pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) for services rendered by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consort- tium before such funds are expended for the purposes of the grant, compact, or annual funding agreement so long as such funds are—

(1) invested by the Indian tribe, tribal or- ganization, or consortium only in obliga- tions of the United States, or in obligations or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States, or mutual (or other) funds registered with the Securities and Ex- change Commission and which only invest in obligations of the United States or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States; or

(2) deposited only into accounts that are insured by an agency or instrumentality of the United States, or are fully collateralized to ensure protection of the funds, even in the event of a bank failure.

S. 112. Notwithstanding any other provi- sions of law, the National Park Service shall not develop or implement a reduced entrance fee program to accommodate non-local trav- el through a unit. The Secretary may pro- vide for and regulate local non-recreational passage through units of the National Park System, allowing each unit to develop guidelines and permits for such activity appro- priate to that unit.

S. 113. Refunds or rebates received on an option basis from a credit card services provider under the Department of the Inter- nes charge card programs, hereafter may
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Provided further, That the Secretary may de- velop, coordinate and administer a system for the management of the areas designated by Congress to be emergency re- resource assessment funds, for the conduct of offshore leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the President's moratorium state- ment of June 26, 1990, in the areas of north- ern, central, and southern California; the North Atlantic; Washington and Oregon; and the eastern Gulf of Mexico south of 26 de- grees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude.

S. 109. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities, on lands within the North Aleutian Basin planning area.

S. 110. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in the mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.

S. 111. Advance payments made under this title to Indian tribes, tribal organiza- tions, and tribal consortia pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) for services rendered by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consort- tium before such funds are expended for the purposes of the grant, compact, or annual funding agreement so long as such funds are—

(1) invested by the Indian tribe, tribal or- ganization, or consortium only in obliga- tions of the United States, or in obligations or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States, or mutual (or other) funds registered with the Securities and Ex- change Commission and which only invest in obligations of the United States or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States; or

(2) deposited only into accounts that are insured by an agency or instrumentality of the United States, or are fully collateralized to ensure protection of the funds, even in the event of a bank failure.

S. 112. Notwithstanding any other provi- sions of law, the National Park Service shall not develop or implement a reduced entrance fee program to accommodate non-local trav- el through a unit. The Secretary may pro- vide for and regulate local non-recreational passage through units of the National Park System, allowing each unit to develop guidelines and permits for such activity appro- priate to that unit.

S. 113. Refunds or rebates received on an option basis from a credit card services provider under the Department of the Inter- nes charge card programs, hereafter may
be deposited to and retained without fiscal year limitations, in the General Capital Fund established under 43 U.S.C. 1467 and used to fund management initiatives of general benefit to the Department of the Interior’s bureaus and offices as determined by the Secretary or his designee.

SEC. 114. Appropriations made in this title under the headings Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and any available unobligated balances from prior appropriations Acts made under the same headings, shall be available for expenditures to fulfill their environmental mandate pursuant to the Trust Management Improvement Project High Level Implementation Plan.

SEC. 115. Notwithstanding any provision of law, hereafter the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to negotiate and enter into agreements and leases, without regard to section 231 of chapter 314 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b), with any person, firm, association, organization, corporation, or governmental entity for all or part of the properties, or governmental entity for all or part of the properties, or governmental entity for all or part of the properties within Fort Baker administered by the Secretary as part of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The proceeds of the agreements or leases shall be retained by the Secretary, and such proceeds shall be available, without further appropriation, for the preservation, restoration, operation, maintenance and interpretation and related expenses incurred with respect to Fort Baker properties.

SEC. 116. A grazing permit or lease that expires (or is transferred) during fiscal year 2001 shall be reassessed under section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1732) or if applicable, sections 306 and 510 of the California Desert Protection Act (43 U.S.C. 410aa-50). The terms and conditions contained in the expiring permit or lease shall continue in effect under the new permit or lease until such time as the Secretary of the Interior completes processing of such permit or lease in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, at which time such permit or lease may be amended, modified, in whole or in part, to meet the requirements of such applicable laws and regulations. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to alter the Secretary’s statutory authority.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REGULA
Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 5, line 12, to offer an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGULA: On page 5, line 12 after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by $1,000,000 and increased by $1,000,000)."

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment decreases construction funding for the Escalante Science Center by $1,000,000 and increases funding for the National Trail Center in Casper, Wyoming, which we had an oversight on and had previously committed to do.

The Members involved in this switch are both in agreement with it, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE
Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. INSLEE: Page 49, beginning at line 23, strike section 116.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will strike section 116, which has a considerable anti-environmental impact both because of the way it was drawn and because of existing law, because basically the existing section of the bill, if allowed to stand, would essentially lock in the livestock levels and practices, on various areas that are leased, for grazing after the permit expires, after the lease has expired and after BLM and other agencies have made good faith attempts to improve the environmental activities in the grazing.

For instance, when a lease expires now, our Federal Government is charged with the responsibility of making sure that before there is a renewal that there is not overgrazing that occurs in the land or there is not erosion that occurs on the land.

Under existing law for the last probably 100 years, they had the right to do that, not subject to the unilateral decision-making by the permittee.

Unfortunately, the way this language is drafted in the existing proposed bill, it would allow the permittee to unilaterally, in a sense, insist on the continuation of the number of animals on the unit, of the uses and the practices on the unit, even to the extent one can have environmental damage. The way that is drafted, it essentially would turn the roll back to 1945, essentially would turn the roll back to 1945. It would be a fairly significant opening up and restriction of our agency's ability to fulfill their environmental mandate.

I also wanted to point out, and I presume the drafters of the language had some concern, that there would be some wholesale refusal or failure to simply reprocess these permits. But I have done some looking into it; and I found that, under existing laws, the agency ought to be able to handle these permits.

In the next year, about 1,600 permits will expire. They will have to do about 170 for previous years for under 2,000 permits. Last year, the agencies processed 3,847 permits.

So basically the agencies are capable of doing this. Our concern is that if we pass this language the way it was written, it will allow some permittees, some folks not all, but some to essentially prevent BLM from enforcing environmental laws by essentially saying, even though my permit is expired, I am going to force Uncle Sam to except however many animals I have had, and that we are going to keep those animals on even if my permit is expired as long as I keep this tied up in the courts.

I believe that is inconsistent with long-term practices and environmental law.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of his amendment because I think the language of the bill raises serious questions and concerns that go beyond the 1945 language. I am told, as is the gentleman from Washington, by the BLM that they do not need this provision and that they are capable of processing all of the grazing permits that will expire in the next fiscal year.

So I think for that simple reason alone, we ought to adopt this amendment and not get in the way of the
work that the BLM is doing on its own at this point.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) understand that the decision rests with BLM? This is permissive authority for them to deal with the problem in the event, for lack of resources, both monetary and manpower that they would not be able to address all of the permits that have an environmental consideration. We are simply giving them some latitude to make the decision, but they do not have to do this.

I do not think it gives the permittees any standing because they have to negotiate with BLM. This is language similar to what we had was negotiated with the President last year and just simply recognizing that the task was so huge they may not be able to effectively re-negotiate all of these permits within the time allocated.

The Chairman. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) has expired.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I think we have a significant drafting issue that I very much would encourage the Chair to look at because I have looked at it very carefully. There is quite a number of folks that have looked at it. I am very clear that the way the language is drafted at this time, it would allow the permittee to insist in the continuation of the lease for as long as this is an ongoing permit process. If that was the intention of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) to make this permissive or discretionary with the Bureau rather than mandatory to the permittee, I really believe we need some changes in the drafting. If that is the intention, I would perhaps encourage us to defer this for a few minutes so we could have that discussion. I really believe we need some drafting changes here.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, it is our understanding, and this was negotiated with the President and the BLM last year. We put the identical language in this year. We do not think it would be appropriate next year because it is our hope that the BLM will have the resources to process the expiring grazing permits in conformance with the court’s decision. Perhaps rather than remove it, we could change a word or two to give the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) some comfort to at least accomplish what we think is being the effect of the language.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, with the Chair’s permission, if we can find a parliamentary way to do this, table this for at least a few minutes while we have discussions in that regard, if the Chair would agree.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the parties here, if we could defer this amendment, I would ask unanimous consent to return to this section at some later point, and allow us to have a meeting of the minds on the language that accomplishes the objectives of all the parties.

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

There was no objection.

The Chairman. The amendment is withdrawn without prejudice and may be returned to at a later time in the pending.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Sec. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of reducing the backlog of Indian probate cases in the Department of the Interior, the hearing requirements of title 10 of chapter 25, United States Code, governing the appointment of a probate judge, and provisions of title 15, United States Code, governing the proceedings conducted by an Indian probate judge, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, for the purpose of reducing the backlog of Indian probate cases in the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 2001.

Provided, That the basic pay of an Indian probate judge so appointed may be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of Chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, governing the appointment of an individual to any office, or position in the competitive service, for such period of time as the Secretary determines necessary:

Sec. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to redistribute any Tribal Priority Allocation funds, including tribal base and set-aside funds, for the purpose of reducing the backlogs of Indian probate cases in the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 2001, by transferring funds to address identified, unmet needs, dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies. No tribe shall receive more than 10 percent in fiscal year 2001, under circumstances of dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies.

SEC. 119. None of the funds in this Act may be used to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in the Kankakee River basin that is inconsistent with the United States Army Corps of Engineers efforts to control flooding and siltation in that area. Written certification of consistency shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Natural Resources prior to such establishment.

SEC. 120. The Great Marsh Trail at the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia is hereby named for Joseph V. Gartlan, Jr. and shall hereafter be referred to in any law, document, or record of the United States as the "Joseph V. Gartlan, Jr. Great Marsh Trail."

Sec. 121. Funds appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for postsecondary schools for fiscal year 2001 shall be allocated among the schools proportionate to the unmet need of the schools as determined by the Postsecondary Funding Formula adopted by the Office of Indian Education Programs.
Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and also Mrs. Clark, our distinguished director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, for working with the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) and the other officials from that area.

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

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), by unanimous consent, Mr. OSE be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I promise the gentleman from California, one, that we will work to make sure that all commitments are kept by the administration, and, number two, that I am very interested in this, and I want to work with the gentleman and the other Members in that area in resolving this issue to the gentleman's satisfaction.

The most important point here is that the Fish and Wildlife Service understands the crucial importance of having adequate flood control and reliable flood control even in the context of this new wildlife refuge once it is created. So I think this is a good outcome. And I appreciate the gentleman's interest and will work with him to resolve this problem in a proper way.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments in the nature of a substitute on page 52, after line 15, add the following new section:

SEC. 301. The amounts otherwise provided by this title are reduced by $9,000,000.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

We are in agreement with this amendment. I think it reaches the intent of what we are trying to do on this committee, and that is to provide funding to match what the State of Florida is doing in land acquisition. This does not remove it, but rather ensures that the money that we have appropriated for all the taxpayers of the United States will be used to benefit a resource that is very valuable to the people of this Nation, namely: the Everglades National Park.

This goes to make sure that the money we appropriate goes to the kind of purpose that the constituents, the people of this Nation, would find very desirable. I commend the gentleman for the language, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, and I very much appreciate, as always, having the opportunity to work with him in a constructive way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY). The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the subcommittee, and I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington, and I look forward to resolving this appropriately.
Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment.

As the chairman, chair of the subcommittee refers to the Forest Service as the working man's country club, it is an everyday recreation area for tens of millions of Americans across the western United States.

I think that this body would agree, certainly including the members of this subcommittee, that our recreation needs on the Forest Service lands are not being met. There is an extraordinary backlog in trails and facilities maintenance. There is virtually no construction of new trails, with the exception of volunteer activities. Recreation is up phenomenally, and the Forest Service has no capability of dealing with it.

This amendment would take money from the petroleum and natural gas industries, the Department of Energy budget. I believe that those industries are quite capable on their own, particularly given the huge run-up we have seen recently in oil prices, in conducting the type of exploration I have described. I do not think that the Federal Government needs to be providing incentives for exploration and production for the oil industry.

Reservoir life extension and management? Certainly the industry, with these extraordinarily high oil prices and gas prices, has its own incentive plus huge tax breaks to invest in that area. Likewise, for exploration and production of natural gas.

I just met with my natural gas folks from the Northwest, and they said things are going swimmingly. They are drilling all sorts of new wells up in Canada and in parts of the United States and they did not give me any inkling that they needed a taxpayer subsidy to undertake very profitable exploration activities.

But we do know that we do not have enough money to fund everyday recreation needs of tens of millions of Americans in the western United States on Forest Service lands. So I think this would be a really great trade-off. Let us give average Americans a break, a subsidy to undertake very profitable exploration activities.

And when they get to the forests they find the facilities are overcrowded, outmoded, inadequate. They find their trails are blocked by downed trees. They find that the same areas they have been going to for 30 years are no longer maintained by the Forest Service. Sometimes the roads are gated because the Forest Service cannot afford to maintain them and do the work.

This is an amendment for average Americans. Let us give them a break today. Let us take their tax dollars and spend them on something they want, need and enjoy, and not give it as a subsidy to the petroleum and the gas industry.

I would urge Members to support my amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I agree with the gentleman that we need and can always use more money in the Forest Service recreation program. However, I do not want to do that at the expense of developing oil and gas technology.

We already know that the price of gasoline has soared to over $2 a gallon in some parts of the country; that we import more than 50 percent of our oil and it is estimated that this will rise to 64 percent by 2020. The only answer that we have is to improve the technology for producing oil in this country.

It is pretty well accepted in the industry that now we only get about 30 percent of the oil that is in the reservoir with today's technology. If we could double the amount of oil that is produced in a well, it does not take a lot of mathematics to figure out what it could do for the shortages that we are experiencing.

I think it is vitally important that we continue developing better technologies not only to increase production but also to reduce production costs. The more we produce onshore, the less we are subject to OPEC pricing. There is no question that the spike in oil prices, gasoline prices, and be related to the higher oil prices, has its own incentive for the oil industry.

We have recognized that they produce.

And it is estimated that this will rise to 64 percent by 2020. The only answer is the industry is to improve the technology for producing oil in this country.

If we have more funding available to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment be withdrawn and be permitted to be reoffered later during the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate and votes on the gentleman's amendment and all amendments thereto be temporarily put aside, without prejudice, and that it be the first order of new business after 9:30 this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment be withdrawn and be permitted to be reoffered later during the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate and votes on the gentleman's amendment and all amendments thereto be temporarily put aside, without prejudice, and that it be the first order of new business after 9:30 this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment be withdrawn and be permitted to be reoffered later during the bill?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate and votes on the gentleman's amendment and all amendments thereto be temporarily put aside, without prejudice, and that it be the first order of new business after 9:30 this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment be withdrawn and be permitted to be reoffered later during the bill?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLES II—RELATED AGENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and range 
land research as authorized by law, 
$224,966,000, to remain available until ex-
pended, as authorized by law: Provided, That 
none of the funds appropriated or otherwise 
amt available by this Act or otherwise 
available to the Secretary shall be used to 
carry out any activity related to the urban 
resources partnership or similar or successor 
programs.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Serv-
ice, not otherwise provided for, for manage-
ment, protection, improvement, and utiliza-
tion of the National Forest System, 
$1,207,545,000, to remain available until ex-
pended, which shall include 50 percent of all 
moneys received during prior fiscal years as 
fees collected under the Land and Water Con-
servation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, in 
accordance with section 4 of the Act (16 
U.S.C. 460l–8a(a)): Provided, That unobligated 
balances available at the start of fiscal year 
2001 shall be displayed by extended budget 
line item in the fiscal year 2002 budget jus-
tification.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an 
amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will des-
ignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
ows:

Amendment No. 35 offered by Mr. DeFazio:

Page 53, line 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $26,000,000)":

Page 57, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by $33,000,000)":

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE
...
and all of our land programs because that
is a very important asset to the
people of this Nation. We have in-
creased it by $25 million. Perhaps con-
ditions will be such that we can do
even more. But let us not do it at the
expense, as this amendment would pro-
pose, of crippling our oil and gas tech-
nology research.
For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I
oppose this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the last
word.

I join to oppose the DeFazio amend-
ment for the following reasons: How
dependent do we have to get on unsta-
ble parts of the world before it con-
cerns us? In my view, there is no issue
facing America more important than
energy self-sufficiency.

Just a year and a half ago we had $10
oil, and we had it for quite a while. We
became drunk on cheap oil in this
country. We had no energy policy, we
had no incentives for production in this
country, and our dependency continues
to grow.

In a few short months, unstable parts
of the world that we cannot trust sud-
denly engineered price increases that
tripled the price of oil will per barrel.
There is nothing to prevent them from
doubling it again. What would happen
to the American economy if oil became
$60 a barrel? It could devastate the
economy of this country.

I am not opposed to where the gen-
tleman is putting the money. I am very
pro recreation. But I cannot support
taking the money away from energy self-sufficiency when we have allowed
ourselves to become dependent on parts
of the world that we cannot trust, that
are unstable, and who care nothing
about our future. I believe it is very
poor public policy to take money out of
energy self-sufficiency, to take money
out of improving our own ability to
produce oil.

We are looking at sonification, where
we would double and triple the amount
of money that we would get out of ex-
isting old oil wells without drilling new
ones. We are looking at sonification
programs that have a lot of promise by
using soundwaves down the well hole
where we would drastically increase the
amount of oil we got out of those
wells, reviving many old wells in this
country.

Now, it needs a little more work. It
needs a little more research. Those are
the kind of projects we need to be deal-
ing with. Those are the kind of incen-
tives. There been no incentives in
this country.

$10 oil destroyed this country’s oil
business. We do not have rigs in this
country to drill. We have a fraction of
the rigs to drill wells that we used to.

We are on a course and the DeFazio
amendment will push us down that
road to where we will be dependent on
Iraq and Iran and countries like that
for our economic future, and it is ludi-
ous.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the
gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PE-
TERSON) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DEFAZIO and by
unanimous consent, Mr. PETERSON of
Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed
for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I
yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank
the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman
from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON)
really believe it is necessary for the
taxpayers of the United States to so-
licit the help of some foreign oil indus-
try, which is immensely profitable, is
price gouging, involved in supporting
OPEC in their price fixing, that we
need to give them taxpayer dollars to
increase their production to go back to
old reservoirs and get more produc-
tion?

Does the gentleman really believe
that? I mean, does he really believe
that they do not have an incentive
from the marketplace to go and do this,
we have to give them a taxpayer subsidy?

This is taxpayer dollars. We are
underfunding recreation which mil-
ions of Americans enjoy.

Yes, we need to become energy inde-
pendent. This is not about energy inde-
pendence. It is about subsidizing a
vastly profitable industry.

How much is $50 million? Is it 1
minute or 2 minutes’ profit for that in-
dustry.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr.
Chairman, reclaiming my time, the
gentleman absolutely misses the point.

With $60 oil, people are not going
to be able to afford to go on vacation,
people will not get out to have recreation,
people will not be running motorboats,
people will not be having vehicles out
there driving.

I want to tell my colleagues, if it
does not scare them when oil can go
from $10 a barrel to $32 a barrel in a
few short months because foreign coun-
tries like Iran and Iraq can manipulate
this country, if that does not scare my
colleagues in the future, I do not know
what does.

We have the ability in this country
in environmental and sound ways to
produce a lot more of our oil. If we
produce 60 percent of our oil instead of
48 percent of oil, we would be less de-
pendent on these unstable parts of the
world.

I think that is a greater threat to our
economic future and the defense of this
country than any other foreign power.
I think the energy crisis that is loom-
ing out there and our vulnerability to
it, and there is no reason that we can-
not have $40 oil in a month. We can
have $50 oil in 2 months. All they have
to do is slow down what they are doing
and we are vulnerable; and there is nothing we can do about it.

And until we become more self-suffi-
cient and get people we can purchase
oil from that are our friends that we
can trust, we better be investing in our
own security and our ability to produce
ergy.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I move
to strike the requisite number of
words.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gen-
tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PE-
TERSON), if I might, he is, of course, a
Republican; and I would imagine that he
is familiar with the 1997 Republican
budget resolution which touched on
this issue. So let me quote it for him.

This is from the Republican budget res-
olution of 1997:

“The Department of Energy has
spent billions of dollars on research
and development since the oil crisis in
1973 triggered this activity. Returns on
this investment have not been cost ef-
corative, particularly for applied re-
search and development, which indus-
try has ample incentive to undertake.”

I think that is the point that the gen-
tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is
trying to make.

Some of this activity is simply cor-
porate welfare for the oil, gas, and util-
ity industries. Much of it duplicates
what industry is already doing. Some
has gone to fund technology in which the
market has no interest.

That is not me. That is the Repub-
lican budget resolution of 1997 regard-
ing the Fossil Fuel Energy Research
and Development Program.

I do not often agree with the Repub-
lican budgeteers, but I think on this
one they are right.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr.
Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gen-
tleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr.
Chairman, I think it is an indictment
of the Clinton-Gore administration
with a complete lack of energy policy
and an inappropriate management of
research dollars. Yes, I think it is an
indictment of the last 5 years previous
to that of this administration, who had
had no energy policy and helped us be-
come dependent on foreign countries.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, re-
claiming my time, I really was not try-
ning to be partisan. My colleague can
attack Clinton and so forth.

The only point that I was making,
and I did not mean to be partisan, I
only meant to record for the RECORD
what the Republicans in 1997 said. And
I think what they said was appropriate.

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

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gen-
tleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, just re-
cently this body voted on a bill called
CARA, which would spend almost $4 billion annually on a lot of worthy causes. That money is to be generated from royalties on oil wells on Federal property.

What we are saying here, in part, is that it is incumbent on the Federal Government to support some research to make these wells even more productive to get more of the resource, which will support the CARA bill.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there is no argument with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) in the sense that we all want to be energy independent and that we want lower prices. No one is arguing about that.

I think the question is that we have an oil industry which some believe is already rigging the game and artificially raising prices; we have an oil industry today that makes billions and billions of dollars in profits. And some of us would ask, why are they not investing heavily into making more oil efficiently.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman previously spoke a lot about energy independence. I support energy independence with alternative energy, energy conservation, and a whole host of other things.

I did vote against the amendment to strike money from real investigation and real research earlier in energy efficiency on an amendment previously. But this is giving more money to the oil industry which is engaged with its OPEC partners in price fixing.

I wonder if the gentleman is a cosponsor to a bill to close the President, the Metcalf legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, to require the President to file a WTO complaint against their WTO illegal price-fixing activities.

They are proud of it. The president of Venezuela says, hey, we are restraining production, we are fixing prices, and we are sticking it to the Americans. And our President and this Congress is silent on the issue.

Giving $33 million to a multibillion-dollar industry, which is price fixing with overseas partners, is not good. Do my colleagues think they are not happy with the high price of oil? Do my colleagues think that this money is being spent to bring down the price of oil, $33 million would bring down the price of oil?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would simply say that, while we all want energy efficiency, providing corporate welfare to some of the largest and most profitable corporations in this country is not the way to go.

In a few moments, perhaps, I will be introducing legislation which increases funds for weatherization. Making homes of low-income and working people's homes more energy efficient is a lot better than paying billions of dollars in profits. And some of us would ask, why are they not in billions of dollars in profits. And some of us would ask, why are they not in billions of dollars in profits.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the two gentlemen on this side. In California, when we asked why in San Diego the prices were so high of gas, the oil industry said, because the market will bear it.

I think the oil companies are ripping us off. It would surprise the gentleman that some of us do believe that when we look at gas prices and what they are across this country.

We had a staged event out here with the truck drivers in this country. They are all going to go bankrupt. They cannot afford the gas prices to haul the products around this country.

So I do not disagree with the gentleman on that. I think we ought to have an investigation through the President on why these oil prices are fixed and are costing us so much.

I would object and I will not support the amendment of the gentleman, however, I will tell my colleagues why.

I also agree with the gentleman that there is a backlog in maintenance and everything else. My whole family used to go to Yosemite in California and the Redwoods. There are gated areas where we cannot go into the roads in San Diego for recreation areas, whether it is even horseback riding; they will not let us into those roads now.

But I would ask of the chairman of the committee, first of all, if there is this big backlog. I understand the President under the Antiquities Act put aside millions of acres in Utah; and our concern, and I see the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), we had a lengthy debate on this floor on the California desert plan. We lost that issue. The gentleman prevailed. But one of our concerns is, if we put all these acres into national monuments, into wilderness, where are we going to get the additional funds, especially since we are in backlog?

Now, we asked Secretary Babbitt what areas are they, at least, looking at under the Antiquities Act to nationalize all these millions of acres, most of them in the West, where more than 50 percent of the land is already owned by the Government? Do my colleagues know what the answer was when we asked him would he share where they are, at least, looking? The answer was, no.

So I would ask my colleagues that will support this presidential plan, up to 25 of these, where we are going to get the additional revenue, when we are already short, to nationalize all of these areas. I think it would be a mistake.

The area in Utah that the President nationalized into a park, if we take a look, it was one of the cleanest coal areas in the whole world. Well, the President nationalized that. The next week, we gave $60 million to China to crack coal. Guess who now has the monopoly on clean coal? Mr. James Riady. And guess where he cracks his coal? In China.

So we have a question, first of all, of where we want to take and do a back-log; but, on the other hand, they want to nationalize all these different areas. I think we do need more money for our forests and our parks and our recreations. I think some of that may be through a study to find out why these oil companies are gouging the American public. I think it is scandalous what they are doing.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this particular amendment. I think it is important for us to understand a little bit about the technology that arises from the research that the gentleman is seeking to take the funding from.

The technology that we are talking about is technology that the purpose of which is to make our oil fields more productive. As oil fields age, the production drops in these oil fields; and, of course, the royalties that accrue to governments drop along with it.

Also, what often happens then is that the ownership of these oil fields migrates from the large companies to small producers. The technologies that are developed as a consequence of this research are really intended to help the small producers as opposed to the large oil companies and to keep these small producers going.

What ends up happening usually is it extends the life of these fields. The consequence of that is that it often sustains the economy of those local areas. It protects the environment because instead of developing new oil reserves, they can utilize the oil reserves that are there. It increases the revenues that go to local governments and to State governments and even the revenues that come to the U.S. Treasury. They are the principal beneficiaries.

I happen to have a university in my district that has done some of the research. Biofilm research, associated with this technology. The consequence of the research that was done originally to try to get a better understanding of what caused oil fields to sour is a whole new area of biofilm that has had incredible benefits in the area of medicine, benefits in the areas of the environment, and is creating whole new industries and whole new jobs all as a consequence of this kind of research.

And so, I think it is important for us to understand that what we are talking about, what this gentleman is trying to take the dollars away from are not the big oil companies. They do not need...
Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETESEON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We have two oil companies in my district for the oil companies. Oil executives will tell you that they do not make any decisions based upon what their customers do. They make those commitments because they have to think in 10-year time lines, they have to think in billion dollar drilling rigs and they have to think in multi-billion dollar pipeline and they have to think in multi-billion dollar commitments around the world.

Did the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio) know that he could affect this whole industry with $35 million? These are people who are betting billions of dollars on a single rig, drilling in a thousand feet of water in some of the most hostile environments in the world, people who are deciding whether they are going to take a pipeline through the United States, through the Canal Zone, through Iran or Turkey, a wonderful place where it can be deployed immediately and it can be deployed immediately.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETESEON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This amendment does one of two things. Either this amendment stands between us and energy independence and non-energy independence, and this is the difference between $30 barrel oil and $60 barrel oil just shows a lack of understanding of the world oil market. Oil did not go above $30 a barrel a few weeks ago, a few months ago when we in California were paying $2 a gallon because they knew that they would drive down the world economy and they would lose their customers. You do not go to $60 a barrel because you can. Because you do, you turn off your customers. That is why they have got a range. They said they would go between 20 and 30 or 22 and 30 or 26 and 22. There is only one market in the world. There is only one price of oil in the world. We used to have a domestic market. Domestic producers produced at one price and foreign producers produced at another price. That does not happen anymore. The world price of oil is set once a day. That is the world price of oil. It does not matter if it comes from Texas, it does not matter if it comes from Saudi Arabia or if it comes from the former Soviet Union. That is the world price of oil. That world price of oil is managing very carefully. It is managed very carefully by those producing states because they have to have enough because they have high unemployment, terrible economies, they have got to keep showering money on their people, and not too high so that they turn off the rest of the world economies.

So let us not pretend like this amendment is the difference. We take 10 million barrels a day. That is 260 million gallons of gasoline a day. If you just took the 50 cents extra they charged on the people in Chicago and Michigan, they could pay all this research time and again. It is four times that amount.

I have the research facilities in my district for the oil companies. Oil executives will tell you that they do not make any decisions based upon what the United States Government does because they have to make such great commitments of capital that they cannot worry about our tax laws, our debt and our laws.

They make those commitments because they have to think in 10-year time lines, they have to think in billion dollar drilling rigs and they have to think in multi-billion dollar pipeline and they have to think in multi-billion dollar commitments around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This amendment does one
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
I understand it perfectly. I understand shut-in wells. I have shut-in wells all over California. We shut in the Bakersfield.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
Thirty dollar oil has not turned a lot of them on.

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

(On request of Mr. DEFAZIO, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
Mr. Chairman, we had oil that you could not give away and at the right price it became one of the most valuable fields in the entire State, in the entire Nation. I understand people shut in those wells. But let us not pretend that it is a lack of this research that shuts in those wells. People make an economic decision and that is the marketplace. I have been through this cycle. I have been through this with all of the oil companies in my district, with all of this research to inject. We have been through it in Prudhoe Bay. We have been up there, and we have talked to them about means to make the oil process more efficient. That is what the oil companies are doing, because it is in their interest to do the enhanced recovery, the tertiary recovery, all of those programs. That is what they are doing, it is in their interest, also. It is in their interest also to collect it from the mom and pops.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the DeFazio amendment. This amendment purports to benefit the National Forest Service by cutting $53 million from the Department of Energy’s fossil energy research activities.

In reality, this amendment will cut energy efficiency research.

Today, 70 percent of the electricity generated in this country comes from fossil fuels. Our nation’s demand for electricity will continue to increase with the rapid growth of our high tech economy.

Do we really want to cut funding for research that will allow us to use nonrenewable resources more efficiently? Do we really want to cut funding for research that will further reduce the impact of fossil energy on the environment?

The answer is no.

Funding for fossil energy research supports national laboratory and university efforts to improve the fuel efficiency and reduce the emissions of fossil energy facilities.

Although it does not fall under the budgetary category of “Energy Efficiency,” fossil energy research is, in reality, “energy efficiency” research relating to fossil fuels and fossil energy.

The United States is already benefiting from the improved efficiency and environmental protections of fossil energy research. For example, three-quarters of America’s coal-fired power plants use lower-pollution boilers developed through private sector collaboration with the Department of Energy.

Future research is expected to promise even greater benefits. Let’s not halt this kind of progress by cutting important fossil energy research.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against the DeFazio amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The amendment was rejected by a vote of 253-192. The amendment offered by Mr. HILL of Montana.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to H.R. 4578. The purpose of this amendment is to make a change within the economic action program of the State and private forstry appropriation. $500,000 should be reallocated to the national Forest Service from the bipartisan Recreation and Historic Preservation Act to establish a special project in support of the Traveler’s Rest site in Montana. These funds are to be issued to the Montana Community Development Corporation in the form of a direct lump sum payment to preserve and enhance the historical, archaeological and cultural values of the Traveler’s Rest site at Lolo, Montana. It is a very important project for local and rural development.

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss an issue which is of great importance not only to the State of South Dakota but to the entire Northern Great Plains ecosystem and that is the Rocky Mountain Research Station.

Mr. Chairman, the Rocky Mountain Research Station plays a vital role in solving resource problems in the several national grasslands and national forests found in the Northern Great Plains ecosystem.

This research station which focuses on managing prairies to sustain livestock and wildlife has been instrumental in decisions affecting wood production, stream flows and fire ecology research in order to provide forage for livestock and wildlife species. Therefore, it is vital that the Rocky Mountain Research Station receives the funding necessary to fulfill its mission in the year 2001.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior.
It is my understanding that the fiscal year 2001 funding for the United States Forest Service was the same level of funding that the Forest Service received in fiscal year 2000 plus inflation. Is that correct?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield, yes, that is correct.

Mr. THUNE. That would mean, therefore, that the fiscal year 2001 funding to operate the Forest Service research facility such as the Rocky Mountain Research Station in Rapid City, South Dakota at least at the same level as in fiscal year 2000 plus inflation; is that correct?

Mr. REGULA. Yes, it is correct.

Mr. THUNE. So is it accurate to state that the Committee on Appropriations intends for the Forest Service to fund the Rocky Mountain Research Station in Rapid City, South Dakota at least at the same level in fiscal year 2001 as it did in fiscal year 2000, that is, at least, very roughly, $356,000,000 plus inflation?

Mr. REGULA. Yes, that is the intent of the Committee on Appropriations. We agree that this is important research, which benefits citizens and the Nation at large.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), for clarifying that issue.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. WU

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 31 offered by Mr. WU

Page 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by $14,727,000) (increased by $14,727,000)".

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and I offer this amendment to increase the Fish and Wildlife Management account of the United States Forest Service by $14.7 million, which would bring the account to the administration's request.

As an offset, the Wu-Udall-Smith amendment reduces the forest products line item to $230 million, still $10 million above the administration's request.

Similar to the amendment that I offered last year with the gentlewoman from Ohio, this amendment is environmentally and fiscally responsible. Investing in forest, fish and wildlife will help us mitigate for past poor management and balance timber harvest with wildlife conservation.

Briefly, we believe in sustainable timber harvest and in preserving fish and wildlife, both for aesthetic purposes and to permit harvest, then vote for this amendment. If we want to cut and run and leave my hunting and fishing buddies without either a job or a place to fish and hunt, then oppose this amendment.

Unless we take adequate steps now to protect watersheds, fish and wildlife, the courts will block further timber harvest in the future.

With more and more species listed as endangered or threatened, we jeopardize the future of timber. The Wu-Smith-Udall amendment strikes a balance between timber harvest, fish, and wildlife.

By redirecting funds to programs that improve the health of our Nation's forests, we protect the future of our Nation's resources. We need a fiscally responsible and environmentally sound approach to managing our Federal forests. The Wu-Udall-Smith amendment is just that, a bipartisan and common sense approach.

Our amendment is both environmentally and fiscally responsible. As a hunter and fisherman, I care deeply about the future of our forests, as well as the health of our forest products industry. The administration requested $220 million for timber sales management and the subcommittee funded it at $245 million. Meanwhile, the fish and wildlife account was underfunded by $14.7 million.

Our amendment restores fish and wildlife habitat funding to the administration requests $10 million above the administration's requests for timber harvest purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility, vote for a commitment to fish and wildlife, vote for the Wu-Udall-Smith amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) about increasing wildlife and watershed funding. But I would point out that the reduction of the amount available for timber sales has a couple pretty serious impacts.

First of all, surprisingly the gentleman may not agree with this, but it as an antienvironment amendment. I say that because much of this funding goes into thinning overstocked stands, enhancing habitat values, reducing dangers of wildfires and tree mortality caused by insects or disease.

One of the things we tried to do in the committee is ensure that there is good management of the forest. We must thin them, take care of insects, disease, etc., and I think one of the reasons we have had these severe fires is that we have not had adequate management of the forests, and the result is we get an enormous fuel buildup on the floor of the forest. When those fires do occur, they tend to be much hotter and much more destructive than if we were able to do thinning, if we were able to do removal of dead and insect-ridden trees.

We have reduced the sales, as the gentleman knows. When the Republicans took over the House, we were at about 12 billion board feet, and I authorized sales. Now we are at 3.6–7 percent reduction. I think we reflect the American public who puts great value on the forests. But on the other hand, we must have adequate funding to manage these forests.

Of course, if we reduce the funding, it results in a decrease of something like $30 million in receipts to local government. Something that is overlooked is that local governments get a lot of benefit out of the forests, from the production of wood fiber. And for all of these reasons, I do not think given the fact that we in the committee have tried to be responsible in providing an adequate amount of money on the advice of the forestry division to manage the sales of 3.6 billion board feet, as a practical matter, we probably will not get over about 2.5. I think it is a mistake to reduce the amount and we have tried to be conservative to begin with in the amount that is available. While we can always provide more for wildlife and watershed funding, keep in mind that good forest management is really important to wildlife habitat, really important to watershed protection. We have tried to put that funding in an adequate level to do that.

I would hope that the gentleman would reconsider withdrawing the amendment. I think the gentleman has made his point. But I would simply say that working with the minority, with the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks), who has a good understanding of the forest needs. We have tried to have a responsible number here in what we have allocated for forest management.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in support of this amendment.

I do want to acknowledge the good work of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu). I think his points are very well made. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) pointed out that this is really a balanced and moderate amendment. What it does is, it moves $14.7 million from the forest products line, and it adds it to the fish and wildlife habitat management line.

The effect of the amendment is to add additional funds to maintain this critical fish and wildlife habitat that we all support. It is additionally important to note that the forest products line item remains at $10 million over the administration's request if this amendment passes; and then at the same time, concurrently, the wildlife fish and habitat management account will be at the requested level.

This is a balanced and moderate amendment. By restoring $14 million to fish and wildlife, we ensure timber harvest for the long term. We also provide
more jobs by investing in the wildlife of our forests today. So I think this is a responsible way to go. It is balanced and it is moderate.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, his State has a lot of forests, and I think the gentleman would agree that management of these forests is probably a very vital responsibility of the Forest Service. It does take adequate funding to do that and, perhaps, we should have more. But this is the best we can do, given the allocation that was available to us.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Reclaiming my time, again, when I look at the numbers, Mr. Chairman, it seems to be that we are 50 percent above the budget allocation to the Forest Service. We have increased the amount available to them in this upcoming fiscal year; and yet we are also doing more directed at our wildlife in making sure that the forest is preserved in such a way that the wildlife also have an opportunity to thrive.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) is certainly well-intentioned, but in the wrong direction. Earlier this year, I asked for $9 million in the supplemental, because I felt the Forest Service had insufficient funding to deal with storm recovery problems all across this Nation, including the disastrous storm that struck the Boundary Waters Canoe area in northern Minnesota in my district, blowing down 450,000 acres of trees, 6 million cords of wood, and we have a calamity on our hands. We do not have enough money in the Forest Service budget to deal with this problem.

But beyond the eighth district of Minnesota is 65 million acres of national forest land in a severe health crisis, high risk of wildfire disease and insect infestation. In the first 6 months of this year, 1.2 million acres of public lands had been consumed by wildfire.

In the previous 10-year average, that was 719,000 acres by this time. We are more than 50 percent above the 10-year average in wildfires primarily because of these problems of forest health. To cut these funds would cut the ability of professional foresters to manage the renewable resource of this Nation, our forestry, to manage the ability of our forests to continue to absorb carbon dioxide and return oxygen to the atmosphere, to keep our air clean, but also to provide jobs and economic stability for communities that are dependent upon those national forests.

And these forests pay for themselves in revenues returned to the Federal Government. The timber program generates over $300 million a year in tax revenue. The net contribution to the national economy is over $25 billion a year from these public lands that provide a balance in the public interests; and in our State of Minnesota, that is a $1.3 billion industry, forestry and allied products. 38,000 jobs in Minnesota, value of the products shipped, $7.2 billion.

Now, it is not all dependent on U.S. forest lands, but those forest lands are the cornerstone of our whole forestry program. The more those forest lands are cut back, and we have already had the road lists program that was announced last year, which we fought out on this floor and opposed, we already had cutbacks. We have already had rare 1, rare 2, rare 3. We have already had more lands added to wilderness, and I am for wilderness; but when we take it out of living forests and deny people job opportunities and livelihoods of community, we are squeezing us too hard.

And when we put that pressure on the public lands, it shifts over to the less well-managed lesser available private forestry lands. I would say well, this is $15 million, but this will take us below the President's budget, which is below what we need.

I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) of our subcommittee, for adding the resources to that we can manage these public resources in the best public interest. Do not take a short-sighted view. A forest is forever.

Trees that were blown down in the boundary waters a year ago this summer, a year ago this July, were saplings at the time of the Civil War; managed well, they can last for another 150 years. I urge this body to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Wu. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that the account for timber sales management remains at $10 million above the administration request; and that with respect to blowdown and other nongreen trees, there is a separate account for salvage purposes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, I would just say to these gentlemen, I know how these budgets work. We cut $15 million here, then we have to shift that money someplace. So it is going to come out of the hide of the resources that I have just addressed, and so I really cannot agree. We must oppose this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Wu. Mr. Chairman, I would like to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of passage of the Wu-Smith-Udall amendment which shifts $14.7 million to the fish and wildlife habitat conservation line item from the forest products line item within the budget of the U.S. Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula), has tried very hard within the budget constraints to allocate sufficient monies for programs within the jurisdiction of his subcommittee. It is a very tough balancing act.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations I found how hard it was to write our bill. Last year the Congress passed my State authorization bill which is now law and it too was a balancing act—287 pages of disparate provisions and allocations. So I emphasize.

But in response to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Obergstar), there is more money not less, but more federal dollars, as my friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu), just pointed out. The pending legislation includes an additional $10 million more than the President's request for the Forest Service line item, the timber sales management program. Our amendment retains that plus up but shifts another $14.7 over to the fish and wildlife programs. It is a reasonable and environmentally sound redirection of scarce resources. It is fiscal prudent. And it deserves support.

June 14, 2000
Mr. Chairman, I have always been a believer in balance and fairness. I believe in balance and fairness. I was the guru, the genius, who really said you have to use control fires; and, frankly, so, again, we are going to have a crisis in the West, and it has been pointed out here. We have six billion board feet that were cut out the diseased trees while leaving the large majestic trees while leaving the large majestic fire resistant forest and better wildlife habitat. It is a carbon sink. It takes the CO\textsubscript{2} out of the air, which we are worrying about. An old dying forest life was not there.

Where do you find grouse in the woods? Where do you find deer, wild turkey, and song birds? Where the forest has been adequately pruned and the forest is healthy. Somebody else mentioned, you do not hear much about it, a fast growing forest that is growing fast and has been pruned is a carbon dioxide sink. It takes the CO\textsubscript{2} out of the air, which we are worrying about. An old dying forest adds CO\textsubscript{2} to the air and adds to the air pollution. Not a healthy, well-mature, well-managed growing forest. The Forest Service has 200 million acres. They have the wilderness and the roadless areas. We have made sure that the President’s plan. I grew up as a youngster, I camped out in the forest more than I did anything else. I have always loved nature and wildlife will be extinct without the most important thing to fish and wildlife management. A healthy forest is the most important thing to fish and wildlife management, and we do not have a healthy forest in this country, nor do we have a healthy forest in the West and parts of other States, especially in view of the importance of wildlife management, and we do not have a healthy forest in this country. It is also a job creator.

Our forest is a valuable resource for this country. It is also a job creator. We have never even talked about the economics. But areas that are basically owned by the Federal Government, there has been no dependency, because the Federal Government, you cannot depend on it to adequately market any amount of timber. Many counties in the West and parts of other States, their economies have been decimated, and for no good reason.

We can manage our forests, we can prune them properly, we can enhance wildlife habitat, and we can do it without the gentleman’s amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This is an unfortunate and uninformed amendment, especially in view of the importance of the timber sale program to preventing the tragedies like we recently saw in Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Contrary to the myth created by some in the environmental community that cutting timber harms the environment, today’s Federal timber sale program is a critical and cost-effective tool for reducing fire risk, improving wildlife habitat and protecting communities.

Let me give Members an example. Last summer I visited a timber sale in the fire-prone forests of Northern California. The purpose of the sale was to reduce the risk of fire on 2,000 acres of forest and return the forest to a more natural state. The strategy was to thin the undergrowth in undesirable fire trees while leaving the large majestic Ponderosa pines. The result was a more fire resistant forest and better wildlife habitat.
This result was achieved through a timber sale contract, a contract that simply thinned the forests of the most undesirable fire-prone trees, a timber sale contract that reduced fire risk and created greater need than we are addressing, elsewhere, rather than take it away from the people that obviously have a greater need than we are addressing, given the fact that we have more than 40 million acres of our National Forests that are subject to high risk of catastrophic wildfire.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make very, very clear that what I am standing up for is not just good fish and wildlife management, but good long-term forestry management. But there is one issue that I want to take off the table.

That is that there is a lot of discussion today about fires on forest land. I understand the concern. I am completely sympathetic to it. I just want to point out to the gentleman and to the prior speaker that there is more than $600 million in the Department of Agriculture funds to prevent wildfires and address wildfires if they occur. Separately, there is $227 million in the Department of the Interior budget to address wildfires and to suppress wildfires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Goodlatte) has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLATTE was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows those funds are available for the purpose of fighting the fires once they get started, or for other fire prevention methods.

But the best way to long-term prevent that catastrophic and to improve the wildlife habitat and the general condition of the forest is to have a viable timber sale program, geared in the new directions of the Forest Service, to use that program to thin these areas that are exposed to very high risk.

While I join with the gentleman in his interest in making sure that wildlife habitat is promoted, taking this money from one fund that promotes that wildlife habitat and putting it into another does not achieve that, whereas working with the chairman to first exercise this fund and then look for additional help, as the ranking Democrat also proposed, that is a better way to proceed.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the Wu, Smith, and Udall amendment. I also believe we should invest wisely in our National Forest resources, but I have a different view on how to accomplish this worthy goal.

Clearly this amendment puts thousands of forestry jobs at risk and jeopardized the economic stability of rural communities such as Northern Michigan.

I want to speak about a larger issue. The amendment claims to be concerned with an extensive backlog of fish and wildlife habitat needs. However, this singular approach is misguided. The real backlog is in the overall forest management, the backlog of improvement projects needed to restore forests to their natural condition.

Fish and wildlife habitat is an important part of forest restoration. Many of us in Congress are aware of the tremendous accumulation of forest fuels on our public lands. Poor forest conditions are a major contributor to larger forest fires, like the recent fire in New Mexico. It is estimated that 65 million acres of our National Forests are currently at risk of catastrophic wildfire, insect infestation, and disease.

While there may be a large backlog of watershed and wildlife habitat restoration needs, there is even a larger national backlog of general forest restoration work.

This amendment is a contradiction. It is proposed to focus solely on fish and wildlife program funding and fail to address the broader forest health crisis that currently exists on our National forest lands. In fact, it is impossible to separate the two goals.

Large-scale watershed and wildlife habitat improvement activities are certainly needed. A lot of work is needed in the removal of massive amounts of wood that currently is a fire hazard on Federal lands.

The rationale that the forest products line item is excessive is simply false. In spite of what others may have us believe, timber sales are not bad. Modern timber sales are a necessary tool and an economic means to an environmentally beneficial end. Professional foresters can develop silvicultural prescriptions and design timber sales to accomplish fish and wildlife restoration objectives.

It certainly would be nice to have many funds for fish and wildlife programs. There certainly is a lot of good work to be done in the woods. But increasing fish and wildlife habitat management funds at the expense of forest products would be a serious mistake. It is unreasonable. Indeed, it would be wrong. It would be wrong to take these funds from Forest Service timber programs. Such a change is misguided and would only serve to hurt both programs in the long run.

These funds are needed to protect the forest product line, to counter inflation, and pay the salaries of people who work in the woods preparing and administering timber sales. Reducing the capacity of the Forest Service to prepare these timber sales would ultimately be detrimental to fish and wildlife habitat.

Timber sales are often of the most effective way to achieve vegetation management objectives. An example of this work is thinning dense forest stands to reduce fire risk and intensity of catastrophic fire by removing excessive forest fuels, and create desired wildlife habitat. Removing excess wood from the forest...
lands improves the long-term health of watersheds and protects fish and wildlife habitat.

A broad forest health strategy and a variety of tools are needed to effectively meet this challenge. Prescribed fire is one tool, but there are many constraints and dangers that limit the use of fire, as we have seen in the catastrophic fire at Los Alamos.

Removing flammable wood requires the use of many tools, including properly planned timber sales. Well-designed timber sales are a good way to remove large amounts of dead, dying, or overmature wood from our accessible public lands.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for increasing the account for timber sales. Let us not cut the timber sales. Let us have a holistic approach to our National Forests.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the passion that we see on both sides of this issue. I simply want to say that I understand the good intentions of the gentleman who offers the amendment. He is very concerned about a very important cluster of programs.

But I think the problem we face here tonight is that we are seeing efforts to move very small amounts of money around from one program to another. It sort of depends on what kind of district you come from, whether you think that is a good idea or not. If you come from a district like mine, which is heavily dependent upon a broad understanding of multiple use, so that forest lands are used for economic production, so that they are used for recreation, so that they are used for wildfire protection, one view of this amendment. If one comes from a different kind of district, one has quite another.

I would urge Members to oppose the amendment because we are not going to fix the wildfire problems in this country by taking a few million dollars out of the forestry program. The real problem is that we need more money in all of these programs, whether it is land acquisition or forestry management or anything else, because the majority at this hour has chosen a significant amount of its resources to providing tax cuts, most of which are aimed at very high-income people, the richest 1 percent or 2 percent, so everything else that this Nation tries to do suffers. That is at the end of the problem with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members to remember that, and I would urge Members in the end, after efforts are made to reflect Members' various districts' differences, I would urge Members to vote against this bill because it is inadequate to meet the Nation's needs on a whole host of fronts, and I would urge rejection of this amendment in the process.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am hopeful that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) will in the end withdraw this amendment. I know that he sincerely believes that the timber management regimen. It is incredibly important that we have the dollars to do that. I urge the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

I think it is important for us to remember that this bill increases the wildlife and fish habitat management funds by about $6 million over last year's funding level. It is about a 5 percent increase over last year's budget. It only increases the timber sales management by $8 million, which is about 21/2 percent increase over the last year budget.

In other words, the amount of increase for the wildlife and fish habitat management fund is twofold as much as what the gentleman offers. This is the amount or money that is offered for the timber sale.

I think it is important also for us to remember that the dollars in this budget are not going to be enough dollars for us to meet the targeted timber harvest that the bill calls for. It is not even going to come close to enough money. We have not been meeting these targets. These are targets that Congress has determined are necessary for us in order to manage the forests.

The events of the last few weeks that others have talked about, the fires at Los Alamos, in Arizona, in California. In my home State of Montana, demonstrate the increasing risks that we have to fires in our Western National Forests.

What the forest supervisors will tell us if we go talk to them is that the biomass in these forests and the threat of fire is at the highest that they have been, ever in their lives. The kinds of fires that we are going to have are going to be more intense, they are going to be more destructive than the fires that we have experienced in the past. The General Accounting Office points out and says that 40 million acres in the Western National Forests are at risk of catastrophic fire. This is over 20 percent of the National Forests that we have in this Nation.

When we talk about catastrophic fire, we are talking about an environmental catastrophe. When we talk about the destruction of soils, we are talking about the destruction of water-sheds, and we are talking about the destruction of wildlife. It means we are not going to be able to do the things that the gentleman claims to seek to protect with his amendment.

We have already cut timber sales in this country by 80 percent. These are having huge impacts on rural communities. I know the gentleman's district has been impacted as well. We have lost $1.500 jobs in Lincoln County, Montana, alone, a county of 10,000 people.

The consequence of this has been the huge loss of revenues to the local governments. At the same time, the people who live in these communities have lost their jobs, the schools in those districts who depend on the timber receipts have lost their revenues, the counties have lost their revenues, and the local hospitals have lost their revenues. Teachers have been laid off, counties have been required to cut back their budgets, at a time when we desperately need to manage this resource and to thin these forests.

The Government Accounting Office says we need to spend $750 million a year for the next 25 years to restore the health of these forests. This bill is $500 million short of what it is going to take just to get us on track. So at this level, we are going to lose ground. It means the risk is going to be even worse than the risk is today.

That means the intensity of these fires is going to go up, not down. It means they are going to destroy more habitat, not less. It means they are going to destroy more watershed, not less. It is going to destroy more fisheries, not less.

While I know the gentleman's intention is to preserve wildlife and habitat, and I agree with him, and he has heard the chairman of the subcommittee and he has heard the ranking member say that he is willing to work for more funds for his purpose, and I support him in that, let us not do it by taking it from this necessary and important area.

We need to mechanically manage these forests to get them to the stage that we can reintroduce fire as a management regimen. It is incredibly important that we have the dollars to do that. I urge the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), had
it about right. That is that we are arguing over a pot of money here that in and of itself does not cure either problem. That is that we still will not deal with that account with the urgency which it is due.

The problem with this amendment is that it is different in different parts of the country. I would invite colleagues to come to the Sierra and look at the watershed there and see that we are in continued decline in those great mountains from activities that have taken place in the last several years, and many years ago.

We cannot have been able to restore habitat. We still have not been able to restore water quality.

In fact, they all continue to be in decline. The very species that have already been listed continue to be in decline so it is not about recovery. That is why this money is so urgently needed in the fish and wildlife account.

That is why the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) felt it was necessary to offer this amendment. It is not as though this would leave the forestry account naked because, in fact, it puts the forestry account back to what the administration requested, and several million dollars above last year's level so that they can continue.

It is not like the investment in the forestry account has been the best deal for the American taxpayers. From 1995 to 1997, we spent $1.2 billion to administer, and we got back $126 million. We lost almost $900 million administering this forest program.

The suggestion is that one is either for forest health if they want to cut trees or one is against it if they want to do fish and wildlife habitat. The fact of the matter is that both of these are tools of forest management. Habitat restoration is part of forest management, as is forest health. But this leaves the salvage accounts that are used in forest health intact. It leaves the wild lands fires account intact, and it allows us to address some of the most urgent needs where we continue to have these watersheds, habitat, and species in decline.

The bottom line is this, our budget may be in surplus but our society is not. We have argued now appropriation bill after appropriation bill where the needs, the urgent needs, for those who are from States with great forest resources, are telling us we need $750 million a year, and we are arguing over $14 million. We are arguing over $14 million.

So we have a society that is in great deficits. When HHS was out here earlier in the day, we were arguing over the lack of being able to provide a decent education to children, to be able to provide good educational students, all of which are in deficits.

We walk around pulling our suspenders and talking about a surplus. Well, this is a deficit account here, both on the forestry side and on the fish and wildlife side, but the more urgent account in this particular case happens to be fish and wildlife because the decline is continuing and that threatens the economy; that threatens the ability of commercial fishermen; that threatens the forest health in a grander scale and then comes back and calls for more people to limit the logging. So we should support the Wu-Smith-Udall amendment.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, for two to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have here some charts that I think really tell a story very graphically. The first one here is the USDA Forest Service, acres harvested. There was 213 acres thinned and acres burned, and what we see here is the difference of what is going on in our forests in terms of acres harvested versus those that are burned.

The next picture I show, Mr. Chairman, is from my district, the Upper Grand. That is not snow we see there. That is ash. That is from a fire in 1996.

This particular part of my district was slated to have a timber management sale. That sale was let and then appealed. No harvest took place.

Mr. Chairman, this area then burned. Do we want to talk about fish habitat? Do we want to talk about fish habitat? After this forest fire occurred in my district, this is riparian area, this was a stream. This was the next major rain, and 30 miles of salmon habitat were destroyed.

Now, why does that matter in the course of this debate? It matters because we are not taking good care of our forests. As the General Accounting Office said in their report right here about western national forests, we believe the threats and costs associated with increasing uncontrollable catastrophic fires, together with the urgent need for action to avoid them, make them the most serious immediate problem related to the health of national forests in the interior West.

We also believe the activities planned by the Forest Service may not be sufficient and may not be completed during the estimated 10 to 25 year window of opportunity remaining for effective action before damage from uncontrollable wild fires becomes widespread.

The tinderbox that is now the interior West we cannot wait that long for a cohesive strategy.

Mr. Chairman, there was another fire in my district this summer, 113 acres near Sun River, Oregon. I quote from the local newspaper there, the fire started in a 75 acre stand of unthinned trees and consumed it, according to the Deschutes National Forest spokesman, but when the flames were blown into a 30 acre area to the northeast that had been thinned fire fighters stopped it. Fire fighters credited the quick control of the fire to the stands that had been thinned as a part of a recent timber sale, thereby reducing its intensity and allowing the crews to get the upper hand.

Both of these programs are important to us, as we manage these forest lands, Mr. Chairman, and this is not an amendment that should be adopted to shift these funds.

Frankly, my colleague and friend from Oregon should recognize when he has a good deal, and the deal he has is the Wu-Smith-Udall amendment. He has this timber management program to stop this kind of catastrophic fire, at least help with the timber sales and prevent that from occurring, and he has gotten a commitment from the ranking member of this subcommittee and the subcommittee chairman to work for the funds we need for fish habitat improvement as well.

I will say, I have not been around this process a long time but that sounds like a pretty good deal that I think my colleague would be wise to accept and withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, more than half of the timber sales on Forest Service lands are about stewardship purposes. They are to thin, because the biggest problem we have is disease and overstocking. Since 1999 we have done one heck of a job of putting out forest fires and we have reduced, as we heard the ranking Democrat say on the Northwest Forest Plan, an extraordinary level of harvest down to a very, very low level we have reduced.

These fires burn. One cannot tell which way they are going when one is in them.

Mr. Chairman, our forests are choking. Our communities are hurting. I represent people in counties that if they were in an urban setting one would say are oppressed, because 70, 75 percent of the lands around them are Federal lands. They live in these neighborhoods. They produce the timber from these forests. These fires are as real in northeastern Oregon as they are in New Mexico.

Let us not move this amount of money around and take money away from the timber sale program. Let us do both. Let us defeat the Wu amendment or hopefully have it withdrawn, which would be the better course of action, Mr. Chairman.

With that, I would urge a no vote on the amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the environmentally and fiscally wise...
amendment from my colleague from New Jersey, my colleague the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu), and my colleague from Colorado (Mr. Udall). The Wu-Smith-Udall amendment adds, as we have heard, $14.7 million to the fish and wildlife management line of the Forest Service.

Yes, both of the programs that we are talking about here are important, but what we want to do is to establish some balance. How did this come about? The administration requested $220 million for the forest products account, what used to be called timber harvest, and the committee gave the Forest Service $245 million, an increase of $25 million above what the agency requested.

Meanwhile, the committee funded the valuable wildlife and fish habitat management restoration. $14.7 million below the administration request.

Now, fish and wildlife management sorely needs an increase in funding. Of course, they both do. For years, this fish and wildlife program has been underfunded. At the forest level, biologists are scarce and are involved in planning and NEPA work and are frequently unable to do the on-the-ground work that needs to be done.

Now on the other hand, there is evidence that the Forest Service timber program is not cost effective. According to the GAO, the program costs the American taxpayer over $2 billion from 1992 to 1997. The Forest Service estimates that this year recreational jobs will account for 77 percent of the national forest employment, whereas timber-related jobs will account for only 2.3 percent.

The Wu-Smith-Udall amendment is not only a statement of fiscal responsibility, it is a commitment to preserving our resources. Without the Wu-Smith-Udall amendment, the current funding levels for fish and wildlife habitat will result in the loss of hundreds of miles of fish habitat restoration and thousands of acres of wildlife habitat restoration.

The head of the Forest Service, Chief Dombeck, has changed the focus of the Forest Service. He has done a great job in promoting a sustainable supply of timber, while promoting conservation and habitat restoration.

The Wu-Smith-Udall amendment is consistent with Chief Dombeck's leadership in continuing a future and sustainable supply of timber, while maintaining a habitat necessary for healthy fishruns and for healthy stocks of wildlife.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong disapproval of this amendment. I think we have heard a great deal tonight. We have heard about the President's budget, and it is obvious that that budget does not understand or does not want to realize the benefits of timber management.

The zero cut philosophy will get us somewhere where we do not want to be. Our timber has been managed for hundreds of years by wildfire. We have suppressed those wildfires in this century pretty successfully, so now we have a ladder of trash, we have a very unhealthy forest and it is susceptible to cataclysmic fire. We saw that in New Mexico.

If the forest is not going to be treated with wildfire, and we do not want to do that, it is dangerous, it has to be treated somehow. The underbrush has to be removed. There has to be harvesting. This resource has to be managed.

Our forests are one of the greatest resources that have been left to this country, and we need to use our best judgment to manage them.

This amendment does not use good judgment. It pulls $14 million away from sound programs to manage our forest resource. As we manage that resource, as has been said earlier this evening, we will provide fish and wildlife habitat. Every time there is a cataclysmic fire, it destroys that fish and wildlife habitat and it destroys it for two or three generations.

So by properly using these stewardship cuts to improve our forest stand, we will get the economic benefit of the removed trees. We will have a safer stand. It will not be as susceptible to fire. It will grow more rapidly. It will absorb more carbon dioxide. That is a win/win.

Our chairman has offered to work with the other side on the budget for fish and wildlife. Let us stop trying to take a sound program out of the forest management program.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, there is $297 million already allocated in the Department of Interior for fire suppression and for thinning activities and additionally there is over $900 million allocated for fire suppression and thinning activities under the Department of Agriculture funds. So every speaker is coming up and talking about fire, and this is just a smokescreen for bad forestry practices of the past. That is something that we were trying to correct with this amendment. We should take the fire issue off the table because that is funded separately in this bill.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I could not disagree more. The $500 million the gentleman is talking about is a transposition. This is fire prevention. $14 million, if it prevents a fire, we will not have to spend that other money. That is good management. Fire cannot be taken off the table here because fire is a result of a poorly managed forest, and this is money to properly manage our forests.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would note the Pennsylvania delegation is slightly out of order.

We have, almost have the deck chairs on the Titanic arranged through this debate, and that is interesting, because as a number of people who have spoken before me have said quite truthfully, there is not an adequate amount of money in the Forest Service budget to perform its many diverse functions.

Mr. Chairman, I offered earlier an amendment to increase the recreation budget. We earlier had an amendment to take $4 million out of the wild horse management program from a gentleman from New Mexico.

This amendment, in the past, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) and before that Ms. Furse and others have offered amendments similar to this; but in those amendments, they actually cut the Forest Service budget. From those amendments, they actually transferred the money to other agencies or transferred money to deficit reduction.

Tonight the amendment before us is trying to divide a pie which is too small. It is trying to decide whether we should undertake crucial activities on the wildlife side. If we do not fulfill those functions and those activities, we will not be harvesting any timber anywhere because we will not be meeting the needs of the forests as a healthy ecosystem.

On the other side, we have the Forest Service struggling to implement in my region the Clinton forest plan, and we are in gridlock again. If fact, I have asked the Clinton administration to begin an early plan update because I believe the plan has failed. It has failed both to protect old growth and to deliver what it said would be predictable supplies of timber.

So the question becomes on this amendment, what can we do. Well, unfortunately, we are slicing up and dicng up the pie into little bits and pieces. The amendment of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) will leave an increase of $10 million in the account for timber harvesting. It will transfer some money to another underfunded account.
This is a difficult choice for those of us who live in areas more than half owned by the Federal Government, somewhere who represents a district like mine that has been formerly the most public timber-dependent district in the United States.

So the question becomes, what should we do here? I am going to recommend that this amendment is not going to break the forest gridlock. It is not going to resolve the controversies. It is not going to be an incredible setback for the Forest Service on the timber management side. There are other monies that have been allocated to the committee by other forms of vegetation management. I am certain in conference they can move some of those funds around. I am certain that they can deliver on the promise they made to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu).

We will both better fund wildlife and better fund reasonable timber management. But I do not think unless a change is made here tonight that necessarily, that problem will be fulfilled. I believe, if this amendment passes, we will get more money for both accounts when we come out of the conference committee. So I will support the amendment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, certainly every Member of this House has a right to weigh in on issues no matter how they fail to affect that particular Member's district. Just as I do not claim any authority over the boroughs of New York City, so too I think it is important that we understand precisely what it is we are talking about. We are talking about jobs. But more importantly, we are talking about forest health.

I have heard some interesting claims tonight. One of my friends from California again says we need more and more and more and more money; and yet this House, against the better judgment of some of us, enacted CARA, calling for an additional $900 million a year over the next 15 years to purchase even more land.

I would invite my friends from the east coast metropolises and also those who hail from coastal districts from the West in urban areas to come visit the Sixteenth Congressional District of Arizona to understand the very clear and present forest fire danger that exists because we fail to employ effective forest management techniques.

Oh, we do have one rallying cry that comes from the inner cities of the East. Over 30 years ago, the cry “burn, baby, burn” has now been inflicted into this debate, because people seem to think let us let the forests go up in smoke; that is the way one controls this renewable resource. That is wrong.

This amendment, though well intentioned, is wrong, because it does not protect the fish and wildlife its sponsors would purport to protect. It, instead, sets up a situation for ecological disaster.

Those of my colleagues who say they embrace the notion of balance and ecological principles, Mr. Chairman, I implore my friends on the left to withdraw this amendment, to work in a constructive way with the ranking member of his subcommittee and the subcommittee chairman, to strike that true balance.

While, again, everyone is entitled to their own opinion, and we certainly re-
homes, we have got to be willing to spend the necessary funds to be sure that we properly manage the forests.

Now, I have talked to the district forester that manages and oversees the four national forests in east Texas. I can tell my colleagues that, when we talk about reducing funding for forest management, it gets his attention, because he knows that it takes personnel and it takes equipment and it takes time to go out and properly manage a forest.

There are some here tonight who criticize the cost of management of our national forests even to go so far as to suggest that it costs more to manage the forests than we get in harvestable commercial timber. Well, the truth of the matter is we may manage our forest well and it may cost a lot, but I will tell you, my colleagues, there is a whole lot of regulations that our national forests have to abide by in management of those forests.

I, frankly, as a private forest land owner only wish that I could afford to manage my property the same way that the Federal Government manages our national forest, because the amount of control and regulation and attention to detail that takes place in the management of our national forest far exceeds anything that I see going on in the private sector.

But the bottom line here for me is that this amendment and any future effort to cut funding for the management of our forest directly affects the school children in my congressional districts, because as we all know, 25 percent of the proceeds of the sale of timber goes to the school districts in our respective congressional districts.

I know personally firsthand the hardship that has been placed upon many of our school teachers and the disadvantages that it has placed the school children in those districts from the reduction of harvesting from our national forest.

There is a piece of legislation that passed this House that is now pending in the Senate that is designed to try to help that situation. I hope that when that bill comes back, we will all support it. But in the meantime, we do not need to be reducing funding for the management of our national forest.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words. The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words. The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman why we do not just go ahead and vote on this amendment. Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word. The CHAIRMAN. I believe we have to vote on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum was not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 49 to offer an amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGULA

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 49 to offer an amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

Amendment offered by Mr. REGULA

On page 49 line 24 strike "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may" and on page 50 line 5 strike "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may at the discretion of the Secretary."

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reflects an agreement between the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and myself on an amendment, and I urge the Members to support it.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).
Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his fine work on clean coal and other alternative fuels over the past years. Mr. Chairman, the articles I referred to above are as follows:

(From the New York Times, June 14, 2000)

In Gas Prices, Mischief and Mystery
Costs in Midwest Exceed $2 a Gallon

By Pam Belluck

CHICAGO, June 14—It is so expensive in the Midwest that a retired railroad worker in Cleveland says he had to cancel his annual summer drive to visit his daughter in San Francisco.

A volunteer agency that delivers meals to shut-ins in Milwaukee cannot afford to pay its drivers enough to fill their tanks.

A florist in Urbana, Ill., is talking about raising what he charges to deliver roses and carnations.

And in suburban Chicago, Kathy Stachnik says she is shopping for gas in the now-jaundiced 1997 Honda Accord an "evil necessity."

"Whenever I stand at the pumps these days, I'm just furious," said Ms. Stachnik, 38, as she bought gas at about $2.30 an gallon in Arlington Heights for $2.25 a gallon. "I know that something fishy is going on with these prices."

Gasoline prices in the Midwest have risen sharply in recent weeks, jumping as much as 50 cents a gallon and far outstripping increases in the rest of the country. In Chicago and Milwaukee, drivers are paying more than $2 a gallon, the first time prices have ever soared that high in the United States, analysts say.

In recent days, the federal government has been trying to determine why the prices in the Midwest have risen so steeply. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Energy Department met with oil refiners on Monday in Washington. And the Clinton administration and the House Judiciary Committee have asked the Federal Trade Commission to look into possible price gouging or collusion.

"We don't have good explanations," said Robert Perciasepe, the environmental agency's assistant administrator for air and pollution programs. "We're not seeing this anywhere else in the country."

Gas prices increased across the country in the last few weeks as the summer driving season began. Gasoline inventories are being depleted, and new requirements for cleaner burning gasoline became effective on June 1. But the spikes in the Midwest are especially steep.

On Friday, the most recent day for which figures are available, the average price of self-serve regular gasoline in Chicago was $2.13 a gallon, up from $1.37 a gallon in January, according to Trilby Lundberg, an analyst who compiles the Lundberg Survey of gas station prices. By comparison, prices on Long Island averaged $1.67 a gallon last week, up from $1.39 in January. And prices in Los Angeles averaged $1.56 a gallon in June, up from $1.29 in January.

Industry representatives say the price increases in the Midwest are a result of several factors.

The most significant, they say, is the new federal requirement for cleaner-burning gasoline, known as RFG-2. In the Midwest, unlike in other regions, the additive oil refineries use to meet the new standard is di-cylohexylamine. That means the regulations is ethanol. Because ethanol evaporates quickly it requires a special for-

mulation of gasoline, said Edward H. Murphy, general manager for downstream operations at the American Petroleum Institute an industry group.

"It's more difficult to produce that gasoline," Mr. Murphy said. "As a result, production is significantly lower."

Another factor, industry officials say, was the rupture in March of a Texas pipeline that Midwest refineries depended on for the supply. The pipeline was repaired two weeks later, but it is still operating at only 80 percent capacity.

A third factor is a court ruling that the Unocal Corporation can collect royalties on a particular type of cleaner-burning fuel. That has prompted smaller refineries to curtail RFG-2 production to avoid paying royalties to Unocal, industry analysts say.

"In a situation where supplies are tight, and you have relatively inelastic demand for gasoline, the price increase you need that occurs in the market is disproportionately large," said Mr. Murphy, who said some refineries had said that the price increase they paid for crude reserves for biofuels should be redirected toward biofuels programs. "In a situation where supplies are tight, you don't adjust very quickly in a very short term. Obviously you don't go out and trade in your brand new Ford Excursion for a Toyota Camry."

Officials at the Environmental Protection Agency and the Energy Department acknowledge that all these factors play a role in increasing gas prices nationwide. But they say none is sufficient to account for the precipitous price jumps in cities like Chicago and Milwaukee.

"All of these may have some impact but they don't seem to explain the size of the disparity," Mr. Perciasepe said. For example, he said the cost of producing cleaner gasoline with ethanol should lead to only about a 5 cent to 8 cent increase in gas prices. "Whether people are taking advance-

age of some of these situations is something that we hope to be able to understand bet-

ter."

A senior official at the Energy Department said although the situation is tight in the Midwest, "we weren't persuaded by the arguments of the refiniers. Generally speaking, all of the large suppliers say they have adequate supplies to serve the demand."

The official added, "It has the administrato-

on very concerned, obviously."

Sam Stratman, a spokesman for the House Judiciary Committee and its chairman, Rep-

resentative Henry J. Hyde, Republican of Il-

inois, said that oil companies had years to prepare for the increased costs of the RFG-

2 regulations.

"This is a complicated issue," Mr. Stratman said. "It deals with issues of supply and demand and regulatory changes mandated by E.P.A., and you wonder, have these changes given oil companies a chance to pass on costs to consumers?"

Of course, Americans still have the lowest gas prices in the world. The Organization of petroleum Exporting Countries, which control over half of the global oil supply, meet next week to decide on whether to in-

crease production.

Although the prices in Chicago and Mil-

waukee are the highest in the country they are still lower than gas prices were at their peak in March 1981, when the national average price of a gallon of gasoline was $2.67, if adjusted for inflation, Mr. Lundberg said. That is hardly comforting to beleaguered drivers across the Midwest these days.
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[From the Toledo Blade, June 13, 2000]

GASOLINE PRICE SURGE SHOCKS TOLEDO DRIVERS

Alex Alvarado filled up his gas tank just in time yesterday, saving big bucks. Most were not so lucky.

By lunchtime, gasoline prices around Toledo had surged to $1.86 or more for regular-grade gasoline and more than $2 for premium gasoline—an unexpected price jump at many stations.
The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 35 offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 15-minute vote followed by a 5-minute period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 249, not voting 13, as follows:

---
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MESSRS. THORNBERY, REYES, TERRY, HINOJOA, RODRIGUEZ and TOOMEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

MESSRS. HOEFFEL, SALMON, ROHRBACHER and HOYER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. WU

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote followed by a 5-minute period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 249, not voting 12, as follows:
Mr. SPRATT changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows: On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(an additional $2,000,000, to be available to the Department of Interior for the acquisition of Cat Island, Mississippi)." On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(reduced by $2,000,000)." Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have an agreement on the amendment. The CHAIRMAN. There is no objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows: On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(an additional $2,000,000, to be available to the Department of Interior for the acquisition of Cat Island, Mississippi)." On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(reduced by $2,000,000)." Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows: On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(an additional $2,000,000, to be available to the Department of Interior for the acquisition of Cat Island, Mississippi)." On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(reduced by $2,000,000)." Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows: On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(an additional $2,000,000, to be available to the Department of Interior for the acquisition of Cat Island, Mississippi)." On page 69, line 13, after the figure insert "(reduced by $2,000,000)."
amendment, which deals with the pressing need for fish and wildlife habitat protection and restoration within the National Forest System. Thank you and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak about what seems like an annual ritual. We are now in the thick of theappropriations process and that can mean only one thing. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have sharpened their pencils and are loading up budget bills with legislative riders that surrender our environment to special interests.

There riders not only threaten important environmental and public health protections, but they subvert the democratic process by trying to force through legislative changes without the benefit of hearings or public scrutiny.

I am calling on my colleagues and the public to demand an end to this yearly assault on our precious natural resources and our open form of government.

I would like to highlight a few of the attacks within the FY 2001 House Interior Appropriations that is before us today.

One rider would prohibit any spending on national monuments developed after 1999. Among the monuments affected are the Grand Canyon-Parashant, Giant Sequoia, Agua Fria and the California Coastal National Monuments. The monuments were created by the Administration to strengthen protection of these unique federal lands.

Apparently, for some, it is not important to protect our land.

Another rider would effectively prevent agencies from implementing the American Heritage Rivers Program. This is a program where the federal government provides help to river communities looking for backing on environmental and economic development projects. This program helps communities improve water quality.

Apparently, for some, it is not important to help communities.

Another rider within the bill would block federal agencies funded within the bill from action on global warming. This rider is not even needed because the Administration does not intend to implement the Protocol prior to congressional ratification. The President is continuing to work on international negotiations on this important treaty.

Apparently, for some the climate is not important.

Finally, besides the various riders, the bill does not adequately fund many programs at the levels needed to carry them out. One such program is the President's Land Legacy Initiative. This appropriation bill places these important conservation programs in jeopardy by rejecting the President's request for a permanent funding source. This program is also drastically under-funded. As a result, federal land conservation efforts to protect national treasures, such as the Everglades, the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail and various Civil War Battlefields are in jeopardy.

Apparently, for some, our national treasures are not important.

Well, for many, including people in central New Jersey, our national treasures, our constitution, our communities and our land are important. I urge all of my colleagues to reject these anti-environmental riders that threaten our environment and our democracy.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to any amendment that strikes language currently in the Interior Appropriations legislation for Fiscal Year 2000. I oppose any bill that allows any federal funds to be used on national monuments created since 1999. I support Mr. HANSEN's effort in the Interior Appropriations bill to bring accountability back to the Administration's use of the 1906 Antiquities Act.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has spent too much time in the last few months reacting to monument designations after unilateral declaration by the Administration.

When Secretary Babbitt first announced his desire to create a higher protective status on lands in the Arizona Strip region, he agreed to work legislatively on a proposal to protect the historic uses of this area. After his announcement, I worked closely with local residents, elected officials, tribal officials, conservationists in the region, as well as the Governor, federal land managers, the recognizes and the State Lands, Minerals and Game and Fish departments to develop legislation reflecting the Secretary's publicly stated objectives.

On August 5, 1999, I introduced H.R. 2795, the Shiwits Plateau National Conservation Area Establishment Act. The original intent of the legislation was to initiate a dialogue with the Secretary, particularly considering the Secretary had not outlined his ideas in any form of legislation.

On January 11, 2000, after months of negotiating, the President, with the Secretary's recommendation, walked into Arizona and declared two national monuments, the Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument in northern Arizona and the Agua Fria National Monument north of Phoenix.

In regard to the Agua Fria National Monument, the Secretary first made public his proposal to create a more restrictive status for the area just four months before the actual monument designation.

The original intent of the 1906 Antiquities Act was protect small areas of land and specific items of archaeological, scientific, or historic importance in imminent danger of destruction. While the Administration contends that the areas designated as national monuments are threatened by increasing development and recreation, the government controls the development which occurs on these lands and has the authority to address problems if and when they exist.

Frankly, the Administration's decision to preempt any action by Congress is political. No reasonable public process has been used to secure public input on the merits of these designations and no environmental assessments have been done. The designations are occurring without any formal public input as mandated by NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, by highlighting these lands as national monuments, the President is merely calling more attention to the areas and significantly increasing recreation and visitation and jeopardizing the very resources he is attempting to protect. I urge my fellow members to reject this amendment to remove language in the Interior Appropriations language to prohibit funds to be used on any national monuments created since 1999. Congress has already spent too much time reacting to the unilateral declaration of such monuments.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today in support of H.R. 4578, the Interior appropriations bill and wishes to particularly thank the chairman of the Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the ranking member, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) for their hard work on the bill.

This Member understands that the Members of the Subcommittee were extremely limited by the 302(b) allocation received and as a result were forced to make tough spending decisions. However, this Member is pleased that continued funding was made available for the next phase of construction of the replacement facility for the existing Indian Health Service hospital in Winnebago, Nebraska. As the members of the Subcommittee know, this on-going project has a long and difficult history, and the Subcommittee's support is greatly appreciated.

In closing Mr. Chairman, this Member wishes to acknowledge and express his most sincere appreciation for the extraordinary assistance that Chairman REGULA, the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee staff have provided thus far on this important project and urges his colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE), having resumed the chair; Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2966

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as cosponsor of H.R. 2966.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order
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