

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, July 11, 1997

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 11, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable VINCE SNOWBARGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful as individuals and as a people that we live without the threat of war and without the threat of conquest and we are at peace. O gracious God, as we express our gratitude for the security we enjoy, we remember those men and women of our Armed Forces who in peace or war protect the welfare of all citizens. May they see in their mission as peacemakers a ministry to the people of our land and may Your blessing, O God, that is new every morning be with them and their families now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain twelve 1-minutes on each side.

TRIBUTE TO PEGGY YOUNG

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my good friend Peggy Young, who is retiring tonight as the museum director at the Museum of Aviation in Warner Robins, GA.

When Peggy retires this evening, she will leave as her legacy an aviation museum that ranks as the second largest in the Air Force, a far cry from its humble beginnings only 15 years ago with no building, two aircraft, and only \$20 in the bank.

Under Peggy's leadership, the Museum of Aviation has grown into a world-class museum complex that covers 43 acres, has over 85 aircraft on display, and hosts nearly a half million families, historians, and aviation enthusiasts each year.

As Peggy says good-bye tonight to the museum she literally helped build from the ground up, she leaves behind a living testament to her personal character and professional abilities.

Congratulations to Peggy, and her husband Bob, on a job well done. Thanks for your contribution to your community, your State, and your country.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leader's newest motto is "Listen, learn and lead," and in a way the Republicans are following that motto.

They are listening to millionaires and powerful corporations who want huge tax breaks. They are learning how to provide clever tax loopholes to their rich friends, and they are leading this country down a road that will allow tax giveaways for the rich while working families struggle.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats want to provide real tax relief for working families. Under the Republican bill, 15 million working families, working families, will get no tax relief. Democrats want to help those families. Under the Republican bill, college students will be hit with new taxes. Democrats want to make college more affordable.

Mr. Speaker, I propose today a new motto for the Republican leader: Listen, learn, and let the Democrats lead.

TRIBUTE TO TOM CLOSSER

(Mr. NEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago we lost a great individual in Tom Closser. He was a good friend of mine who served the people of eastern Ohio admirably and effectively for years, and he will be greatly missed.

Tom was born in Yorkville, OH, in 1937. He moved down the river to Marietta in 1969. Since then he worked to improve the entire Appalachian region in Ohio. He was president of the Eastern Ohio Development Alliance and a trustee of the Appalachian Development Corp.

He is survived by his wife Loretta Closser, who he married in 1965, two daughters, Cynthia and Leslie, a sister, a cousin, and a granddaughter Lauren.

My heartfelt sympathy and condolences go out to everyone who knew and loved Thomas Closser. He worked for the people every single day to improve their lives. He will be truly missed, Mr. Speaker, by all of us in eastern Ohio.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL SHOWS BENEFITS ON THE RICH

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is already starting. The Wall Street Journal this morning tells the wealthy what to do. Ready, get set, here is how to profit from your big cut in capital gains. What the Journal describes is how the rich can manipulate

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

their income so they avoid paying the same tax rate that wage earning Americans pay every day of their life; how the rich can pay a 20-percent rate while those who are getting a paycheck every day pay a 28-percent rate on their income; how they can manipulate their stock dividends so as not to pay ordinary tax on their dividend income; how to avoid paying estate taxes even though the estate taxes are going to be reduced.

What the Republican bill does is shower these benefits on the wealthy of America while denying hard-working families even the right to the child tax credit. What they are saying to millions of working families who get up every morning, go to work, they work hard they just do not make a lot of money, that they are not going to share the benefits of this tax bill with those families because they have given too much to the wealthy and there is just not enough left over for wage earners in America.

CLINTON CONSIDERS TEACHERS AMONG THE RICH

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton White House and people like the gentleman who just spoke have criticized Congress' tax cut plans as unfair because they say that the richest 20 percent of the country will get most of the tax relief. Most Americans think of the rich as people like Bill Gates and Michael Jordan. In Clinton's plan it only takes a family income of \$56,000 per year to be in the top 20 percent of the earners, or the rich.

According to the 1996 census, millions of working families who would never consider themselves rich by any measure are in Clinton's top 20 percent: 2.4 million elementary and school teachers, over half; 1.7 million union members, one out of every 10; 8.1 million Federal, State and local government workers; 120,000 editors and reporters, almost half; 4.2 million mechanics, repairmen, construction workers have family incomes considered rich by the standards of the gentleman that just spoke here.

These are precisely the people who deserve the bulk of the tax cuts. Congress wants to make sure they receive those cuts. It is time for Bill Clinton and his cohorts in the Congress to stop misleading the American people.

GUILTY, GUILTY, GUILTY

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, when the IRS takes the taxpayer into civil court, the taxpayer is considered

guilty, guilty, guilty. Unbelievable in America, where you are innocent until proven guilty. Not with the IRS. You are guilty, guilty, guilty.

And the IRS says, even though 97 percent of the American people want the burden of proof changes in a civil tax case, they say "no," it will cost too much money, Congress.

Let me submit here, if we applied the IRS thinking to the Constitution, the IRS would throw out the Bill of Rights. I think it is time to tell the IRS, "Audit this." Cosponsor H.R. 367; take our government back. Taxpayers shall be innocent. If the IRS takes them to court, they should have the facts to do so.

AMERICANS SHOULD LOOK AT THE RECORD

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, every single morning we are treated to a litany of speeches from the other side talking about Republican plans to cut taxes as being a tax cut for the rich, and I sometimes think that people mistake volume for sincerity because when we look at the record of what a Democrat Congress versus a Republican Congress has done, it is clear who is on the side of working families.

For 40 years they controlled this Chamber. When they took over, American families' tax rates were about 10 percent. When they left a few years ago, we had the highest taxes in the history of America. And in one Congress, this Republican Congress has repeatedly passed tax cuts for working families.

Who are the rich that they keep talking about? They are talking about teachers and truck drivers and foundry workers. When we look at the record as to who really stands for expanding the welfare state, we know it is the other side. We are the side that believes in expanding people's checkbooks, expanding their take-home money.

THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION TAX PROPOSAL WILL HELP WORKING FAMILIES

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little outnumbered on our side. We will have to get reinforcements.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand up and say that I disagree with the one-minutes from the other side because you do not need to be a Harvard Law School or business graduate to know what is happening in the Republican tax bill, but let me talk about how important the educational tax cuts are in

both the President's plan and also in the Democratic alternative.

There are a lot of people in this country who are middle-class, who make \$30,000 a year, and yet their kids are not eligible for Pell Grants. But the President's plan and also the Democratic plan, with the educational tax cuts proposal, would help those people make sure that the next generation has the opportunity to go to college. We are not talking about wealthy folks. We are talking about average working folks who go to work every day, maybe a school teacher who makes \$30,000 a year, with two children at home having to go to college. That is what we are talking about, and that is why the Republican plan is so wrong. Hopefully, the conference committee will correct this.

WHO BENEFITS FROM THE TAX RELIEF PACKAGE?

(Mr. PAPPAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, much of the debate over this tax relief package has been about the question of who benefits. Leaving aside the obvious point that all Americans benefit from a growing economy, I would like to draw your attention to this chart.

This chart uses official statistics from the Joint Committee on Taxation. I would ask the other side to admit that, yes, the Joint Committee on Taxation is bipartisan. This chart scores the tax relief over the next 5 years. This chart shows that 76 percent of the tax relief goes to middle-class taxpayers, those earning incomes between \$20,000 a year and \$75,000 a year. I would like to repeat that fact.

Scored by the official bipartisan committee in Congress to judge these questions, 76 percent of the tax relief goes to middle-class taxpayers, in this case defined as those who earn between \$20,000 and \$75,000 a year.

I ask liberals on the other side to show me where the Joint Committee on Taxation numbers are wrong. Show me how these numbers are in any way misleading. Who will step forward?

FAMILY ECONOMIC INCOME

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, ever wonder what the Family Economic Income of the President is? Let us see. The President's salary is about \$200,000 a year. But then the Treasury Department's calculates his income is actually a lot more than that, even if it is not.

□ 0945

For example, they say we need to add something called imputed rental income to real income. Imputed rental

income is income we would get if we rented out the house that we own.

Now normally the Treasury Department would add something like \$10,000 to the President's income for renting out the White House and carrying that as income, but the Treasury Department officials are not so sure what to do now since they know that the Lincoln bedroom can be rented out for over \$400,000 a year, so they are really not sure how to score it.

And then they have other problems as well. They have not a clue as to how much to score the President's White-water property for imputed income purposes, and then there is the huge question mark about how much foreign money should go under unreported and underreported income category.

I guess the Treasury Department needs to take another look at this family income economic income.

MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES DESERVE THE CHILD TAX CREDIT

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the prior gentleman asked about challenging the information from the Joint Committee on Taxation. The fact of the matter is, very plainly, is that the Joint Committee on Taxation analysis only analyzes the first 5 years of a 10-year program that the Republicans have put together. Their tax cuts for the wealthy are phased in so that their analysis is only that first 5 years, and then they hide their tax cuts for the wealthy in the later years.

I rise today to respond to inaccurate claims by my Republican colleagues that Americans receiving the earned income tax credit are on welfare. Let me tell my colleagues the story of a young police officer from Georgia, just starting out, \$23,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a man who protects our kids, patrols our streets, risks his life every single day to keep our communities safe, yet the Republicans say that he is not worthy of their child tax credit simply because he and his family do not make a lot of money. They actually accuse him and his family of being on welfare. Shame on them.

This is a man who goes to work every day, who pays taxes, whether it is Federal taxes or payroll taxes. All he knows is there is less money in his pocket.

Let us focus this tax proposal on working middle-class families in this country, not the wealthy.

GET RICH QUICK—CALL THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, when the Democrats refer to this mythical tax cut for the rich, I wonder if they have ever thought about running infomercials. Better than the typical "get rich quick" scheme, all one has to do is dial the Treasury Department at 202-622-0120 and they too can have the Democrats declare that they are rich and undertaxed overnight.

That number, again, 202-622-0120. Treasury operators are standing by. Tell them the income, and, presto, they will double it. If someone thinks they are only making \$45,000 a year, think again. The Treasury Department says it looks like \$75,000 to them.

Cannot qualify for that new credit card? Cannot afford a night in the Lincoln bedroom? No problem. The secret is in an obscure Treasury Department manipulation called family economic income. That is right, family economic income. It is like being in a higher tax bracket but without all the extra income.

Do not delay, this get rich quick offer ends soon, and it is brought to us by the same people who make the currency. Act now, the Treasury Department is standing by at 202-622-0120.

DEMOCRATS WOULD TURN TAX CUTS INTO A WELFARE PROGRAM

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have not been listening to Rush Limbaugh this week, but I can only guess how much fun he is having making fun of the other side right now. I am not sure if we could make up anything more ridiculous than what I have been hearing from the left. Only liberal Democrats can possibly turn tax cuts into another welfare program. I guess Rush really does not have to work that hard to get new material. There is always another liberal outrage just around the corner.

Here they are complaining that people who pay no Federal income tax, big goose egg on the old 1040, Mr. Speaker, complaining that these people are somehow getting cheated because they cannot get welfare money from a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, this is the mother of all welfare schemes, and if this is what the "New Democrat" is all about, then give me back the old ones.

Can the President be serious that he wants working people to be stuck with a couple of billion dollars more welfare payments? Well, this is truly a bizarre way of increasing welfare spending.

TAX RELIEF FOR HARD-WORKING AMERICANS

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this and did not intend to speak on this particular subject.

Talk about class warfare, 50 percent of American workers pay more FICA than they do income tax, that big goose egg on the 1040 of which the gentleman speaks, 50 percent. But they are not Republican types because they are not making over \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$75,000 like all of us are. Everybody in this Chamber, are we not big deals?

But let me tell my colleagues about my three kids working and paying more FICA, and let me tell them something if they do not think these people need relief, trying to get a house and buy a car and do what we want them to do. Hard-working Americans, not our crowd, not the big bucks guys that my Republican colleagues want to give the big tax cuts to that bust the budget in the second 10 years and do exactly what they did in 1981, create \$4.5 trillion dollars of new debt for working Americans to pay.

Yes, we want to give relief to hard-working Americans who pay taxes.

LET US RID THE WORLD OF LANDMINES

(Mr. QUINN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful to talk about something that is not quite as partisan this morning. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits I rise this morning to talk to our colleagues about the devastating effect of landmines. Throughout the world hundreds of innocent civilians are maimed and killed each week by landmines, and I wonder if our colleagues know that at the current time there are over 110 million landmines buried in the earth. We also know that landmines have wounded almost 300 UN and NATO troops in Bosnia alone. It is obvious that these weapons extract a terrible toll on all humanity.

Fortunately the United States has an opportunity to ban these menacing weapons. Later this year over 95 countries from around the world will meet in Ottawa, Canada to sign a treaty banning these landmines forever. In the United States we believe all of us have the greatest economic, military, and moral influence of any Nation on Earth, and it is imperative we make a commitment to get rid of these landmines.

That is why the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and I, along with over 160 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle, have asked the President to join that Ottawa treaty. Our legislation has the backing of the Catholic church's Conference of Bishops, the

Vietnam Veterans Foundation, and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf. We ask our colleagues to join us in this important matter.

EVERYONE IN AMERICA IS RICH ACCORDING TO THE LIBERALS

(Mr. THUNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, liberals have a funny way of figuring out who is wealthy. They say that 21.2 million Americans make more than \$75,000 a year. But the Census Bureau says only 11 million people earn that much. So who are we going to believe?

Well, here is how liberals come up with numbers. They are not looking at take home pay, they are not looking at how much money is available at the end of the month to pay bills, they are adding all the things they take out of one's paycheck. Here is what they are adding, considering part of one's income:

First, one's adjusted gross income; the money taken out of the paycheck for IRA and Keogh deductions, the money taken out of the check for social security, the money taken out of the check for pensions, the money taken out of the check for life insurance. They are even adding the money one pays in rent every month.

Now I do not know about my colleagues, but the last time I wrote out a rent check it felt more like an expense than income.

Now add all these things up, and everyone in America is rich, and that is funny because most people in America do not feel very rich after they pay bills every month. That is why we Republicans are working to give working Americans, not rich Americans, tax cuts, their first tax cuts in 16 years.

WE SHOULD NOT CHARGE GRADUATE STUDENTS TAXES ON MONEY THEY DO NOT EARN

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing some creative accounting on the other side. They are saying American families who earn \$25,000 a year do not pay taxes so they should not get a child tax credit.

They do pay taxes, and they should be entitled to a credit; a rookie cop, a beginning teacher.

But let us talk about real creative stuff on their side. They want to tax people who do not have earnings. Graduate students would have to pay taxes on their tuition waivers under a little provision they stuck into this bill.

Now if someone were a graduate student, they would give you a stipend of \$300 or \$400 a month, but they get a

\$5,000 relief from their tuition. The Republicans are saying, "You should pay taxes on that \$5,000 you don't get." Now what kind of opportunity is that?

This is such a bad idea that the last time this provision of law expired, I sponsored legislation to fix this problem, and even Ronald Reagan agreed that we should not charge graduate students taxes on money they do not earn. But the Republicans have stuck it in this bill to help pay for tax cuts for corporations and for the wealthy. That is outrageous.

GOVERNMENT'S POWER TO TAKE AWAY OUR DREAMS HAS GROWN TOO GREAT

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, few issues are more closely linked to the idea of freedom than taxation. America is a land of opportunity, but it can only be so if people are free from a government that stands in the way of individuals pursuing their own dreams. Families who came to America as immigrants earlier in this century may have arrived penniless, but they knew that through hard work in our country the sky was the limit. They knew that to be true because their friends and others who had come before them had proved that America really was a country where the sky was the limit.

Mr. Speaker, people came to America to escape the limits on their freedom at home, whether religious, economic, or political, and they came to pursue their dreams, but when Government takes more and more of the fruits of one's labor it becomes more and more difficult to pursue those dreams.

Quite simply, Government's power to take away from dreams has grown too great. It is time now to cut back on Government's power, it is time to cut back on taxes, it is time to bring back the opportunity that we know in this country of ours called America.

WHY AMERICANS FAVOR THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats want tax cuts for working taxpaying families. A lot of smoke is being created here to say, well, who is really saying the truth? Well, let us look at the Congressional Research Service report made by the non-partisan Library of Congress, by the specialists on the economics end of policy, that says the Office of Treasury provides a more comprehensive measure, more consistent with how economists would measure the bill's benefits to individuals in different income classes. What they conclude is that

using measures that are more consistent with conventional economic analysis the permanent provisions of the bill the Office of Treasury estimates indicate that by any distributional measure; that means who gets what, the tax cuts under the Republican plan favor higher income individuals in the House and Senate bills with the effects more pronounced in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is why Americans throughout the country favor the democratic alternative. They understand it is for working taxpaying families.

THE MIKE TYSON TAX BITE

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, lend me your ear.

Uncle Sam's tax bite has gotten so overbearing that not even Mike Tyson could defend himself. Taxpayers everywhere are so outraged that some are calling it the Mike Tyson tax bite. Hard-bitten taxpayers who call up the IRS to complain sure do get an earful.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for taxpayers to bite back. Uncle Sam's relentless drive to take an ever greater bite out of the family budget is an insult to taxpayers everywhere who want to pay their fair share but think that Mike Tyson tactics are over the line.

Uncle Sam's tax bite is more than just irritating. It is downright offensive to the spirit of fair play.

It is time to put a stop to Uncle Sam's ear-isistible urge to rip off a huge chunk from the family paycheck. Taxpayers and Congress should not allow such barbaric behavior to continue. It is time for the taxpayers to stand up and declare, "No mas." It is time for tax relief for working Americans.

□ 1000

TAX FAIRNESS FOR WORKING FAMILIES

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to talk about taxes, but I want to talk about it in a little different way. I want to talk about tax fairness, because that is what this debate is really all about.

The Republican tax plan gives 60 percent of the benefits in tax cuts to the richest 5 percent of Americans. We think that is wrong. We think working families, working Americans, ought to get the lion's share of the tax benefits.

If Members look at the Republican plan, we will find something very interesting. They are willing to give a child

tax credit of \$500 per child for families making over \$100,000 a year, but when we say we have a police officer who makes \$25,000 a year, or perhaps a clerk that makes \$30,000 a year, they say, no, they get the earned income tax credit so they should not get a child tax credit.

That does not make sense. They have tax breaks for dinners, lunches, for travel, corporate welfare for building roads, corporate welfare for attending trade shows overseas; there are lots of tax breaks for the wealthy. That is OK. But now, today, we have an opportunity to have tax fairness for working families. That is what we ought to do.

A TRIBUTE TO NASA

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to praise the men and women of NASA, and to applaud the vision and leadership of NASA Administrator Dan Golden.

The landing of the Pathfinder explorer on Mars and the subsequent exploration by the Sojourner rover, named after that great American hero, Sojourner Truth, demonstrates that the United States is the global leader in science, technology, and space exploration. It is especially fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is making one of its most substantial achievements in space at the same time that President Clinton is expanding NATO, our most successful military alliance in contemporary history.

In 1960, at the height of the cold war, President Kennedy challenged the Nation to send a man to the Moon by the end of the decade. Spurred by strategic competition with the Soviet Union, we met that challenge. Today, however, Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over, but the challenge to inspire our people in the national interest still exists today.

If we expect to build on the successes of the Pathfinder mission and to make NATO a success well into the 21st century, we must recommit ourselves to educating our people, educating our young people, and educating those who are going off to college. A national commitment to education will enable us to produce the scientists, engineers, astronauts, and diplomats that will ensure our national security and make future space exploration a reality.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Pursuant to House Resolution 181 and rule XXIII, 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. 2107.

□ 1003

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. 2107, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 10, 1997, the bill had been read through page 76, line 7.

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

Mr. Chairman, the schedule, at least as we see it for the rest of the day, would be we will have two 15-minute votes immediately. One will be on the Klug-Miller-Foley amendment, and the second will be on the Royce amendment, and then we will go on to the balance of the bill. Our goal is to finish by 2 o'clock today, and I think if we can get some time limit agreements on the balance of the amendments, we will be able to do that and finish the bill.

Other than that, following the two 15-minute votes there will not be a Journal vote, but following the two 15-minute votes we will then move to the Ehlers amendment. I believe there is 1 hour of time for that, and then we will try to keep moving, and as I said before, get this completed by 2 o'clock today.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 181, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]; and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 58, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$292,000,000)".

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 243, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—173

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allen | Granger | Paul |
| Andrews | Gutknecht | Paxon |
| Archer | Harman | Peterson (MN) |
| Armye | Hastings (FL) | Petri |
| Barcia | Hastings (WA) | Pitts |
| Barr | Hayworth | Porter |
| Barrett (WI) | Hefley | Portman |
| Bass | Hinchey | Quinn |
| Becerra | Hoekstra | Ramstad |
| Berry | Hookey | Rivers |
| Bilbray | Horn | Rogan |
| Blagojevich | Hulshof | Rohrabacher |
| Blumenauer | Inglis | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Blunt | Johnson (CT) | Rothman |
| Brown (FL) | Johnson (WI) | Roukema |
| Brown (OH) | Jones | Roybal-Allard |
| Bryant | Kasich | Royce |
| Burr | Kelly | Ryun |
| Camp | Kennedy (MA) | Salmon |
| Campbell | Kennedy (RI) | Sanders |
| Cannon | Kind (WI) | Sanford |
| Capps | Kingston | Saxton |
| Carson | Klecza | Scarborough |
| Castle | Klug | Schumer |
| Chabot | Lantos | Sensenbrenner |
| Christensen | Latham | Shadegg |
| Coble | Leach | Shaw |
| Collins | Levin | Shays |
| Condit | Lewis (GA) | Sherman |
| Cooksey | LoBlondo | Smith (MI) |
| Cox | Lowe | Smith (NJ) |
| Davis (FL) | Luther | Smith, Adam |
| Deal | Markey | Smith, Linda |
| DeFazio | McCarthy (NY) | Snyder |
| DeGette | McCollum | Stabenow |
| Delahunt | McCrery | Stark |
| DeLauro | McGovern | Stearns |
| Dellums | McInnis | Stump |
| Deutsch | McIntyre | Sununu |
| Doggett | McKeon | Talent |
| Ehlers | McKinney | Tanner |
| Ehrlich | McNulty | Tauscher |
| Ensign | Meehan | Taylor (NC) |
| Eshoo | Menendez | Thornberry |
| Fawell | Miller (CA) | Thune |
| Filner | Miller (FL) | Tiahrt |
| Foley | Moran (KS) | Tierney |
| Fowler | Moran (VA) | Towns |
| Frank (MA) | Morella | Upton |
| Franks (NJ) | Nadler | Velazquez |
| Frelinghuysen | Neal | Vento |
| Furse | Neumann | Waxman |
| Ganske | Nussle | Weldon (FL) |
| Gejdenson | Obey | Wexler |
| Gibbons | Olver | Weygand |
| Gilchrest | Owens | White |
| Gordon | Pallone | Woolsey |
| Goss | Pappas | |

NOES—243

- | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| Abercrombie | Clay | Engel |
| Ackerman | Clayton | English |
| Aderholt | Clement | Etheridge |
| Bachus | Clyburn | Evans |
| Baesler | Coburn | Everett |
| Baker | Combest | Ewing |
| Baldacci | Conyers | Fattah |
| Ballenger | Cook | Fazio |
| Barrett (NE) | Costello | Flake |
| Bartlett | Coyne | Foglietta |
| Barton | Cramer | Forbes |
| Bateman | Crane | Ford |
| Bentsen | Crapo | Fox |
| Bereuter | Cubin | Frost |
| Bilirakis | Cummings | Gallely |
| Bishop | Cunningham | Gekas |
| Bliley | Danner | Gephardt |
| Boehner | Davis (IL) | Gillmor |
| Bonilla | Davis (VA) | Gilman |
| Bono | DeLay | Gonzalez |
| Borski | Diaz-Balart | Goode |
| Boswell | Dickey | Goodlatte |
| Boyd | Dicks | Goodling |
| Brown (CA) | Dingell | Graham |
| Bunning | Dixon | Green |
| Burton | Dooley | Greenwood |
| Buyer | Doyle | Gutierrez |
| Callahan | Dreier | Hall (OH) |
| Calvert | Duncan | Hall (TX) |
| Canady | Dunn | Hamilton |
| Cardin | Edwards | Hastert |
| Chambliss | Emerson | Hefner |

Herger	Mascara	Sabo
Hill	Matsui	Sanchez
Hilleary	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin
Hilliard	McDade	Sawyer
Hinojosa	McDermott	Schaefer, Dan
Hobson	McHale	Schaffer, Bob
Holden	McHugh	Scott
Houghton	McIntosh	Serrano
Hoyer	Meek	Sessions
Hunter	Metcalfe	Shimkus
Hutchinson	Mica	Shuster
Hyde	Millender-	Sisisky
Istook	McDonald	Skaggs
Jackson (IL)	Mink	Skeen
Jackson-Lee	Moakley	Skelton
(TX)	Mollohan	Smith (OR)
Jefferson	Murtha	Smith (TX)
Jenkins	Myrick	Snowbarger
John	Nethercutt	Solomon
Johnson, E. B.	Ney	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Northup	Spence
Kanjorski	Norwood	Spratt
Kaptur	Oberstar	Stenholm
Kennelly	Ortiz	Stokes
Kildee	Oxley	Strickland
Kilpatrick	Packard	Stupak
Kim	Parker	Tauzin
King (NY)	Pascrell	Taylor (MS)
Klink	Pastor	Thomas
Knollenberg	Payne	Thompson
Kolbe	Pease	Thurman
Kucinich	Peterson (PA)	Torres
LaFalce	Pickering	Trafficant
LaHood	Pickett	Turner
Lampson	Pombo	Visclosky
Largent	Pomeroy	Walsh
LaTourette	Poshard	Wamp
Lazio	Price (NC)	Waters
Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Watkins
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Watt (NC)
Linder	Rahall	Watts (OK)
Lipinski	Rangel	Weller
Livingston	Redmond	Whitfield
Lofgren	Regula	Wicker
Lucas	Reyes	Wise
Maloney (CT)	Riley	Wolf
Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez	Wynn
Manton	Roemer	Yates
Manzullo	Rogers	Young (FL)
Martinez	Rush	

NOT VOTING—18

Berman	Doolittle	Pelosi
Boehler	Farr	Riggs
Bonior	Hansen	Shiff
Boucher	Hostettler	Slaughter
Brady	Minge	Weldon (PA)
Chenoweth	Molinar	Young (AK)

□ 1026

Mr. MCHALE, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, and Messrs. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, McDADE, SCOTT, and LIVINGSTON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PAXON, STUMP, MORAN of Virginia, GIBBONS, McNULTY, HINCHEY, STEARNS, Mrs. FOWLER, and Messrs. MORAN of Kansas, SAXTON, and INGLIS of South Carolina changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall No. 264. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The amendment offered by Representatives KLUG, MILLER, and FOLEY to increase by \$292 million the bill's rescission of \$100 million from the Energy Department's Clean Coal Technology Program [CCTP] is one I agree with wholeheartedly.

This program has been plagued by a history of waste and mismanagement. A 1991 U.S.

General Accounting Office [GAO] report discovered that a large portion of projects had either been terminated within a few years of being unfunded, experienced substantial schedule delays, or exceeded their budgets. In addition, the same GAO report found that "DOE selected some projects that are demonstrating technologies that might have been commercialized without federal assistance."

During an era of supposed fiscal responsibility, this program illuminates inefficiencies of the past.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROYCE:
Page 59, line 10, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by \$21,014,000)".

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 246, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—175

Allen	Franks (NJ)	McHugh
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	McIntosh
Armey	Furse	McIntyre
Bachus	Gallegly	McKinney
Baldacci	Ganske	McNulty
Barcia	Gedjenson	Meehan
Barr	Goode	Menendez
Barrett (WI)	Goodlatte	Metcalfe
Bass	Goodling	Miller (CA)
Becerra	Goss	Miller (FL)
Berry	Gutknecht	Minge
Bilbray	Harman	Moran (KS)
Blagojevich	Hastings (FL)	Morella
Blumenauer	Hayworth	Nadler
Blunt	Hefley	Neal
Boswell	Hinchee	Neumann
Bryant	Hoekstra	Norwood
Campbell	Hooley	Nussle
Canady	Horn	Obey
Cannon	Hulshof	Oliver
Carson	Hunter	Owens
Castle	Hutchinson	Pallone
Chabot	Inglis	Paul
Christensen	Johnson (WI)	Paxon
Coble	Jones	Peterson (MN)
Collins	Kasich	Petri
Condit	Kelly	Pitts
Cox	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Crane	Kennedy (RI)	Portman
Danner	Kind (WI)	Quinn
Davis (FL)	Kingston	Radanovich
Deal	Kleczka	Ramstad
DeFazio	Klug	Rivers
DeGette	LaFalce	Rogan
Dellums	Latham	Rohrabacher
Deutscher	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Dickey	Leach	Rothman
Duncan	Levin	Roukema
Dunn	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Ehlers	LoBlundo	Royce
Ehrlich	Lowey	Ryun
Emerson	Luther	Salmon
Ensign	Manzullo	Sanders
Eshoo	Markey	Sanford
Fawell	McCarthy (MO)	Saxton
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Scarborough
Foley	McCollum	Schumer
Fowler	McGovern	Sensenbrenner
Shadegg	Shaw	Stearns
Shays	Sherman	Stump
Smith (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Sununu
Smith, Adam	Smith, Linda	Talent
Souder	Stabenow	Tanner
Stark		Tauscher
		Taylor (NC)
		Thune
		Tiahrt
		Tierney
		Torres
		Upton
		Velázquez
		Vento
		Waxman
		Weldon (FL)
		Wexler
		Weygand
		White
		Woolsey

NOES—246

Abercrombie	Frost	Mollohan
Ackerman	Gekas	Moran (VA)
Aderholt	Gephardt	Murtha
Archer	Gibbons	Myrick
Baesler	Gilchrest	Nethercutt
Baker	Gillmor	Ney
Ballenger	Gilman	Northup
Barrett (NE)	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Bartlett	Gordon	Ortiz
Barton	Graham	Oxley
Bateman	Granger	Packard
Bentsen	Green	Pappas
Bereuter	Greenwood	Parker
Billrakis	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Bishop	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Payne
Boehler	Hamilton	Pease
Boehner	Hastert	Pelosi
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
Bono	Hefner	Pickering
Borski	Herger	Pickett
Boyd	Hill	Pombo
Brady	Hilleary	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Poshard
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Bunning	Holden	Rahall
Burr	Houghton	Rangel
Burton	Hoyer	Redmond
Buyer	Hyde	Regula
Callahan	Istook	Reyes
Calvert	Jackson (IL)	Riley
Camp	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Capps	(TX)	Roemer
Cardin	Jefferson	Rogers
Chambliss	Jenkins	Rush
Chenoweth	John	Sabo
Clay	Johnson (CT)	Sanchez
Clayton	Johnson, E.B.	Sandlin
Clement	Johnson, Sam	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Schaefer, Dan
Coburn	Kaptur	Schaffer, Bob
Combust	Kennelly	Scott
Conyers	Kildee	Serrano
Cook	Kilpatrick	Sessions
Cooksey	Kim	Shimkus
Costello	King (NY)	Shuster
Coyne	Klink	Sisisky
Cramer	Knollenberg	Skaggs
Crapo	Kolbe	Skeen
Cubin	Kucinich	Skelton
Cummings	LaHood	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Lampson	Smith (TX)
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Snowbarger
Davis (VA)	Largent	Snyder
Delahunt	LaTourette	Solomon
DeLauro	Lewis (CA)	Spence
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Linder
Diaz-Balart	Lofgren	Lipinski
Dicks	Lucas	Livingston
Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Strickland
Dixon	Maloney (NY)	Stupak
Doggett	Mantony	Tauzin
Dooley	Martinez	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	Masera	Thomas
Dreier	Matsui	Thompson
Edwards	McCery	Thornberry
Engel	McDade	Thurman
English	McDermott	Towns
Etheridge	McHale	Trafficant
Evans	McInnis	Turner
Everett	McKeon	Visclosky
Ewing	Meek	Walsh
Fattah	Mica	Wamp
Fazio	Millender-	Waters
Flake	McDonald	Watkins
Foglietta	Mink	Watt (NC)
Ford	Moakley	Watts (OK)
Forbes		Weller
Fox		Whitfield
Frank (MA)		

Wicker	Wolf	Yates
Wise	Wynn	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Berman	Hansen	Slaughter
Bonior	Hostettler	Weldon (PA)
Boucher	Mollinari	Young (AK)
Doolittle	Riggs	
Farr	Schiff	

□ 1043

Mr. TORRES changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No.'s 264 and 265, I was unable to be present to vote due to a personal family commitment off of Capitol Hill. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both matters.

□ 1045

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Endowment for the Arts, \$10,000,000.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language contained on page 76, lines 10 through 13, constitutes an unauthorized appropriation in violation of clause 2 of House rule XXI.

Mr. Chairman, the language I have specified is an appropriation of \$10 million for necessary expenses of the National Endowment for the Arts. Authorization in law for the National Endowment for the Arts expired in fiscal year 1993.

Mr. Chairman, specifically, clause 2(a) of House rule XXI states, "No appropriation shall be reported in a general appropriation bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law."

Mr. Chairman, since the National Endowment for the Arts is clearly not authorized in law, and the bill includes an appropriation of funds for this agency, I make a point of order that the language is in obvious violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I request that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] withhold his point of order to permit me to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois may be heard on his point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I wondered whether he would defer his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] reserve the

point of order only to permit the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to strike the last word?

Mr. CRANE. Yes, I will do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] for permitting me to discuss the amendment and to hold off the point of order.

I dare to think of offering an amendment in view of what happened on the floor yesterday, in view of the remarkable closeness of the vote, which our side thought we had won, I dare to hope that perhaps some of my colleagues on the other side may, including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], might want to give the Members of the House a chance to vote on NEA to see whether or not the House would again sustain his position in opposition to the point of order.

Would it be as close as the vote on the rule? I would be willing to bet that the vote on NEA itself would support NEA by at least 50 votes. If my memory serves me correctly, that was the difference the last time my colleague rose to kill NEA.

Is it possible that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], might withdraw his point of order to give us this opportunity to let the Members of the House vote on the subject? What does he think?

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

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully like the approach of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to this issue, and I know he has fought valiantly through the years. But, as I indicated, these are the rules of the House; and as a result of that, I still adhere to the point of order that I made, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATES. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] is absolutely correct. They are the rules of the House. I was hoping that perhaps he would overlook the strict version of the rules of the House and give us the opportunity to have our vote on NEA.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I have no alternative except to concede the point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] insist on his point of order?

Mr. CRANE. I do insist on my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any other Member that wishes to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule. In reviewing section 11(c) of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, codified in title 20, section 960, of the United States Code, the Chair finds that the authorization

for the National Endowment for the Arts has lapsed with fiscal year 1993.

The provision contains an unauthorized appropriation, and the point of order is sustained. Accordingly, the paragraph is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. EHLERS:

Page 76, after line 13, insert the following:

SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES TO SUPPORT THE ARTS

For the necessary expenses to carry out section 202, \$80,000,000. Each amount otherwise appropriated in this Act (other than in this paragraph) is hereby reduced by 0.62 percent.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

TERMINATION OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

SEC. 201. (a) REPEALERS.—Sections 5, 5A, and 6 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 954, 955) are repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—Section 2 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 951) is amended—

(A) in paragraphs (1) and (6) by striking "arts and the";

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (5) by striking "and the arts";

(C) in paragraphs (4), (5), and (9) by striking "the arts and";

(D) in paragraph (7) by striking "the practice of art and";

(E) by striking paragraph (11), and

(F) in paragraph (12) by striking "the Arts and" and redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (11).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 952) is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d), and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking "to foster American artistic creativity, to commission works of art,"

(ii) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking "the National Council on the Arts or", and

(II) by striking ", as the case may be,"

(iii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking "sections 5(l) and" and inserting "section",

(II) in subparagraph (A) by striking "artistic or", and

(III) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by striking "the National Council on the Arts and", and

(bb) by striking ", as the case may be," and

(iv) by striking "(d)" and inserting "(b)", and

(C) by redesignating subsections (e) and (g) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES.—Section 4(a) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 953(a)) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "the Arts and" each place it appears, and

(ii) by striking "a National Endowment for the Arts,"

(B) in subsection (b) by striking "and the arts", and

(C) in the heading of such section by striking "THE ARTS AND".

(4) FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES.—Section 9 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 958) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking "the Arts and",

(B) in subsection (b) by striking "the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts",

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking "the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and",

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts", and

(II) by striking "Humanities," and inserting "Humanities", and

(iii) in paragraphs (6) and (7) by striking "the arts and".

(5) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS.—Section 10 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 959) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking "in them",

(II) by striking "the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and", and

(III) by striking "in carrying out their respective functions",

(i) by striking "of an Endowment" each place it appears,

(iii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking "of that Endowment" the first place it appears and inserting "the National Endowment for the Humanities",

(II) by striking "sections 6(f) and" and inserting "section", and

(III) by striking "sections 5(c) and" and inserting "section", and

(iv) in paragraph (3) by striking "Chairperson's functions, define their duties, and supervise their activities" and inserting "functions, define the activities, and supervise the activities of the Chairperson",

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), and

(ii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking "one of its Endowments and received by the Chairperson of an Endowment" and inserting "the National Endowment for the Humanities and received by the Chairperson of that Endowment", and

(II) by striking "(4)",

(C) by striking subsection (c),

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking "Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and the", and

(ii) by striking "each" the first place it appears,

(E) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking "National Council on the Arts and the", and

(ii) by striking "respectively", and

(F) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking "Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and the", and

(II) by striking "sections 5(c) and" and inserting "section",

(iii) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(I) by striking "either of the Endowments" and inserting "National Endowment for the Humanities", and

(II) by striking "involved", and

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking "that provided such financial assistance" each place it appears, and

(II) in subparagraph (C) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts or".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 11 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 960) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (C), and

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking "(B)", (B) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A), and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking "(B)", and

(II) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively,

(C) in subsection (a)(3)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A),

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (A),

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C), and

(iv) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking "(D)" and inserting "(B)", and

(II) by striking "and subparagraph (B)",

(D) in subsection (a)(4)—

(i) by striking "Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and the",

(ii) by striking "as the case may be", and

(iii) by striking "section 5(e), section 5(1)(2), section 7(f)," and inserting "section 7(f)",

(E) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1), and

(ii) in paragraph (2) by striking "(2)",

(F) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1), and

(ii) in paragraph (2) by striking "(2)", and

(G) by striking subsection (f).

(d) TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—

(1) TRANSFER OF PROPERTY.—On the effective date of the amendments made by this section, all property donated, bequeathed, or devised to the National Endowment for the Arts and held by such Endowment on such date is hereby transferred to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

(2) TERMINATION OF OPERATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide for the termination of the affairs of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Council on the Arts. Except as provided in paragraph (1), the Director shall provide for the transfer or other disposition of personnel, assets, liabilities, grants, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds held, used, arising from, available to, or to be made available in connection with implementing the authorities terminated by the amendments made by this section.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS.

(1) POET LAUREATE CONSULTANT.—Section 601 of Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 177) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE PAY RATE.—Title 5 of the United States Code is amended in section 5314 by striking the item relating to the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts.

(3) INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—Subsection (a)(2) of the first section 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 8G(a)(2)) is amended by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts".

(4) DELTA REGION PRESERVATION COMMISSION.—Section 907(a) of National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 230f(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (7),

(B) in the first paragraph (8) by striking the period at the end and inserting "and", and

(C) by redesignating the first paragraph (8) as paragraph (7).

(5) NATIONAL TEACHER ACADEMIES.—Section 514(b)(4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1103c(b)(4)) is amended by striking "and the National Endowment for the Humanities".

(6) JACOB K. JAVITS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 932(a)(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1134i(a)(3)) is amended by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts",

(7) GRADUATE ASSISTANCE IN AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED.—Section 943(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1134n(b)) is amended by striking "National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities" and inserting "National Endowment for the Humanities".

(8) AMERICAN FOLKLORE CENTER.—Section 4(b) of the American Folklife Preservation Act (20 U.S.C. 2103(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (5), and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively.

(9) JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION.—Section 4(a) of the Japan-United States Friendship Act (22 U.S.C. 2903(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3) by adding "and" at the end, and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

(10) STANDARDS AND SYSTEMS FOR OUTDOOR ADVERTISING SIGNS.—Section 131(q)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking "including the National Endowment for the Arts".

(11) INTERNATIONAL CULTURE AND TRADE CENTER COMMISSION.—Section 7(c)(1) of Federal Triangle Development Act (40 U.S.C. 1106(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (I), and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (I).

(12) LIVABLE CITIES.—The Livable Cities Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 8143 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 804—

(i) in paragraph (4) by inserting "and" at the end,

(ii) by striking paragraphs (5) and (7), and

(iii) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking "and" at the end and inserting a period, and

(II) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (5), and

(B) in section 805—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) by striking "in consultation with the Chairman", and

(II) in paragraph (3) by striking "jointly by the Secretary and the Chairman" and inserting "by the Secretary",

(ii) in subsection (b) by striking "and the Chairman shall establish jointly" and inserting "shall establish",

(iii) in subsection (c) by striking "jointly by the Secretary and the Chairman" and inserting "by the Secretary",

(iv) in subsection (d)—

(I) by striking "consult with the Chairman and", and

(II) by striking "jointly by the Secretary and the Chairman" and inserting "by the Secretary", and

(v) in subsection (e) by striking "in cooperation with the Chairman",

(13) CONVERSION OF RAILROAD PASSENGER PROVISIONS.—Title 49 of the United States Code is amended—

(A) in section 5562 by striking subsection (c),

(B) in section 5563(a)(4)—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by adding "or" at the end.

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B), and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(C) in section 5564(c)(1)(C) by striking "or the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts", and

(D) in section 5565(c)(1)(B) by striking "or the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts".

(14) EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Title IX of Public Law 103-227 (20 U.S.C. 6001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 921(j)—

(i) by striking paragraph (5), and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7) and (8) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, and

(B) in section 931(h)(3)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (H), and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (I), (J), (K), and (L) as subparagraphs (H), (I), (J), and (K), respectively.

(15) ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-382), is amended—

(A) in section 2101(b) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts,"

(B) in section 2205(c)(1)(D) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts," and inserting "and",

(C) in section 2208(d)(1)(H)(v)—

(i) by inserting "and" after "Services," the 2nd place it appears, and

(ii) by striking "and the National Endowment for the Arts",

(D) in section 2209(b)(1)(C)(vi) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts",

(E) in section 3121(c)(2) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts",

(F) in section 10401—

(i) in subsection (d)(6) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts," and

(ii) in subsection (e)(2) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts",

(G) in section 10411(a)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2), and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) as paragraphs (2) through (7), respectively,

(H) in section 10412(b)—

(i) in paragraph (2) by striking "the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts", and

(ii) in paragraph (7) by striking "the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts",

(I) in section 10414(a)(2)(B)—

(i) in clause (i) by inserting "and" at the end,

(ii) by striking clause (ii), and

(iii) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(16) DELTA REGION HERITAGE; NEW ORLEANS JAZZ COMMISSION.—Public Law 103-433 (108 Stat. 4515) is amended—

(A) in section 1104(b) by striking "the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts", and

(B) in section 1207(b)(6) by striking "and one member from recommendations submitted by the Chairman of the National Endowment of the Arts",

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 1997.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES AND LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES TO SUPPORT THE ARTS

SEC. 202. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Art for Kids Act".

(b) GRANTS TO STATES.—From funds allotted under subsection (e)(2), the Secretary of Education may make grants to eligible States to support the arts in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the people and communities in each of the several States through—

(1) projects and productions which have substantial national or international artistic and cultural significance;

(2) projects and productions, meeting professional standards of authenticity or tradition, irrespective of origin, which are of significant merit;

(3) projects and productions that will encourage and assist artists to work in residence at an educational or cultural institution;

(4) projects and productions which have substantial artistic and cultural significance;

(5) projects and productions that will encourage public knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of the arts;

(6) workshops that will encourage and develop the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens;

(7) programs for the arts at the local level; and

(8) projects that enhance managerial and organizational skills and capabilities.

(c) GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES.—From funds allotted under subsection (e)(1), the Secretary of Education may make grants to eligible local education agencies to carry out activities relating to the arts for the benefit of children.

(d) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section in any fiscal year, a State or local education agency shall submit an application for such grants at such time as shall be specified by the Secretary and accompany such application with a plan that the Secretary finds—

(1) in the case of a State applicant, designates or provides for the establishment of a State agency (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "State agency") as the sole agency for the administration of the State plan;

(2) provides that funds paid to the State or the local education agency under this section will be expended solely on projects, productions, and activities approved by the State agency or the local education agency, as the case may be, described in subsection (b) or (c), respectively;

(3) provides that such projects, productions, and activities will be carried out—

(A) in public, private, or public charter schools;

(B) on government property;

(C) in government-owned or community art museums; or

(D) in government-owned or community theaters;

(4) provides that the State agency or the local education agency, as the case may be, will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, including a description of the progress made toward achieving the goals of the plan involved;

(5) provides—

(A) assurances that the State agency has held, after reasonable notice, public meetings in the State to allow all groups of artists, interested organizations, and the public to present views and make recommendations regarding the State plan; and

(B) a summary of such recommendations and the State agency's response to such recommendations;

(6) contains—

(A) a description of the level of participation during the most recent preceding year for which information is available by artists, artists' organizations, and arts organizations in projects and productions for which financial assistance is provided under this section;

(B) in the case of a State applicant, for the most recent preceding year for which information is available, a description of the extent projects and productions receiving financial assistance from the State agency are available to all people and communities in the State; and

(C) a description of projects and productions receiving financial assistance under this section that exist or are being developed to secure wider participation of artists, artists' organizations, and arts organizations identified under clause (i) of this subparagraph or that address the availability of the arts to all people or communities identified under subparagraph (B);

(7) an assurance that no part of a grant received under this section will be used for any project, production, or activity that is obscene or contains sexually explicit conduct;

(8) an assurance that no part of a grant received under this section will be used to provide financial assistance to any applicant who in the then preceding 5-year period had artistic control of, or contributed significant financial support for any project, production, or activity that was obscene or contained sexually explicit conduct; and

(9) an assurance that such funds will be used to supplement, and not to supplant, non-Federal funds.

No application may be approved unless the accompanying plan satisfies the requirements specified in this subsection.

(e) ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) 60 percent of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this section shall be allotted by the Secretary among local education agencies based on the population of children who are not less than 5 years of age, and not more than 17 years of age, residing in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such agencies.

(2) 37 percent of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this section shall be allotted by the Secretary among the States as follows:

(A) If the amount appropriated for a fiscal year does not exceed \$11,200,000, then the each State shall receive an equal share of such amount.

(B) If the amount appropriated for a fiscal year does exceed \$11,200,000, then—

(i) the each State shall receive \$200,000; and

(ii) the amount remaining after making the allotment required by clause (i) shall be allocated among the States based on population.

(f) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—

(1) STATES.—If in any fiscal year the amount of non-Federal funds expended by a State to carry out activities relating to the arts is less than the amount of such funds so expended in the preceding fiscal year by such State, then the amount such State would be eligible to receive under this section but for the operation of this paragraph shall be reduced by 3 times the percentage reduction of such non-Federal funds.

(2) LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES.—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if in any fiscal year the amount of non-Federal funds expended by a local education agency to carry out activities relating to the arts is less than 90 percent the amount of such funds so expended in the preceding fiscal year by such agency, then such agency shall

be ineligible to receive a grant under this section for each fiscal year in 5-year period beginning after the fiscal year in which the reduction occurs.

(B) If throughout any period of 5 consecutive fiscal years the aggregate amount of non-Federal funds expended by a local education agency to carry out activities relating to the arts is less than 80 percent the amount of such funds so expended in the 5-year period ending immediately before such period of 5 consecutive fiscal years, then such agency shall be ineligible to receive a grant under this section for each fiscal year in 5-year period beginning immediately after such period of 5 consecutive fiscal years during which the reduction occurs.

(g) COMPLIANCE.—Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, finds that—

(1) a State agency or local education agency is not complying substantially with terms and conditions of its plan approved under this section; or

(2) any funds granted to a State agency or local education agency under this section have been diverted from the purposes for which they were allotted or paid;

the Secretary shall immediately notify the Secretary of the Treasury and the State agency or local education agency with respect to which such finding was made that no further grants will be made under this section to such agency until there is no longer any default or failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected, or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such agency repays or arranges the repayment of the Federal funds which have been improperly diverted or expended.

(h) GUIDELINES.—The Secretary shall issue guidelines that facilitate compliance with this section.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "arts" includes, but is not limited to, music (instrumental and vocal), dance, drama, folk art, creative writing, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, radio, film, video, tape and sound recording, the arts related to the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of such major art forms, all those traditional arts practiced by the diverse peoples of this country, and the study and application of the arts to the human environment;

(2) the term "sexually explicit conduct" has the meaning given it in section 2256 of title 18, United States Code;

(3) the term "local education agency" has the meaning given it in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(4) the term "production" means plays (with or without music), ballet, dance and choral performances, concerts, recitals, operas, exhibitions, readings, motion pictures, television, radio, film, video tape and sound recordings, and any other activities involving the execution or rendition of the arts;

(5) the term "project" means programs organized to carry out this section, including programs to foster American artistic creativity, to commission works of art, to create opportunities for individuals to develop artistic talents when carried on as a part of a program otherwise included in this definition, and to develop and enhance public knowledge and understanding of the arts, and includes, where appropriate, rental or purchase of facilities, purchase or rental of land, and acquisition of equipment, and in-

cludes the renovation of facilities if (i) the amount of the expenditure of Federal funds for such purpose in the case of any project does not exceed \$250,000;

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education; and

(7) the term "State" means any of the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, or the Virgin Islands of the United States.

(i) REPORT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Education shall submit annually to the Congress a report describing the extent to which recipients of grants made under subsections (b) and (c) comply with the requirements of this section.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 181, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] and a Member opposed the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is an attempt to mediate or to end a long-standing dispute in the House of Representatives regarding funding of the arts. As my colleagues well know, every year we have a battle about the NEA and the manner in which it disburses Federal funding. This year for the first time it appears definite that the House will not approve funding for the NEA, as we just observed.

This amendment is an effort to separate the issue into two aspects. One is the funding of the arts. The second is the method of distributing the funding for the arts. The purpose of my amendment is to avoid the battles we have had in the past about the NEA and the manner in which they distributed their funds by developing a new distribution system and yet maintain the funding of the arts that we have had during the past year.

The amount of money we are arguing about is relatively small in the sense of the amount per citizen. Last year we funded the arts in this Nation to the tune of 38 cents per capita. The bill that is before us had great difficulty reaching the floor. As we all know, the rule passed by only one vote. And yet the entire debate appeared to focus on the arts and the funding for the arts.

I happen to support the arts. I also support funding for the arts. In fact, I support Federal funding for the arts when it is handled appropriately.

This amendment will provide appropriate funding for the arts. The NEA has proved to be a lightning rod. It has attracted all types of criticism because they have, upon occasion, given money for art which is profane, or obscene, or vulgar, or sacrilegious, or sometimes all four.

The amendment avoids this problem by recognizing that there are not enough votes in this body, as it is presently constituted, to support the continuation of the NEA, and simply says we will recognize the fact that the NEA cannot pass the House of Representatives but it is very important to continue the funding.

This amendment has other advantages over past methods of distributing funding. One of my goals was to achieve equity. Currently we have approximately \$229,000 contributed by every Member's district toward the operation of the NEA and the funding of the arts. Of that amount, most districts do not get anywhere near that kind of money back.

In fact, 25 percent of the arts funding distributed in programs by the NEA went to one State. Let me say that again. One-fourth of all arts programs funding went to one State. That is hardly what one would consider equitable funding. I refuse to believe that one-fourth of the worthy artists in this country all reside in one State.

The amount we are advocating is \$80 million, which is even less than last year. It is 31 cents per capita. So if any citizen should happen to write one of my colleagues and object to the Federal funding of the arts, they are spending more on their stamp than they spend on support of the arts. I think that helps put this in perspective.

This is not, however, a reduction from last year, even though it is almost a \$20 million reduction in total funding. It simply gets rid of \$20 million in overhead and internal operations of the NEA which we will not be perpetuating.

The amendment is somewhat vague about the precise guidelines to be followed in distributing the funds, and that was done deliberately because, at the request of the authorizing committee, they wish to prepare an authorization bill. And we have a gentleman's agreement that the actions of the authorizing committee will, in fact, guide the deliberations of the House members of the conference once this bill reaches the conference committee.

Now, I am concerned, because this effort emphasizes funding for the arts and equitable distribution for the funding of the arts, and I have been told that some of the Members on this body on the other side of the aisle plan to vote against this amendment because it does not continue the NEA.

I urge Members on the other side of the aisle not to listen to that argument. I happen to believe funding the arts is more important than the existence of the NEA. I think it is much preferable to send a bill from this House containing \$80 million to fund the arts and provide some continuation of funding than to send a bill across to the other side of the rotunda which has

zero dollars appropriated for the funding of the arts.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. This is a new approach that will provide block grants to the States. It will provide as much funding for the arts commissions for their own general distributional purposes as they had last year in every State, or, perhaps, in many cases more. Approximately 26 of the 50 States will get more money this time because we will not have one-fourth going to one State.

Furthermore, it provides additional money for arts education in the schools, and I believe that is very, very important. First of all, it is proven that arts education at an early age helps in brain development and helps students do better in other fields. But, in addition to that, I believe that proper arts education will help develop greater arts appreciation in this Nation and will ensure healthy continuation of the arts in the future.

So Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be adopted, that we not get wrapped up in the details of the distribution mechanism. We can certainly work that out through the authorizing committee as we go to conference. But this, I believe, is a worthy amendment which will continue funding for the arts even though the NEA will no longer exist as the House bill passes.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes, and I want to request the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

I asked NEA how much money is being allocated to the States; and I was told that by statute 35 percent of the program funds are being allocated to the States, but that in practice 37 percent of their program funds. I was told also that under their interpretation the amount that my colleague would make available would be less for each State than the amount they currently get.

I thought the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] ought to know that so that he might have the opportunity of verifying it with NEA, as well.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of those figures. First of all, I think two comments must be made. They are per-State figures. They also include roughly \$2 million which is designated for arts education. We are designating far more than that for arts education. I did not include that in the title.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the other fact that they distributed I think is very misleading. They do not include, in the total being distributed to the States,

the arts funding that we are distributing, and it makes it look like every State is getting less money. That is simply not true.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the point I was trying to make is that there is not a great discrepancy between the amount that the States are currently getting under the NEA programs and the amount that I understand the gentleman proposes to make available under his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ehlers amendment because it is designed to gut the NEA.

The National Association of State Arts Agencies, which is the organization that represents the State arts agencies that would get these block grants, is strongly opposed to the Ehlers amendment because they know that it will not help them provide quality programs to young people.

□ 1100

These arts agencies benefit from NEA's experience and their leadership in creating partnerships with schools and universities across the country. They cannot do that on their own and certainly not with the small amount of money they would get from the Ehlers proposal.

Think about this. Under the Ehlers proposal, each school board would get about \$3,000, or \$1 per child. That is not going to work. It is almost laughable. No wonder that they oppose it.

Further, this amendment requires the Department of Education to create a new bureaucracy to administer the program. DOE does not have any competitive grant programs by subject area now. NEA has the staff expertise. DOE does not.

Let us not pretend that a vote for the Ehlers amendment represents a commitment to arts in this country. These State art agencies rely upon Federal leadership and direct funding of national initiatives to attract private, corporate, and foundation support, especially from funders who can be encouraged to provide matching support. That is why the major corporations have already told us they will not fill this vacuum.

But right now we are getting about \$12 in nonfederal funding for every dollar that the NEA provides. That is what is working. It is seed money. It will not be seed money under this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment, because this amendment is not what the State art agencies want and it is certainly not what our country needs.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his excellent amendment and just to answer a few of the questions that have been raised. First, why have we had this incredible debate over the last number of years?

It is not whether or not we spend the money, but in essence it has been who spends the money. We have had people in the NEA here in Washington, for whatever reason, who have disbursed money in a way that has embarrassed this House. We have had the horror stories of people handing out \$10 bills to illegal aliens on the international border on the basis that that is an art project that shows the contribution of illegal aliens to the U.S. economy. We have had the desecration of the crucifix, these famous cases where absolute obscenity has been funded with U.S. taxpayer dollars, and the taxpayers do not like that.

This amendment does exactly the right thing. It eliminates the NEA, and that is the problem, the people who spend the money. But it does spend some money in a way that we all agree money should be spent, and that is that it gives it to kids. It sends money, most of the money, to the art classes in our grade schools, grammar schools and high schools throughout this country.

Pictures like this one, this was a picture from the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] done by Christopher Suniga from North High School in his district. This represents, and we all see, the great representation and manifestation of the talent of our kids when we walk the hallway from the Cannon Building over here to the Capitol to vote. We see wonderful art. We see all these budding artists who are being taught great art in their classes.

We have had art classes in schools for hundreds of years in this country. What this money will do is go to those kids, go to those classes. If the gentleman says, "Well, a dollar a student isn't going to do any good," I say it is going to do a lot more than handing out \$10 bills to illegal aliens at the international border as some kind of a fuzzy-headed art project. We are not going to give the money to aging hippies anymore to desecrate the crucifix or do other strange things. We are going to give it to our kids, our 10 and 12 and 14 and 16-year-old kids who have talent, who want to develop that talent.

Lastly, it is going to give it to the kids on a per capita basis. That means, I say to my great friends from New York who have gotten 25 percent of the money over the years, all the States are going to get an equal amount of money based on their population, based on the number of kids they have who need to develop this talent.

This is a great amendment. It eliminates the NEA, and it funds art where

we really should fund it, and that is with our children. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who over the years has been such a strong defender of the National Endowment for the Arts, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friends on both sides of the aisle, do not be fooled by the Ehlers amendment. The intent, as the gentleman from California just stated, is to eliminate the NEA and to try to give cover to a few Members in providing money to State arts councils and back to the schools. The State arts councils say, "We don't want the money. We think this is a mistake. Killing the Endowment, our partner, is a mistake."

I must tell Members that over the years, and I have served on this committee for 21 years and I have watched the NEA, we have made some improvements. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], when he was the ranking member, insisted on language. I worked with him on that language to make certain that we got quality funding by the NEA. Out of 100,000 grants, 50 have been controversial. When it comes to the arts, that is not a big deal.

I want to say to my Republican friends, many of which have joined with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] in signing a letter to the leadership on this issue, this is our test vote. This is our opportunity to say whether we are for the Endowment or whether we are against the Endowment. I think a showing defeating the Ehlers amendment is the right thing to do. Then we can move on and deal with the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The Endowment has worked well. I can tell my colleagues from the State of Washington's perspective, in 1977 we received 3 challenge grants. It had more to do with developing the arts in Washington State and in Seattle than any other thing. The work over the years with the Endowment has been good and positive. Jane Alexander has been an outstanding leader at the National Endowment for the Arts.

Again, this is a bad amendment. It is nothing but a cover for those people who want to have it both ways. I hope the House will reject it and let us go on and move forward.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would simply respond, those who know me well know I do not try to fool anyone and this amendment is not intended to fool anyone.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the authorizing committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the authorizing committee with jurisdiction over NEA, I would like to make a few comments about my understanding of the future of NEA.

At the outset, I would note that over the years, nothing associated with the NEA has ever been easy. There are always competing factions with strong views. In fact, because of these strongly held views, 1993 was the last year the NEA was authorized and for the past few years it has been continued on a year-to-year basis only by virtue of the appropriations process. In 1995, my committee did vote out, with some bipartisan help, an authorization to phase it out over a 3-year period. However, the leadership did not see fit to bring that to the floor of the House.

Now we have before us a rule which would allow the Ehlers amendment, block grant amendment, which is authorizing legislation to be attached to the appropriations bill. I would have preferred that they wait before moving authorizing legislation on this bill. However, it is my understanding that the authorizing committee will be permitted to work its will, according to the majority leader and the chairman of the appropriations Subcommittee on Interior.

Here is my understanding of how it will happen. Assuming the Ehlers amendment is adopted and goes to conference, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will work its will through the normal authorizing process in developing an arts-related bill over the next several weeks. It is my hope that the bill will be promptly reported from the committee prior to the end of September before the conference is held, and we will fill in all the details as far as what the bill will do.

Thereafter, the bill would be made available to the Interior conferees as a clear statement of the authorizing committee's views on the future of NEA. My understanding is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior will ensure that the authorizing committee's bill becomes the official position of the House in conference.

I do want to point out that I had a letter some months ago from Ms. Alexander, concerned that one of my subcommittees was doing a witch-hunt. I assured her that would not happen. However, I asked her to do what I did. We appreciate in my area the money we get for the York Symphony Orchestra, a very small amount but we appreciate what we get. However, I asked her to do what I did. I looked at "Watermelon Woman" in its entirety, I looked at "Sex Is" in its entirety, and I asked her to do the same and then report back to me and tell me what it is I missed, because I am sure I must have missed something, there must have been some reason for tax dollars to be used for those two films. As yet, I have not had a response.

I have long believed that the normal protocol of deferring to the authorizing committee is the way to handle these matters. With the understanding I have with the subcommittee chair and with our leadership, I will support the action that is being taken today.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to ask the gentleman a question. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that if the Ehlers amendment passes, he will then activate his committee in order to pass an arts bill?

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. YATES. Suppose Ehlers does not pass. Would the gentleman nevertheless activate his committee?

Mr. GOODLING. We probably will run out of time, because it will not become an emergency.

Mr. YATES. In other words, the activating of the gentleman's committee will depend upon passage of the Ehlers amendment?

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, we have the chance today to uphold a long and a proud Federal commitment to culture and to humanity in the United States. But we can only maintain strong national support for the arts by rejecting block grants and restoring funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

NEA opponents might make my colleagues think that the NEA budget is colossal, but NEA funds are 0.01 percent of the budget, a tiny amount of money. Eliminating the NEA would not balance our budget, but it would bankrupt an essential element of our Nation's culture and artistic heritage. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it turns us back to the Dark Ages.

Providing a small amount of money for the arts through the NEA is a catalyst for local, State, and private arts support. It ensures that small communities as well as large can enjoy American treasures in literature, painting, film, and the theater.

A small amount of NEA seed money has helped Connecticut's arts thrive. We saw the results this summer and last summer with performers from around the world who came to New Haven for the Second Annual International Festival of Arts and Ideas. The nonprofit arts employed more than 17,000 people in Connecticut and generated more than \$1 billion for the State's economy in 1 year.

The NEA ensures that the arts are enjoyed not only by the affluent in

large cities but by the less well off in small towns. National grants are efficient. They allow exhibits and performers to travel to places. Even a small community that cannot afford a symphony can still enjoy a traveling orchestra's music.

NEA grants have had a positive effect across this Nation. One example: 3 grants benefited 140 small communities in all parts of this country. A grant to the Spanish Repertory Theater in New York enabled the company to tour Ohio, Pennsylvania, Colorado, Illinois, Texas, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin. If funds are block granted to the States, these kinds of traveling exhibits will be much harder to fund and to coordinate. The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies opposes block grants. Let us not return to the Dark Ages.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, as a strong supporter of the arts, I want to add my voice to the others raised in support of the Ehlers-Hunter amendment. While this amendment would eliminate the NEA, it would not eliminate Federal funding for the arts. Instead, it would block grant Federal arts funds to allow communities, not bureaucrats in Washington, DC, to decide what kinds of projects are appropriate for funding in their areas. In light of the many questionable projects funded by the NEA in recent years, I think this is a very appropriate solution.

Under this proposal, more money will be provided for arts education in schools so that students will have access to art, whether it be going to a symphony or having an artist visit their school. In many of my rural communities, they just do not have the resources to provide these kinds of opportunities for their young students. This amendment addresses that situation and will be very beneficial to the youth of America, because the arts expand the mind and heart, they stimulate creativity and they encourage creative self-expression.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage support of the Ehlers-Hunter amendment.

□ 1115

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Again I return to the statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. If I understand him correctly, he finds fault with the Ehlers amendment because he proposes, if the Ehlers amendment is successful and passes, he is going to call his committee in order to pass a bill that is more appropriate that he can turn over to the conferees, rather than the Ehlers amendment itself. If the Ehlers amendment fails, he said, he will not have to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Republican leadership voted to kill the National Endowment for the Arts, and today unfortunately they are dancing on its grave.

With all due respect to my colleague from Michigan, this amendment is not a compromise, it is a sham. It will not undo the damage that will be inflicted on communities across the Nation by eliminating the NEA.

We do not need a new bureaucracy at the Department of Education, a new distribution system to support the arts. The NEA, particularly under the leadership of Jane Alexander, already has the expertise and a proven record of getting the job done.

Let me remind my colleagues that out of more than 112,000 NEA-funded grants over the past 32 years, only 45 are controversial. That is less than four one-hundredths of 1 percent of all grants. Let us not throw the baby out with the bath water simply because a few grants years ago were controversial.

As I mentioned yesterday, this battle is not about defending the values of mainstream America. This is about pandering to Pat Robertson and the Christian Coalition. The assault on the arts, on cultural expression itself, is an outrage, and it must be defeated.

One of the standards by which we judge a civilized society is the support it provides for the arts. In comparison to other industrialized nations, the United States falls woefully behind in this area, even with a fully funded NEA.

But let us be honest. This is not a fight over money. The leadership wants to eliminate the NEA because they are afraid of artistic expression in a free society. Polls overwhelmingly show that the American public supports Federal funding for the arts because students, artists, musicians, teachers, orchestras, theaters, dance companies across the country benefit from the NEA support. For many Americans, whether they live in the suburbs or cities or rural areas, the NEA is critical in making the arts affordable and accessible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Ehlers-Hunter amendment. Preserve the NEA.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I simply point out that if we had a better distribution mechanism that was not so controversial, we would probably have much more money to distribute to the arts than we do now.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding this

time. As chairman of the oversight committee that has responsibility for the National Endowment for the Arts, we have done oversight work, and the reason I am supporting my colleague's amendment today is because I believe it addresses the worst abuses that we have uncovered in the National Endowment for the Arts. It does not address them all, but it addresses the worst ones.

What are they? As this amendment does, it takes away the \$20 million in administrative overhead that the National Endowment spends each and every year, \$20 million to distribute an additional \$80 million. That is an unreasonable cost.

Where does the money go? The National Endowment for the Arts, as an example, has spent \$21,000 per employee on a computer system. Not bad. The disappointing thing is that computer system still is not up and running and does not even do e-mail.

The second abuse that this program deals with is the distribution of funds. I do not think this House would ever develop a program from scratch that would ensure that 143 congressional districts get no money directly from the program. We would never develop a program that sends 25 percent of the funds to one State. This amendment assures that we will equitably distribute funds throughout the country.

And the third thing that this amendment does is it moves decisionmaking for the local arts programs to where those decisions can be best made, where they will be supported by the local community, where they will be supported by the American public, moving decisionmaking for arts projects back to the State level, and the money, the additional funds, are moved into arts education for our kids.

This is a great program, this is a good amendment, it does not go exactly where we need to go, but it moves the program in the right direction and handles the worst abuses for an ineffective bureaucracy.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us is not even a serious legislative effort. It is very clear what is going on here is simply "Operation Cover Your Tail." We have had a lot of people in this House who promised to vote for funding the arts, but yesterday they chose to assassinate the arts behind the cover of the Ehlers amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a smokescreen amendment, and I think the comments of the Chair of the Committee on Education and the Workforce indicate just how unreal this proposal is as an alternative. What he really indicated by his remarks is that this is just a time filler. It is a device by which to kill the National Endowment for the Arts, and

then they figure out later how they are going to explain it to the folks back home and come up with some other scheme to cover what they have done.

What he said in response to the comments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is, "Well, if this amendment passes, then what we'll do is, we'll pull our committee together and we will really then figure out what it is we really want to do, and then we will send it on to the conferees." When he was asked would he do that same thing if the Ehlers amendment is not adopted, he said no.

That indicates that this Ehlers amendment is nothing but a device by which you accomplish the assassination of the National Endowment for the Arts. That is all it is, and it just seems to me that that is not what a majority of Members in both parties in this House want to do.

Now I have served, when I first came to the Congress I served, on this subcommittee as one of my first assignments. I remember for years the wonderful bipartisan support that we had for the Endowment. People now complain about a couple of the grants that the Endowment was involved in because they say that they produced art that is not consistent with American values. There is no question about that, and I agree with that. But they have had about a 99 or 97 percent success rate.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to meet the Member of Congress who has that high a performance by any standard, no matter who would determine that standard.

Let us be very clear about it. The arts community is against the Ehlers amendment. The State arts agencies who would receive a very large share of the funds under this amendment do not want this amendment. And the idea that we are going to turn this over as an orphan program to the Department of Education, which at least a third of my colleagues on that side of the aisle have been trying to abolish, indicates just what a slapdash operation this really is.

So it seems to me if my colleagues are serious, if they want to cast a vote that will keep continued pressure on to resurrect a meaningful arts program, they will vote this down and they will insist that the committee in conference resurrect the National Endowment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply observe this amendment is definitely not a smokescreen. I have never smoked in my life.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

YATES]. Over the years they have done a valiant job with this budget. I happen to have a hundred percent record of arts support. I voted against the rule yesterday. I think the National Endowment was not treated fairly in the rule, and that is why I voted against this.

Now those of us who believe that the Federal Government has a role in the arts, the Ehlers proposal is the one thing we have to show that this House cares for Federal support of the arts. Let us forget about some of the administrative machinery right now. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is on the right track. That does not mean we have every dot dotted and every I dotted and so forth.

It is wrong to deny this House a vote, and this is the chance to vote and show our support for the arts. This is the one opportunity we will have on this bill going into negotiations with the Senate. They might well succeed in having the NEA continued, and I would support that. But I think we have to go in with support of the Federal Government for the arts.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] formerly has 30 percent of those funds going to the State arts councils. I am quite familiar with the California State Arts Council which does an outstanding job. Sixty percent would be going to public schools. Only 3 percent on administration, not 20 percent.

This proposal does not pretend to be perfect. I think universities with outreach efforts in inner cities and public schools need to be supported.

Revenue sharing that we had in this country between 1973 and 1983 worked. Who did not like it? The Washington lobbyists. Who did not like it? The staff on the Hill and people that had been here too long on the Hill.

This program will work. Give it a chance. Vote for the Ehlers proposal. Vote for Federal support of the arts.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I have the greatest respect for my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], but I should like to point out to him that in the years I have been in the Congress and in the number of times that I have been in conferences with the Senate, I have gone through those conferences with bills that had no appropriations on programs from the House and appropriations that came from the Senate that had to be reconciled, and I suspect that the Senate will approve an appropriation for NEA.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we would be better off going to the Senate with a vote like we had yesterday on NEA, 217 to 216, showing that the House still wanted to have NEA rather than clouding the issue with an amendment like the Ehlers amendment.

Nevertheless I respect the position the gentleman has taken.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I would be the last person in this bill to defend the obscene art that is the controversy about the funding. But to me, I am a bit troubled; I am still smarting from the vote yesterday on the rule.

The gentleman here, who I served with for 22 years, and there is not a finer man that has ever served in this body than the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. SID YATES], a man of integrity who has had many awards from the arts community, and the Committee on Rules waived points of order. This is legislation on an appropriation; make no mistake about that. They waived the points of order to allow this amendment to come up. They denied the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] the same courtesy to offer his amendment up or down on NEA funding.

□ 1130

This is wrong. My friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], who I served with on the Subcommittee on Military Construction for many, many years, and we have saved this country a million dollars in funds for our military and quality of life, but to make a rule to where they waive the points of order to allow an amendment such as this, and they deny a man who has been in this House for many, many years, a man of integrity, it is just not right.

Let me make one other point. All the abuses that have been in the grants and what has taken place, let me just kind of draw an analogy here. I serve on the Committee on National Security. We had some scandals in our academies, in the Naval Academy, in West Point and the others. We do not close the schools down. We try to correct them, which is what we have done in this area.

We have tremendous cost overruns on weapons systems. We do not quit spending money for defense. We try to fix it. We do not try to kill it in a roundabout way and allow an unfair rule on this House floor to responsible Members that have given their lives in service to their countrymen here on this floor. That is not democracy.

Mr. Chairman, this is not right. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS], if I could, on most of these amendments that come up that call for block grants, they pass out literature that says how much each district in the country will get. Do Members have such a printout that we could have, where I will know how much these block grants we will get in the Eighth District in North Carolina, or statewide, under block grants? Or have Members gone that far in analyzing the block grants?

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Yes, I do have a chart here. I have not distributed it. It is not by district, because we do not know how the State agencies or how the State art commissions would distribute on a per district basis, but I do have a breakdown by State of how much would be given to each State for the use of their arts commission to distribute and how much would be given for their schools to distribute.

Mr. HEFNER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just make this final point. Living in rural North Carolina, my kids were in grade school, and nothing pleased them any more than when the symphony or a portion of the symphony from Charlotte or someplace came and performed at their school.

It was the highlight of their day and the highlight of their week when they could participate in something that they would not be able to participate in otherwise. To me this is just an absolute tragedy when we did not allow a vote, an up-and-down vote for my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply observe that under the NEA 25 percent of the funding went to one State. There was a lot of talk about the NEA, about distributing funds to the little people. Our program does a lot better job at distributing funds to the little people than the NEA has done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT].

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, as we look for alternatives today, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, and the gentleman from California, Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER. My freshmen colleague the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. JERRY MORAN, a couple of months ago began to mention this concept to me as a concept that he thought would work.

We are looking to new and better ways to do things. Clearly Members are not going to privatize or turn back to the States the obligation to defend the country, so we have to look for different ways to solve problems, management problems in the Defense Department.

We are talking about an agency that spends 20 percent of its money just to administer its programs, and according to their own inspector general's report, as of March 31, 1996, 63 percent of the project costs were not reconcilable to the accounting records, 79 percent had inadequate documentation, 53 percent failed to engage independent auditors, even though their grant requirement absolutely required that.

We are not debating today whether or not to spend money on the arts. The

key here is not about spending money on the arts. We are for the first time really significantly debating where is the better place to make this decision. Should this decision be made in Washington, or can this decision be made better in the States?

We got an opportunity to look to the States. The State art councils have done a good job distributing the State money. Thirty percent of the NEA-distributed money has gone to six cities in America. In the Seventh District of Missouri that I represent, of the money distributed by the NEA, even though our proportionate share would be a quarter of a million dollars, we get back \$5,000. The State arts councils are going to do a better job in distributing this money. They are going to do a better job administratively in spending it.

I urge support of this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nothing but a smokescreen to hide the actions taken by the House leadership to prevent the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to restore funding to the NEA. This amendment was cooked up in the middle of the night. It has not been considered by any committee nor had the benefit of any public hearing. It would effectively waste the \$80 million it appropriates with virtually no benefit to the arts.

For 30 years, Mr. Chairman, the NEA has brought art and culture to those who would not otherwise have access to it. Before the NEA there were 58 orchestras in the country. Today there are more than 1,000. Before the NEA there were 37 professional dance companies. Now there are 300. Before the NEA, only 1 million people went to the theater in this country every year. Today more than 55 million do. Without the NEA, we will revert to the old situation where the arts were not accessible to most people in this country.

But this amendment eliminates the NEA. It would instead distribute \$600 or \$1,000 to every school district. \$600 for an entire school district? What use could they make of that? The amendment is so restrictive, there is no guarantee, no assurance it would continue our support for symphonies, operas, concerts in the park, local Shakespeare festivals and touring dance and theater groups that benefit entire communities, not only schoolchildren. Even the State arts agencies that would directly receive 30 percent of the block grants strongly oppose the amendment.

The amendment does not recognize the purpose of a national arts agency, and therefore it tends to set up a distribution system that sounds fair but in reality is completely unworkable.

The amendment will eliminate funding for the traveling theater and dance groups that visit small towns and communities all across the Nation, because if States control these funds they will have no incentive to support theater or dance groups that travel to other States outside their borders.

And the amendment will distribute an equal portion of Federal money to every region. But we all know this makes no sense. Mr. Chairman, should New York City get the same amount of money for wheat subsidies as towns in Kansas and Iowa, even though we grow no wheat in New York City? Of course not. Some regions have more wheat farmers and others have more artists, and Federal funds should be distributed accordingly.

In the end, wheat subsidies help consumers nationwide, and NEA grants bring excellent art produced by the country's finest artists to people all over the country.

I hope it is very clear that the amendment is a fraud, designed only to create a political fig leaf for those whose constituents will not appreciate their votes yesterday to kill the NEA.

Do not be deceived. Vote against this amendment, and wait for the Senate and the President to rescue the arts in this country from the folly of this House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ehlers-Hunter amendment eliminating the NEA and block granting funding and giving control to the local school boards. I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the Ehlers-Hunter measure. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Ehlers-Hunter NEA amendment. Though I support the efforts of both of my distinguished colleagues in trying to formulate a workable compromise that would fund the arts, I believe it is too little and too late.

I strongly support the vital need to continue funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, and it is distressing that this amendment terminates this important agency.

Over the past 30 years, our quality of life has been improved by the National Endowment for the Arts. Support for the arts acknowledges our Nation's commitment to freedom of expression, one of the basic principles upon which our Nation is founded. Cutting funding for the arts will deny citizens this essential freedom, and detract from the quality of life in our Nation.

The President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities released the report entitled *Creative America*, which makes several recommendations about the need to strengthen support for cultural in our country. It applauds our American spirit, and observes that an energetic cultural life contributes to a strong democracy. This report not only highlights our Nation's unique tradition of philanthropy, but

also mentions that the baby-boomer generation, and new American corporations, are not fulfilling this standard of giving. It saddens me that something as important as the arts, which has been so integral to our American heritage, is being cast aside by our younger generations as something of little value.

By block granting funding for the arts and fragmenting the NEA, our Nation would be the first among cultured nations to eliminate the arts from our Nation's priorities. As chairman of the International Relations Committee, I recognize the importance of the arts on an international level, in helping to foster a common appreciation of history and culture that are so essential to humanity. If we eliminate the NEA we will be erasing an essential part of our culture.

Moreover, this measure which block grants funding for the arts, places most of the authority for distribution of art funding to local school boards, virtually eliminating a significant Federal role.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Ehlers-Hunter amendment and instead work with our colleagues in the conference to provide full funding for the NEA.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ehlers-Hunter amendment. I am deeply offended by the subterfuge which it represents as a backdoor way of putting money into the Department of Education, frequently the target of the majority side of the aisle.

What offends me more than that, however, is that we stand here every day preaching the rule of law, where we insist that for Americans, that there is an even application of the rule of law and that it ought to be abided by.

This House has rules that ought to be abided by, and the rule says that you cannot authorize on an appropriation bill. On that basis they have ruled out of order the ranking member's amendment to restore funding. Well, that is fine. If they are going to enforce the rule of law and apply that to the gentleman's amendment, that is fine.

But on the other hand, through a manipulation of the rules of this House, they have allowed an amendment to come forth which does not even belong in this appropriation bill. It goes to another committee on appropriations. It has to do with funding of the Department of Education.

If Members do not believe me, they should remind themselves about the words of the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, who said on the floor of this House that if the Ehlers amendment passed his committee will be put to work to write the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, if that is not back door subterfuge, I do not know what is. If we have problems in explaining what we do to our constituents, I hope Mem-

bers can go back to their constituents and explain what we are doing today.

The annihilation of the National Endowment for the Arts is a very, very serious act, prompted by a few objections to maybe less than 50 art programs or projects among millions. If we are offended by these things, make the rules tougher, but do not do away with the symbol of national support for the idea of creativity, which is the essence of free expression protected by our Constitution.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply remark that the rules of the House provide that a waiver protecting from a point of order applies only if the chairman of the authorization committee authorizes it. That is what happened in this case. So the rules of the House were followed.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the rural States in mid-America, I speak in favor of the Ehlers-Hunter amendment for a number of reasons. First, the status quo funding of the NEA results not in art education, but in art arrogance. Do we really need a centralized, federalized ministry on the arts to tell the people of America what is good and what is not good art, what does and does not deserve funding?

Second, the present philosophy of the NEA does not accomplish its original mission of providing art education to underserved areas; not the big cities, but underserved areas. Rather, Washington control results in mismanagement and a lack of common sense in art funding.

The Ehlers amendment gets the money to the State art agencies, which do a good job, and it also for the first time provides funding for art programs in schools. I urge my colleagues to support a commonsense approach to arts by voting for art education and not art arrogance.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I take issue with my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] when he said that they observed the rules of the House when the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce gave his consent. I gathered the impression that the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce did not give his consent. He came down in the well of the House and said that if the gentleman's amendment passes, he is going to put his committee to work to pass a bill that means something, and then turn it over to the conferees.

What happened, of course, was that the Committee on Rules waived all points of order with respect to the gentleman's amendment, which included

the rule that required the approval of the chairman of the legislative committee. That is what happened in this particular case.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I do not question the good faith effort of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS], but I do have to say I rise in strong opposition to this proposal. This is no way to run a railroad, and it is certainly no way to legislate. This is not the time nor is the appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior bill the place to undertake a complete overhaul of our arts funding process. This is a job for the authorization committee, the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. Chairman, I speak with some authority on this because I have been a member of that committee, and also a leader for years in reforming the NEA, so I think I have some understanding of what is involved here.

□ 1145

Regardless of my commitment to the NEA, the point here today is that we are about to establish an entirely new program that we know next to nothing about. There are a lot of questions here. I do not have time to go into all of them, but I have a list of questions here that are not answered. And some of the answers that are not in the legislation, proposed legislation, are said to be for the committee report.

Is that any way to legislate? That is ridiculous. But without going into all of the questions, aside from real serious questions about how the funding formula is distributed, I want to ask my colleagues at least two questions:

Will the bill be written in the conference if the committee of jurisdiction, as the chairman has said, does not act? Are we handing that over to a conference committee? I doubt it.

What will it mean in terms of the conference committee in the Senate having worked its will on the NEA? Will it undermine that effort? There are questions on both sides of this issue.

To my Republican colleagues, particularly those who have sworn allegiance to eliminating the U.S. Department of Education, is not anyone here concerned that this proposal creates a new bureaucracy in the Department of Education?

Those are but two of about 10 important questions that are left unanswered in this procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the list of questions to which I referred:

ADDITION TO STATEMENTS—QUESTIONS ABOUT EHLERS

Mr. Yates cannot offer his amendment because the NEA has not been reauthorized by the Education Committee since 1993. Should

we be approving here a 28-page amendment that substitutes for the Committee's authorization process?

Has anyone seen the formula for distribution? If not, when will we see it? Before conference? Before final passage? Before enactment?

Will the bill be written in conference if the committee of jurisdiction doesn't act?

Do we know how this will affect each State?

Many of my Republican colleagues have sworn allegiance to the cause of eliminating the U.S. Department of Education. Isn't anyone concerned that in this proposal we are handing a new \$80 million bureaucracy to DOE?

What experience does the DOE have in operating an arts program?

There are about 16,000 local school boards across the Nation. Under Ehlers, each one would get about \$3,000 each. It seems to me that the paperwork involved in this program will cost each district more than \$3,000. Is it worth it?

The Ehlers amendment contains a 3 percent funding figure for administrative costs? Whose administrative costs? Will the States get any of this? If not, why is this not one of those famous "unfunded mandates" we so strongly oppose in this House?

I recommend a "no" vote on Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, Government support of the arts has created access to the arts for millions of Americans and has provided tremendous economic and educational benefits to our Nation.

Just as the Department of Education embodies our belief that mastering a disciplined body of knowledge is essential to exercising freedom with responsibility, so the NEA embodies our national commitment to the arts and our recognition that creativity is absolutely essential to an entrepreneurial economy in a visionary democracy.

It is no surprise that students who have 4 more years of art education have SAT scores that are significantly higher than those that do not. Further, arts moneys have been the most successful economic development program in our great cities.

I rise at this time in support of the Ehlers amendment because it significantly restores funding for the arts while the underlying bill slashes funding 90 percent. It also recognizes that there is a need for a Federal role in funding the arts.

The Ehlers amendment is therefore better than the underlying bill. However, it is dangerous to make significant changes in any Government agency without hearings and this amendment has some serious problems. It eliminates any significant Federal role in supporting unique museums, theaters, symphonies, and dance troops that are institutions of national significance and value. Also, by sending the education dollars directly to the schools, it destroys the powerful partnerships that have emerged and been

developed between the great museums like Hartford's Wadsworth Atheneum and local schools. These partnerships provide a totally different and higher order of arts experience to our children than could any public school arts department.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment sends the House into conference, and this is where I disagree respectfully with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. It sends the House bill into conference with far more dollars in it than the base bill and a clear message of support for a Federal role. In conference I would hope the NEA structures prevail and this bill goes to hearing as part of the reauthorization process.

Government support of the arts at the Federal, State, and local levels has created access to the arts for millions of Americans, and has provided tremendous economic and educational benefits to our Nation. Funding from the National Endowment of the Arts [NEA] directly or indirectly supports thousands of programs that bring the arts to urban and rural communities, with local decisionmakers selecting cultural activities of importance to their communities. NEA-supported arts education programs open the doors of museums and symphonies to thousands of students and bring unique arts experiences into the classrooms.

Just as the Department of Education embodies our belief that mastering a disciplined body of knowledge is essential to exercising freedom with responsibility, so the NEA embodies our national commitment to the arts, and our recognition that creativity is absolutely essential to an entrepreneurial economy and a visionary democracy.

It is no surprise that students who have 4 or more years of art education have SAT scores that are significantly higher than those who do not. Direct and indirect funding from the NEA is essential to continuing and developing quality art education that will build the skilled minds and hands needed to shape our future.

The economic impact of the arts is significant and especially dramatic in our great cities, large and small. Of all the urban economic development programs, arts funding has proven to be among the most important of our great cities. An investment equal to 38 cents per American, one one-hundredth of 1 percent of our total Federal budget, stimulates 18 times that amount from other sources. Nationally, nonprofit arts generate \$37 billion in economic activity, support 1.3 million jobs, and return \$3.4 billion in Federal income taxes. The arts are good business.

I rise in support of the Ehlers amendment because it restores significant funding for the arts and recognizes the Federal responsibility to fund the arts, while the underlying bill slashes funding by 90 percent. The Ehlers amendment, therefore, is better than the alternative—which provides virtually no funding at all. However, it is dangerous to make significant changes in any government agency without hearings and this amendment has some serious weaknesses. It eliminates any significant Federal role in supporting the unique museums, theaters, symphonies, and dance com-

panies that are institutions of national significance and value. Also, by sending the education funding directly to the schools, it destroys the powerful partnerships between great museums like Hartford's Wadsworth Atheneum and local partner schools. These partnerships provide totally different and higher order arts experiences to our children than could be provided by school arts departments alone.

Public Law 89-209, the law establishing the NEA, states: "It is necessary and appropriate for the federal government to help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination and inquiry, but also the material conditions facilitating the release of this creative talent." I take that responsibility very seriously.

The arts are an integral part of our society and our economy. The American people recognize the importance of the arts. Seventy-nine percent of them support a government role in funding the arts. This amendment sends the House bill into conference with more dollars than the base bill and clear support for a Federal role in arts funding. In conference we should retain current the NEA structures and send this thoughtful amendment to hearing as part of the reauthorization process.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to repeat what I said with respect to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN]. I think that if we went into conference with the Ehlers amendment, we would be in a very weak position because the Senate, I am sure, will put an appropriate amount of money in the bill. And it all depends on what my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], and I are able to come up with in our negotiations with the Senate.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, we have not been able to reauthorize the NEA legislation either under Democratic leadership or Republican leadership. It is my hope that the conference committee will take the old language, and then we could go into the authorizing process this year and bring together some of the interests of conservatives who have opposed NEA but many of whom do not oppose some Federal funding of the arts in our Nation and really think through how do we get a reauthorization that meets the needs of all of us. But that is a separate issue. I think in the conference committee we could go forward.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest the vote yesterday indicated that conservatives who are opposed to it would have been outvoted, had we had a chance to vote on NEA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this

amendment. I rise in opposition because if something is not broken, then there is no need to mend it. There is no need to fix it. The fact of the matter is the NEA has, for a number of years, developed tremendous outreach to the arts community all over America. Everybody involved in the arts, they know. Everybody involved in the arts, they are a part of. They know where the programs are. They know where the funds need to go. They know the kind of activities that need to take place. I believe, again, if it is not broke, do not fix it. I commend my colleague from Illinois for having been a longtime guardian of these programs. I stand with him and say, if it is not broke, do not fix it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in objection to the Ehlers amendment. Under the Ehlers amendment, the NEA would be eliminated as we know it. The Ehlers amendment would appropriate \$80 million in Federal funds to be allocated as block grants. Under this proposal, 97 percent of the money is to go directly to State arts councils and local school boards for only school-based arts education programs.

Beyond monetary terms, this shift of 60 percent of the funds allocated entirely toward schools, which serve primarily K-12 needs are the funds that support institutions that promote lifelong learning, such as museums, dance companies, theaters, outreach programs, community-based programs, and folk arts are lost. These arts and humanities programs that Americans have grown to know and love over the years no longer will be funded.

This proposal means that a majority of Federal arts funding would not be available for cultural organizations and some of their programs. Important programs that enrich the lives of many across this Nation. Although the State Arts Council may receive slightly more money, they cannot possibly compensate for this loss. The 7th Congressional District of Illinois which I represent would lose over \$1.8 million overall based on fiscal year 1997 appropriations. This is bad for Chicago, but more important it is bad for America. I say it is bad for America because Americans come to Chicago.

There are numerous organizations that would be hurt by this proposal in my district, fine institutions that people across this Nation enjoy—such as the Art Institute of Chicago, the Chicago Artist's Coalition, the Chicago Dance Arts Coalition, Inc., Hubbard Street Dance Chicago, Illinois Arts Council, Lyric Opera of Chicago, Museum of Contemporary Art, Urban Gateways, and the YMCA's USA Literature Special projects would no longer receive their much-needed NEA funds.

I join with my constituents, the State arts agencies and the mayors across our great Nation that reflect the view of millions in my opposition to the Ehlers amendment that greatly hinders our Nation's commitment to the arts.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, most of us here in this body and citizens across the country were offended with some of the arts that were funded by the NEA

in years past. We had a fellow colleague, Paul Henry, who led the successful fight to stop much of that abuse of taxpayer money several years ago. I am delighted that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS], his successor, has followed that same trail.

Because we did not have an authorization, money could and was struck for the NEA. That is a simple tact under the rules of the House. The Ehlers amendment is a step in the right direction for allowing the funding for the arts. No, the Ehlers amendment is not music to everyone's ears. It does not fund symphonies and a number of worthwhile organizations, museums that today are funded. I know that there are a number of things that we need to correct in the future with those things in mind.

But today we need to adopt the Ehlers amendment and we need to let the Committee on Education and the Workforce reauthorize this very valuable program for the future. The bottom line here is that we would rather have something than nothing, and the Ehlers amendment is a good step in the right direction. I would urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] has 6¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has 2½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the arts but in strong opposition to the Ehlers amendment which at its best is an untested way of handling arts funding. The NEA is indeed a lightning rod. It has some basic good ideas. I give them a lot of credit for that.

But this concept is less than 24 hours old at this point. It has not been tested across the country. Virtually nobody really understands what is in it. In addition, it is a travesty that we are not in this body voting on NEA funding, which every single Member knows would be reinstated to the exact amount it got last year if we were given that opportunity, because of legislative process and procedures that has been avoided. The bottom line is that most groups in this country that I have been in touch with through fax, by telephone call, whatever, are in opposition to this amendment. That goes all the way from the Conference of Mayors to arts groups in general to business leaders to State arts agencies, all of whom are saying this is not the way to proceed.

So it is a dilemma for those of us who support the arts. I oppose the Ehlers amendment. I believe that we must move ahead with good arts funding by the Senate and by the White House.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO].

Mr. BONO. Mr. Chairman, I was not going to speak but I am sitting in my office choking on the rhetoric that I am hearing on what a great contribution the NEA is to the arts. I have been in the arts for 30 years. That has been my occupation. I know of no one in 30 years in the arts that has been assisted by the NEA. I do not see where the NEA is this amazing contribution to mankind and has brought all these artists forward.

Furthermore, there is no equity as far as how artists are selected or chosen. There is no system. There is no equity. And I would not qualify and many of my colleagues that are artists, successful artists, would not qualify today. So finally we have a system, the Ehlers amendment, that would at least have a fairness as far as qualifying or as far as assisting artists, and we are denying that and we are giving it to a group. I wish Congress would stop thinking that they are experts on everything. They certainly are not experts on art and they do not know what they are talking about when they talk about the NEA.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, despite a few mistakes, the National Endowment for the Arts has worked and continues to work remarkably well. It provides funds on the basis of excellence, not merely population. That is not an elitism, that is the time-honored conservative principle of giving money where it will be used most effectively. Under the Ehlers plan, the distribution of funds on population, every single State except one, every single State except one loses money.

The discretionary grants are gone and the 37 percent distribution formula means every State loses money. The only place that came out on the plus side of the ledger is when you distribute money for students and then you give them 90 cents apiece to buy crayons and construction paper. Support the NEA.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds for a brief response.

My good friend, the gentleman from New York, just made a statement that every State loses. He is undoubtedly basing that on the NEA flier that I mentioned earlier on, which was distributed and simply gave inaccurate information. States do not lose. They in fact do gain.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has suggested I gave inaccurate information to the House. The

gentleman has suggested that the gentleman in the well has given inaccurate information to the House. I would like the opportunity to correct that statement. How do I get time to do that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan may yield time as he sees fit.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds for a response to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, under the population aid formula, 37 percent distribution of funds, every State except Florida loses money because we eliminate all discretionary spending.

Where you gain money, and it is marginal, is under the student aid distribution formula, and that is about 90 cents a student, which will allow them to buy crayons and construction paper.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, rather than continue that mini-debate, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ehlers amendment. We have had problems with the NEA because a few artists want to extend beyond what is acceptable with public funds.

We have had great success with the State arts councils. I want to give them the funds they need to continue. There is a legitimate matter of debate about the use of public funds for art, but I believe that in a great civilization there has always been the use of public funds to support the arts. America is such a great civilization.

I ask my colleagues to set aside their concerns and to help us move to a substantial situation of providing assistance to our State arts councils. Perhaps too much is allocated to the schools at the expense of the State arts councils, but this Ehlers amendment is a valid effort. I think it is important that we move in this direction. It is the solution in the long term.

The national level will always be contentious. It is time to get the money to the State arts councils. They have done an extraordinary job in deciding how to spend their funds. I urge Members to support the Ehlers amendment to expedite this process to the final solution.

The Ehlers amendments would replace the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) with a block grant program to the State art councils and public school districts.

This Member has always been in favor of public funding for the arts. Every great civilization has always had public support of the arts. America is a great civilization and we should continue small but reasonable Federal funding in this area.

This Member has great confidence in the State arts councils. For example, there is no doubt that the Nebraska

Arts Council will make the right decisions regarding use of Federal funds.

As we all know, the controversy surrounding the NEA is largely the result of inappropriate funding decisions regarding pornographic or obscene projects which have been the subject of strenuous objections by many Members of Congress, including this Member. Because of the strong public opposition to the NEA, the best way to ensure continued Federal support of the arts is to send the money to the State art councils and public schools for distribution. A vote for the Ehlers amendment is a vote to support the arts.

In closing Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to support the arts by voting "aye" on the Ehlers amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply reiterate the choice before us is very clear at this point. This amendment, in spite of the accusations made against it, is not a smoke screen, it is not trying to fool anyone. It is a simple attempt at providing continued Federal funding for the arts, given the fact that the House at this moment in time is not prepared to continue the NEA.

So the issue is clear. Do we want to send a bill to the Senate that has no NEA and no arts funding, or do we want to send a bill to the Senate that has no NEA but does have continued arts funding?

The choice to me is very clear. Let us continue the Federal support for the arts. Let us continue to provide funding for the arts through the various State agencies that are available, through the arts education programs at various States and that school districts have. I believe it will be a more equitable distribution than we have had. It certainly will be far less controversial, and I believe it will be beneficial for the arts, for the people of this Nation who are interested in the arts, and it will be beneficial for the students who will be learning about the arts. I think it is a win-win situation.

I urge all Members of this body to forget partisan differences, to forget the arguments about the NEA and say at this point in time the best thing we can do is pass this amendment and send this bill to the Senate with continued funding for the arts, and we will there, in conference, resolve the issues about the future of the NEA. So I urge all Members of this body, regardless of partisan differences, to vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Let me just say I think the direction that the Ehlers amendment is taking us is the right direction. Clearly, this is a new approach and a new way of funding the arts at the Federal level. It indicates our commitment to making sure that at local levels, local communities and the States have resources for funding.

I wanted to say to my good friend from New York that I would certainly urge, in conference, the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], who has been working in this direction for several years, to work with him and anyone else to make sure that States actually do have full funds. There is no question about whose list is right, whose list is wrong. Our goal is to get funding to the States to have a mechanism for the States to be able to help fund the arts in an appropriate way under local leadership.

This is the only point I would make to our friends who are arguing so passionately for the endowment to the arts: If one talks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], who I think is a very reasonable and a very responsible person, he will advise that as recently as this year he tried to get information out of the NEA, defending certain films that they had granted, that he could not defend. He could not defend why taxpayers were paying for them. He could not understand what was the point of certain types of gratuitous pornography and gratuitous violence in a way that made no sense. Yet we want to find a way, with local communities, with local input, with local involvement, to fund the arts.

So I think for those who care about the arts as opposed to the National Endowment, this is actually going to take most of the argument, most of the controversy, most of the irritation out of the system and allow us to focus, instead, on how do we help the local symphony, how do we help the local ballet, how do we help the local art museum, and to do it in a way which allows us to build support for the arts rather than engage in arguments over controversy.

I think it is an important step in the right direction. I commend the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership and the gentleman from Ohio for having organized it, and I believe this is the best way to have funding for the arts at the local level, where it matters, so that local communities can have the kinds of involvement and input they should have.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the most distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the Republican assault on

creativity in America and urge my colleagues to vote against the Ehlers amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ehlers amendment. The past 24 hours have been sad and disappointing ones for the House of Representatives, because the Republican leadership has refused to allow the Ehlers amendment of our distinguished ranking member, Representative SIDNEY YATES. The regular order of the House will call for the ranking member to have an amendment made in order on a subject on which he has standing. No one in the country has more standing on the arts than SID YATES—a champion indeed. We are all privileged to call him colleague.

Yesterday, Mr. ARMEY said that the Ehlers amendment would put Crayolas in the hands of our children. Yes Crayolas and that's about all. The Ehlers amendment would translate into less than \$1 per child. That's for a small box of crayons with no burnt sienna and azure blue.

The Rep leadership has shown its true colors on this Ehlers amendment. In the debate on the NEA they claim they need to reduce the deficit. Today they are spending that money on the Ehlers amendment. This is about content restriction not deficit reduction. The Ehlers amendment is a transparent figleaf to give cover to those Representatives who voted against arts in America.

I urge my colleagues to reject this hoax and reject the Ehlers amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ehlers amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, again I find myself differing from my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS]. He made the statement that the House did not propose to approve NEA. Now, that was never made clear, I suggest to the gentleman. The vote on the rule yesterday was certainly not an open and shut and clean vote on NEA.

I suggested to the House today that if they gave the opportunity to this House for me to offer my amendment to reinstate NEA and give it some money to operate, I would be willing to bet, a substantial sum, in view of yesterday's very, very close vote, that the House would have supported NEA. We never had that opportunity to pass upon that question.

I want to close by saying that even the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce [Mr. GOODLING], refused to accept the Ehlers amendment. He said clearly, in response to the question that I asked him, that if the Ehlers amendment passed, he would unite his committee and pass legislation to correct the defects that are in the legislation so he could have a bill that he could give the conferees between the House and the Senate as representing the House side.

So, obviously, this Ehlers amendment is in the nature of a figleaf. It does make available some of the money for art, but not in a way that is effective and certainly not in the way that art has been distributed over the years so effectively by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote down the Ehlers amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the arts and against the Ehlers amendment which would abolish the NEA and provide insufficient and ineffective block grants to the States.

The Ehlers amendment would eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts. This is a move that even State arts agencies oppose. Why adopt an amendment that even the very organizations purported to benefit think it is a bad idea?

NEA funding, on the other hand, allows artists and presenters to bring the arts directly to students and the community at large.

I did some math on Mr. EHLERS' amendment. Assuming all States get an equal share of this funding, and each school district gets an equal share within the State, each California school district will receive \$961 per school district.

Even if a school district consisted of only one elementary, middle, and high school, \$961 would barely purchase a set of colored pencils for each student.

Thankfully, common sense prevailed and the Ehlers amendment failed.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ehlers amendment. This amendment would eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts and is opposed by the very State art councils it purports to help.

In all candor, the Ehlers amendment is something of a smoke screen. We should be having a straight, up-or-down vote on the NEA, and we would have had one if the leadership of the House had not blocked the Yates amendment from even being debated by a procedural slight of hand. Whatever you think about the NEA—whether or not you support Federal funding for the arts—everyone should agree that we should have a fair, up-or-down vote on the issue. The Yates amendment would have given Members the option of restoring funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. It is unfortunate that the House won't have the opportunity to debate it.

The spending priorities of this Congress continue to amaze me. Just the other week, this House of Representatives voted to purchase nine additional B-2 bombers that the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have told Congress repeatedly that they do not want or need. These planes will cost \$13.6 billion dollars to build and an additional \$13.2 billion to operate and maintain.

What a difference 2 weeks make. Today the House is considering legislation that eliminates funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Apparently, the House leadership has determined that, after spending billions of dollars for B-2 bombers the Pentagon says it doesn't need, there isn't any money left to support the arts in the United States. For all the extreme and inaccurate rhetoric coming from the other side about the expense and

utility of the Arts Endowment, the truth is that the NEA represents just one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. Put another way, the NEA costs each American less than 38 cents a year: That's three dimes, one nickel and three pennies.

So what are our constituents getting for their 38 cents? Since the NEA was created 32 years ago, the number of arts organizations has dramatically increased. When the NEA was established, there were only 56 nonprofit theaters in America; today there are over 400. The number of orchestras have quadrupled in number to over 200. Opera companies have grown from 27 to nearly 100. Our country's modest investment in the NEA helps support folk festivals, community theater, free lawn concerts, arts exhibitions in public libraries, and chamber music in rural areas. The NEA helps to bring the arts to millions of school children. Just last week, millions of Americans saw the broadcast of the Fourth of July concert on the Mail by the National Symphony. The NEA helped make that possible.

The Endowment also serves as a catalyst for private investment in the arts. Every dollar awarded by the NEA attracts \$12 from State and local art agencies, corporations and other private sources. Indeed, the non-for-profit arts generate \$37 billion in economic activity and support more than a million jobs. On the community level, the art activities supported by the NEA simulate local economies, promote tourism, and make our communities better places to live.

Elimination of the NEA would not mean the elimination of the arts in America. What it would mean is that the arts could become inaccessible to many Americans. The arts should not be just for the well-to-do.

Opponents of the Arts endowment insist on rehashing old arguments against a few controversial grants awarded by the NEA over the last three decades. The fact of the matter is that only a handful of the more than 112,000 grants awarded since the NEA's founding have proven to be controversial, and most of these grants were awarded years ago before Congress and the NEA took steps to curb funding to objectionable projects. Yet the opponents of the NEA would throw the baby out with the bath water.

Had the leadership permitted us to debate it, the Yates amendment would have given Members the choice of restoring the NEA's funding at last year's level. I would point out that the Yates amendment was deficit-neutral since it contained offsetting spending reductions in other programs.

Mr. Chairman, the NEA is the country's largest single supporter of the arts in America. Other nations, far less wealthy than the United States, do much more to support the arts in their countries. Let's not eliminate the little the Federal Government does do to make the arts accessible to every American.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Ehlers amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ehlers amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Much of the controversy over the National endowment for the Arts [NEA] stems from a

very small number of artistic projects funded by the NEA which some people find in poor taste or morally objectionable. In fact, only 45 out of the 112,000 NEA grants awarded over more than 32 years have been controversial. Further, "taste" and "moral objection" are highly subjective yardsticks by which to measure the arts, and I certainly do not take issue with those subjective judgments.

I do, however, take issue with the conclusions such people draw that, because they object to the work a few artists have produced with NEA funding, the whole program should be terminated. Make no mistake—that is what will happen if the Ehlers amendment is adopted. This proposal for a block grant to States will diminish the national stature of the arts; it will substitute the judgment of one level of government for another; it is no guarantee the States' judgment will be any better than that of the NEA; and, in the long run, it will mean diminished funding and the ultimate termination of support for public funding for the arts.

In my congressional district, over my entire service in the Congress, I have never heard an objection to a local arts initiative supported by the NEA. Quite the contrary, those funds are highly prized and put to very good use to stimulate initiatives in small communities, which would not have been possible without those very modest Federal NEA funds. A few examples from this past year will suffice to make the point: Little Falls received \$7,500 for the St. Francis Music Center; Pequot Lakes Children's Theater Company received \$22,000 for the production of a new work, "A Mark Twain Storybook," scheduled for an extended tour during the 1996-97 season; the public television station in Duluth received a \$40,000 grant to broadcast "Headwaters," an acclaimed public TV series; and the College of St. Scholastica's Arts Midwest group received a grant for \$131,000 for a performing arts tour by the college's arts group.

In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance Era, it was the doges of Italy, the archdukes of Austria, the kings and queens and other nobility throughout Europe, and a few individual wealthy patrons who supported the arts. In our post-monarchy world of democracy and egalitarian governments, it has been the Fortune 500 corporations and wealthy philanthropic industrialists who supported the arts, until the election of President John F. Kennedy. He recognized that a nation that rightly invests in the infrastructure, military readiness, education, and adventure in space should also invest in the enrichment of the human spirit by supporting the arts, and he launched the National Endowment for the Arts and its companion program, the National Endowment for the Humanities.

If your community happens to be fortunate enough to have Fortune 500 mega-corporations in its midst, or a philanthropic foundation with a commitment to the arts, children's theater, community music centers, the local symphony orchestra, and other similar expressions of the spirit, the arts may well be adequately nurtured. But if your community happens to be rural, remote, and devoid of multimillionaire philanthropies, then the arts and artists will either perish, if they exist, or never take root at all for lack of funding.

President Kennedy said: "A nation devoid of the arts has nothing to look backward at with

pride, nor to look forward to with hope." The NEA has, for people in many small communities and their artists, been a source of both pride and hope. Do not vote to extinguish either hope or the NEA.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong disappointment that the rule for debate of the Interior appropriations bill blocked an open and fair vote on funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

I support the NEA, as do a majority of my constituents and, according to poll after poll, a majority of Americans. NEA-funded activities have permitted public school students in San Pedro, Venice, and Torrance the opportunity to participate in improvisational theater sponsored by a touring performing arts and musical company. They have enjoyed special education operatic performances. They city of Venice has hosted numerous performing arts events, arts displays, and multi-media activities. And, a grant to the LA Theater Works Program in my district enabled a set of five American stage plays taped for radio to be donated to 500 undeserved libraries throughout the country. Events, programs, and gifts such as these foster creativity and an appreciation of our rich and diverse cultural and artistic heritage.

Mr. Chairman, private funds alone will not permit the continuation of activities like these should Congress eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts. And, while I certainly understand the necessity of restructuring and reforming the NEA, elimination is not reform. As mandated in past Congresses, the NEA has worked tirelessly to ensure that local decision makers are given the ability to fund the programs needed and requested by their communities. The proposal to transfer arts funding to State agencies will only waste precious dollars in creating 50 new bureaucracies to administer a program effectively run now by the NEA. States and cities tell us they are concerned that other funding sources they currently enjoy in support of their arts programs will dry up.

The House should be allowed to debate the future of this agency openly and fully and to vote. Regrettably, it won't. I oppose this rule which sanctions tyranny of the minority, and the ideologically driven policy it seeks to implement.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ehlers amendment. I have long been a supporter of the arts in America. Although I did vote in favor of the rule yesterday, which allowed for arts block grants as a substitute for NEA funds, I did so in strong recognition of the importance of arts and as a method of continuing dialog between arts supporters and opponents.

I do however, have concerns that the Ehlers compromise does not adequately recognize the importance of the Federal arts presence, and that it does not adequately fund or allow States to fund traveling art projects and other activities which had been funded by NEA program grants.

Many of these grants, such as the Glen Ellen Children's Chorus, the Chicago Youth Symphony Orchestra, and the American Western Composers Midwest Chapter have done an excellent job of providing arts education and enrichment throughout the State of Illinois,

and I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a complete list of the outstanding arts organizations funded by NEA program grants in Illinois.

The amendment, although not a perfect compromise does continue arts funding in America. I support its affirmation of the State and local arts agencies funded by State arts councils. Indeed, its recognition of the importance of arts education is also well intended. I therefore urge support of the amendment.

While saying this, I also urge the House and Senate conferees to strongly consider the importance of the Federal arts programs ongoing in the United States as they evaluate arts programs either within or outside of the National Endowment for the Arts structure.

I appreciate the effort that has gone into this proposal and this bill, and I urge support of the Ehlers amendment, and the importance of arts in America.

NEA DOLLARS FUND ILLINOIS ARTS

In addition to the block grant made to the Illinois Arts Council, the NEA directly funded the following groups in Illinois this year.

American Library Association (for the "Writers Live at the Library" Program)

American Women Composers Midwest Chapter (to support American Women Composer 15th Anniversary Gala Opening Concert)

Art Institute of Chicago (to support "Cinema in a Chinese Sphere: Before and After 1997" & to support the traveling exhibition "Art and Archaeology of Ancient West Mexico")

Arts Matter (for production of support materials for Gallery 37)

Chicago Children's Choir (to support increase in programming for children)

Chicago Children's Theatre, Inc. (to support production of "A Woman of Truth," a one-act play celebrating the life of Sojourner Truth)

Chicago New Art Association (to support the exhibition review section of the New Art Examiner)

Chicago Public Art Group (to establish a cash reserve)

Chicago Theatre Group, Inc. (to support Goodman Theatre's Student Subscription Series)

Chicago Youth Symphony Orchestra (to support in-school outreach project called "Music Pathways")

Chinese Music Society (to support a series of lectures and educational concerts of Chinese music)

City Lit Theatre Company (to support collaborative program with high school students & to develop and present an original theatre/jazz performance piece based on John Clellon Holmes's novel, "The Horn")

City of Chicago, Illinois (to support collaborations between the Chicago Coalition of Community Cultural Centers and the Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs)

Columbia College (to support Dance Center presentations, including "Celebrate Africa/Celebrate Chicago," the Festival of Solo Artists, and the Festival of European Premieres)

Court Theatre Fund (for presentation of "The Iphigenia Cycle")

ETA Creative Arts Foundation (to support "The Voice: Celebrating Divas of the African World")

Facets-Multimedia, Incorporated (to support 1997 Chicago International Children's Film Festival)

Free Street Theatre (to support "TeenStreet," a jobs program offered to low-

income, inner city teenagers, involving creative writing and theater performance)

Glen Ellyn Children's Chorus (for educational outreach programs)

Guild Complex (to support "Poets Across the Generations," a series of 6 readings)

Hubbard Street Dance Chicago (to create new works)

Illinois Alliance for Arts Education (to support expansion of the ARTSMART program into Quad Cities, Springfield, Rockford, Peoria, Champagne/Urbana, and Decatur)

Illinois State University (to support development of website for the independent literary presses and writers' conferences)

Jazz Institute of Chicago, Inc. (to support musician fees for 1997 Chicago Jazz Festival)

Little City Foundation (for exhibition of artwork created by people with developmental disabilities)

Lookingglass Theatre Company (to support world premiere of the play, "My Life in Pop: A Theatrical Essay on Popular Music in Context")

Lyric Opera Center for American Artists (to support world premier of "Between Two Worlds")

Lyric Opera of Chicago (to support world premiere of the opera, "Amistad")

Merit Music Program, Inc. (for augmentation of existing endowment)

Mostly Music, Inc. (to support the beginning of 3 year retrospective of 20th Century American Chamber Music)

Muntu Dance Theater (for commissioning of Jawole Jo Zoller to choreograph "Roots n Blues")

National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations of the USA (to support expansion of the National Readings Tour of the National Writer's Voice Project)

Orchestral Association (for scholarships for members of Civic Orchestra of Chicago & to support a month-long residency devoted exclusively to the performance of new, modern, and contemporary music, directed by Principal Guest Conductor Pierre Boulez)

Quad City Arts, Inc. (to support Visiting Artist Series)

Randolph Street Gallery, Inc. (to support "Trance," a multi-disciplinary project exploring the role of race and ethnicity in America)

Ravinia (to support student artist jazz camp scholarships and Jazz in the Schools Mentor Program with Chicago Public Schools)

Renaissance Society at the University of Chicago (to support exhibition of African-American artist Kerry James Marshall)

Review of Contemporary Fiction, Inc. (for recovery and publication of out of print works of fiction by Dalkey Archive Press)

Shakespeare Repertory (to support live musicians for Shakespeare productions)

Sutherland Community Arts Initiative (for 1997 JAAZ Festival)

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (to support the 1997-1998 New Visions series performances)

Victory Gardens Theater (to support development of new plays)

Remember in your letter to specifically mention any of the above programs that you attended and enjoyed.

In addition to state and local programs, NEA funds support public radio and television programs which reach millions of listeners and viewers nationally. In your letter, please refer to any such programs that you listen to or watch.

Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. Chairman. I rise in support of full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

The NEA is a precious gift to all Americans, and we should be lauding, not killing it.

The NEA is responsible for teaching art and music to children in our schools. It brings exhibits to small towns and cities in America—places which cannot afford, or do not have the market to support a touring dance group or play.

And it is partly responsible for allowing some of America's greatest artists to get their start. Who knows where the next Stephen Spielberg, Maya Angelou, or Leonard Bernstein will come from?

As a New Yorker, I am proud that the NEA helps make our museums and galleries among the greatest in the world. I am proud that people from across the country and around the globe come to New York City to hear our operas, see our plays, listen to our symphonies, and enjoy the creativity that abounds.

The NEA is an integral part of what makes New York great. And it gives those who otherwise would not receive funding a chance to succeed—a chance to be great.

And NEA is an important economic tool for New York. Some areas of the country depend upon soy beans—and they get generous farm subsidies. Other areas depend upon the defense industry—and they get huge contracts. New York depends upon creativity. We get a very small stipend from the NEA to help struggling artists, struggling galleries, and struggling art schools.

There are those on the right who seek to stifle the creativity of artists—those who fear freedom of expression. I would argue that Government censorship is a greater fear.

When police start coming into the homes of Oklahoma families to confiscate copies of The "Tin Drum", all Americans should be alarmed. When political leaders demand that "Schindler's List" be barred from television, we should take pause.

That is why I rise in support of NEA, and in support of painters, sculptors, playwrights, musicians, authors, teachers, lithographers, photographers, and all those who make this world a more beautiful and interesting place.

Let's make this tiny investment to help others achieve greatness.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in fervent opposition to the amendment offered by Representative EHLERS and Representative HUNTER to H.R. 2107—the Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1998. I oppose this amendment because it summarily terminates the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA].

Under the Ehlers amendment, only \$80 million will be granted to the States for arts funding. This will be done in block grants to the States. Thirty-seven percent, or \$29.6 million, will be granted directly to State art commission; 60 percent, or \$48 million, will be granted directly to local school boards to fund school-based art activities in the form of arts education block grants; and 3 percent, or \$2.4 million, will be allocated for administrative costs.

The 3 percent allocation to the States will amount to nothing more than a burden on the States to administer another Federal Program. There are many questions that must be answered regarding this new plan. Will this 3

percent allocation be sufficient to administer a brand new program to all of the 50 States. This amounts to \$2.4 million allocated to administer arts funding to each of the 50 States for distribution of moneys to the numerous school districts in the United States as well as the many art commissions of the 50 States. Is this really possible?

Government bureaucrats, whether State, Federal or local, should not be involved in deciding what art is worthy of funding. Under the NEA, panels of private citizens make decisions in a three-step process.

First, panels comprised of citizens from every geographic, ethnic and minority, and artistic and cultural background representing views of the general public make the initial decisions of accepting applications. This allows for those who are best qualified to make artistic decisions to do so.

Second, the chosen applications are then reviewed by the National Council on the Arts. This Council consists of 26 private citizens who are nominated by the President. They are each confirmed by the Senate to 6-year terms.

Third, the applications are then forwarded to the Chairman of the Council for a final review and decision. Mr. Speaker this is the way that decisions for the arts should be done; by the people. The citizens of the NEA are experts in their fields of art and culture.

There is no doubt that an investment in the NEA is an exemplary investment in the culture of American people. The NEA costs each American a grand total of 38 cents per year. With this incredible investment, the NEA enhances the quality of life for Americans through a diverse and breathtaking array of cultural activities from the best in theater, touring dance companies, folk festivals, music concerts, museums and orchestras. This vast array of arts entertainment is extended to our Nation's schools where millions of students and children benefit each year.

That is why this amendment offered by Representative EHLERS is unnecessary and duplicative. It seeks to do what the NEA is already doing. Representative EHLERS' amendment allocates 60 percent of the block grants proposed for the States, or \$48 million to be targeted for school-based arts activities. However, the NEA already funds arts projects where students greatly benefit.

Representative EHLERS' amendment seeks to allocate 37 percent or \$29.6 million of his proposed block grants to the States, to be targeted for State art commissions. However, this is already being done. In Houston, for 1997, no less than 13 reputable arts organizations received much needed NEA funding. These organizations are: Houston Grand Opera Association; Menil Foundation; Museum of Fine Arts, Houston; Contemporary Arts Association of Houston; Cultural Arts Council of Houston; Da Camera Society of Texas; The Ensemble Theater; Project Row Houses; University of Houston-University Park Location; Rice University; and Writers in the Schools.

These grants to the organizations and schools are vital for creation and presentation, planning and stabilization, as well as education and access.

The beauty of these grants from the NEA is that they cover a myriad of cultural and ethnic representations of art. From The Ensemble

Theater which showcases African-American artists to the University of Houston and Rice University which each train young artists, the NEA is making a marked difference in the quality of life for all different cultures represented in America.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the arts and humanities are important to the cultural life and diversity of our country—to people of all ages, to people in our inner cities, in our suburbs, and in our rural communities—and support efforts to promote the arts and humanities because of what they make possible in Delaware.

For example, funding for the NEA and the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH] helps the Delaware Division of the Arts and the Delaware Humanities Forum provide grants for many community and school activities, productions, and initiatives. In addition, the NEA provides direct funding to the Delaware Symphony Orchestra, the Delaware Theatre Company, and Opera Delaware. Americans of all ages, race, and income levels can benefit from the educational and cultural opportunities of the arts and humanities, fostered through the NEA and the NEH. Our State agency does tremendous work in enabling the arts to flourish in our State—in the schools and throughout our rural communities.

I would have liked Members of the House to have had the opportunity to cast an up-or-down vote on funding for the NEA. Unfortunately, the rule crafted did not permit a fair and open debate on this important issue. And the only amendment permitted was one that would eliminate the NEA and instead provide \$80 million in funding to States and schools for arts programs.

While I do think the block grant concept is one that deserves consideration and further review, I am opposing the amendment offered by Representative EHLERS of Michigan because I think it is a late and hurried attempt to partially address the situation while still killing the NEA. I would support holding congressional hearings on his proposal and learning more about how it would work. At this point, we have no idea what the impact would be on States' arts agencies; how specifically the funding formulas for distributing grants to both the States and the schools would work; whether it would warrant a new bureaucracy within the Department of Education to administer these grants to both the States and the schools; whether or not underserved communities would benefit from these grants; whether lifelong learning programs and programs benefiting older Americans would continue; and a variety of other questions and concerns.

Because this amendment, while offered with good intentions by VERN EHLERS, is poorly understood, should not have been the only alternative, was offered as a quick fix to a spending bill, and was terribly manipulated from a procedural point of view, I opposed the rule to bring this bill forward and must at this time oppose the Ehlers amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for continued funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA broadens public access to the arts for all Americans.

The latest Lou Harris poll indicates that 79 percent of the American public favors a gov-

ernmental role in funding the arts. Furthermore, 86 percent of adult Americans participated in the arts last year. Federal funding for the arts is a good investment because the arts contribute to our society both financially and educationally.

Financially, the NEA is a great investment in the economic growth of communities. The nonprofit arts community generates \$36.8 billion annually in economic activity, supports 1.3 million jobs and returns \$3.4 billion to the Federal Government in income taxes.

Federal funding for the arts is critical to leveraging private funding. NEA requires grant recipients to match all Federal grants up to 4 to 1. It is also important to note that the NEA's budget represents less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. In fiscal year 1997, we spent \$99.4 million on the NEA, and almost twice that, \$176.2 million, on military bands.

Society benefits from this small investment particularly when art is part of a comprehensive educational program. Recognizing this, NEA Chairwoman Jane Alexander has made arts education her top priority. Each year, the Arts Endowment opens creative doors to millions of school children, including at-risk youth. Participation in the arts improves overall student learning, instills self-esteem and discipline, and provides creative outlets for self-expression. The arts also help prepare America's future high-technology workforce by helping students develop problem-solving and reasoning skills, hone communication ability, and expand creativity—all important career skills for the 21st century.

Students who study the arts outperform nonarts students on the SAT, according to reports by the College Entrance Examination Board. In 1995, SAT takers with course work in music performance scored 51 points higher on the math portion than students with no course work or experience in the arts. Scores for those with course work in music appreciation were 61 points higher on verbal and 46 points higher on the math portion. And longer arts study means even higher SAT scores: in 1995, those who had studied the arts 4 or more years scored 59 points higher and 44 points higher on the verbal and math portions respectively than students with no course work.

Exposing children to the arts is more important now that we know how crucial the first 3 years of a child's life are to full mental and emotional development. Even at the very beginning of life, children respond to music and visual stimuli. The NEA increases opportunities for parents and teachers to share art with children who may not otherwise have such opportunities.

In Michigan, the NEA supports apprenticeships, mentoring programs, and in-school performances. These programs enrich the cultural fabric of our community. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the continuation of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, for less than 38 cents a year, each American supports a program which benefits our country culturally, educationally, and economically. Since its creation over 30 years ago by President Johnson, the National Endowment for the Arts has more than proven its value. Today, I would like to

stress the importance of the NEA, and urge that my colleagues vote to save it.

Balancing the budget is a goal that we all share, and we are on the right road to achieving that goal. We have all worked hard, as has President Clinton, to bring more fiscal order to our house by eliminating unnecessary programs and wasteful bureaucracy. Earlier this week, the Washington Post reported, as did newspapers across the country, that even without cutting additional governmental programs, our budget could well be balanced by 1998.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we struggle to balance the Federal budget many of my colleagues have targeted the NEA as a program which could, and should, be eliminated. However, even if the NEA was eliminated, it would do little to balance our budget, as the NEA accounts for less than one-hundredth of 1 percent of the budget. We spend more on military bands each year than on the NEA. Furthermore, a \$99 million Federal investment in the NEA yielded a \$3.4 billion return to the Treasury in taxes from the arts.

Another oft-mentioned misperception is that NEA funds are used to sponsor controversial programs that Americans find distasteful. The majority of these claims are distorted, overblown, or misunderstood. While it is true that some clearly distasteful projects were funded in the past, it is also true that the rules as to which programs can be funded have been changed to eliminate funding for controversial projects.

The NEA was created to enrich cultural lives in all corners of America. The arts have always flourished in our Nation's biggest cities, but not so in many of our rural areas, less affluent areas, and smaller communities; the NEA has changed this. Without the NEA, Michigan communities such as Muskegon, Ada, Tecumseh, Flint, Ypsilanti, Dearborn, Temperance, and Monroe would not be able to offer the quality arts programs that they can today; these programs make a difference. In Michigan's 16th District, the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village, the University of Michigan-Dearborn, numerous youth and community programs could lose all Federal funding.

Mr. Chairman, arts exposure and education is of great importance to our children and our future. Statistics don't lie. Students with 4 years of arts education score, on the average, 35 points higher on the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Arts help students excel in math, science, reading, and all areas requiring critical thinking.

Finally, Americans enjoy the arts and support the NEA; 79 percent support funding for arts programs.

When looking at the NEA, I urge my fellow colleagues to think about the budget, think about the importance of our culture, think about our children, think about our future, and reject narrow thinking. Join with me today to save the NEA.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in adamant support of continued funding of the National Endowment for the Arts. As we work through the budget process, deciding to build weapons of destruction, and spend unknown billions on the intelligence community, we must maintain spending for the arts and humanities.

Arts and humanities are a critical part of what civilized life is about, and I have very serious disagreements with those who want to increase funding for B-2 bombers and cut back on cultural programs for all Americans at the same time. Each B-2 bomber costs at least \$1.5 billion, 15 times more than the entire funding for the NEA. This Congress must decide whether we will continue to increase the destructive capability of this Nation without regard to creative and artistic expression.

The NEA helps enhance the lives of the children and adults by supporting organizations which encourage individuals to cultivate their creative energies. Further, public funding of the arts allows many more people the chance to attend exhibits and performances, not just those who can afford expensive theater tickets. NEA is not pork for the rich and elite. It is crucial funding that brings art to people, schools, and communities that otherwise would not be able to afford them.

Arts teach our children understanding, self-expression, cooperation and self-discipline, and tell the story of a nation. Today's children should be inspired by music and theater and creative art, rather than desensitized to violence on television by a Congress that sends a message to the young people of this country that bombs and bullets are a higher priority than painting and singing.

In my State of Vermont, NEA funding has supported symphony concerts in rural underserved communities. NEA dollars have assisted in community-based artist-in-residence programs and a collection of the work and biographies and self-taught artists in northern rural Vermont. The NEA is a major funder of the Vermont Council on the Arts, an organization that brings the arts and festivals to communities across the State. NEA moneys have funded many other projects in Vermont that otherwise would not have been possible.

The elimination of the NEA would decimate funding for the arts across the country. We would likely witness a domino effect wherein local and State governments redirect their spending priorities in reaction to changes in Federal spending. private support cannot possibly replace the role of Federal dollars in arts funding. From 1992 to 1995, there was a \$270 million decline in real dollars in private giving to the arts. Small and rural communities are even more at risk, since they receive far fewer private dollars toward the arts. The elimination of the NEA is contrary to the public will. Recent polls show that 79 percent of the American public favors a governmental role in funding the arts.

Every year the nonprofit arts community creates nearly \$37 billion in economic activity in this country and 1.3 million American jobs. For every dollar the NEA invests in communities, there is a twenty-fold return in jobs, services, and contracts.

The arts are an important part of the foundation of every healthy democracy. The NEA brings the arts to communities all across the country regardless of geographic location or level of income.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

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

RECORDED vote

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 271, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

AYES—155

- Aderholt
- Archer
- Armedy
- Bachus
- Baker
- Balenger
- Barrett (NE)
- Bass
- Bateman
- Bereuter
- Bilbray
- Billrakis
- Bliley
- Blunt
- Boehner
- Boyd
- Bunning
- Burr
- Buyer
- Callahan
- Calvert
- Camp
- Canady
- Chambliss
- Chenoweth
- Christensen
- Coble
- Coburn
- Collins
- Cook
- Crapo
- Cublin
- Cunningham
- Davis (VA)
- Deal
- DeLay
- Diaz-Balart
- Dickey
- Dreier
- Duncan
- Dunn
- Ehlers
- Ehrlich
- English
- Ensign
- Everett
- Ewing
- Fawell
- Fowler
- Galleghy
- Ganske
- Gekas
- Gibbons
- Gilchrest
- Gillmor
- Gingrich
- Goodlatte
- Goodling
- Goss
- Graham
- Granger
- Gutknecht
- Hall (TX)
- Hastert
- Hastings (WA)
- Hill
- Hobson
- Hoekstra
- Horn
- Hunter
- Hutchinson
- Hyde
- Jenkins
- Johnson (CT)
- Kim
- Klug
- Knollenberg
- LaHood
- Largent
- Latham
- Leach
- Lewis (CA)
- Lewis (KY)
- Linder
- Lipinski
- Lucas
- McCollum
- McDade
- McHugh
- McInnis
- McKeon
- Metcaif
- Mica
- Miller (FL)
- Moran (KS)
- Nethercutt
- Ney
- Northup
- Norwood
- Nussle
- Oxley
- Packard
- Pappas
- Parker

- Paxon
- Pease
- Petri
- Pickering
- Pombo
- Porter
- Portman
- Pryce (OH)
- Radanovich
- Redmond
- Regula
- Riley
- Rogan
- Rogers
- Rohrabacher
- Ros-Lehtinen
- Royce
- Sanford
- Schaefer, Dan
- Sensenbrenner
- Sessions
- Shaw
- Shays
- Shimkus
- Skeen
- Skelton
- Smith (MI)
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (OR)
- Smith (TX)
- Snowbarger
- Solomon
- Spence
- Sununu
- Tanner
- Taylor (NC)
- Thomas
- Thune
- Traficant
- Upton
- Wamp
- Watkins
- Watts (OK)
- Weldon (FL)
- Weldon (PA)
- Weller
- Whitfield
- Wicker
- Wolf
- Young (AK)
- Young (FL)

NOES—271

- Abercrombie
- Ackerman
- Allen
- Andrews
- Baesler
- Baldacci
- Barcia
- Barr
- Barrett (WI)
- Bartlett
- Barton
- Becerra
- Bentsen
- Berry
- Bishop
- Blagojevich
- Blumauer
- Boehlert
- Bonilla
- Bono
- Borski
- Boswell
- Brady
- Brown (CA)
- Brown (FL)
- Brown (OH)
- Bryant
- Burton
- Campbell
- Cannon
- Capps
- Cardin
- Carson
- Castle
- Chabot
- Clay
- Clayton
- Clement
- Clyburn
- Combust
- Condit
- Conyers
- Cooksey
- Costello
- Cox
- Coyne
- Cramer
- Crane
- Cummings
- Danner
- Davis (FL)
- Davis (IL)
- DeFazio
- DeGette
- Delahunt
- DeLauro
- Dellums
- Deutch

- Gonzalez
- Goode
- Gordon
- Green
- Greenwood
- Gutierrez
- Hall (OH)
- Hamilton
- Harman
- Hastings (FL)
- Hayworth
- Hefley
- Hefner
- Herger
- Hilleary
- Hilliard
- Hinchey
- Hinojosa
- Holden
- Hooley
- Hostettler
- Houghton
- Hoyer
- Hulshof
- Inglis
- Istook
- Jackson (IL)
- Jackson-Lee
- (TX)
- Jefferson
- John
- Johnson (WI)
- Johnson, E. B.
- Johnson, Sam
- Jones
- Kanjorski
- Kaptur
- Kasich
- Kelly
- Kennedy (MA)
- Kennedy (RI)
- Kennelly
- Kildee
- Kilpatrick
- Kind (WI)
- King (NY)
- Kingson
- Kleczka
- Klink
- Kolbe
- Kucinich
- LaFalce
- Lampson
- Lantos
- LaTourette
- Lazio
- Levin
- Lewis (GA)
- Livingston
- LoBlundo
- Lofgren
- Lowey
- Luther
- Maloney (CT)
- Maloney (NY)
- Manton
- Manzullo
- Markey
- Martinez
- Mascara
- Matsui
- McCarthy (MO)
- McCarthy (NY)
- McCrery
- McDermott
- McGovern
- McHale
- McIntosh
- McIntyre
- McKinney
- McNulty
- Meehan
- Meek
- Menendez
- Millender
- McDonald
- Miller (CA)
- Minge
- Mink
- Moakley
- Mollohan
- Moran (VA)
- Morella
- Murtha
- Myrick
- Nadler
- Neal
- Neumann
- Oberstar
- Obey
- Olver
- Ortiz
- Owens
- Pallone
- Pascarella
- Pastor
- Paul
- Payne
- Pelosi
- Peterson (MN)
- Peterson (PA)
- Pickett
- Pitts
- Pomeroy
- Poshard
- Price (NC)
- Quinn
- Rahall
- Ramstad
- Rangel
- Reyes
- Riggs
- Rivers
- Rodriguez
- Roemer
- Rothman
- Roukema
- Royal-Allard
- Rush
- Ryun
- Sabo
- Salmon
- Sanchez
- Sanders
- Sandlin
- Sawyer
- Saxton
- Scarborough
- Schaffer, Bob
- Schumer
- Scott
- Serrano
- Shadegg
- Sherman
- Shuster
- Sisisky
- Skaggs
- Smith, Adam
- Smith, Linda
- Snyder
- Souder
- Spratt
- Stabenow
- Stark
- Stearns
- Stenholm
- Stokes
- Strickland
- Stump
- Stupak
- Talent
- Tauscher
- Tauzin
- Taylor (MS)
- Thompson
- Thornberry
- Thurman
- Tiahrt
- Tierney
- Torres
- Towns
- Turner
- Velazquez
- Vento
- Visclosky
- Walsh
- Waters
- Watt (NC)
- Waxman
- Wexler
- Weygand
- White
- Wise
- Woolsey
- Wynn
- Yates

NOT VOTING—9

- Berman
- Bonior
- Boucher
- Doollittle
- Farr
- Hansen
- Mollnarl
- Schiff
- Slaughter

□ 1225

Messrs. PAYNE, CANNON, and COX of California, and Mrs. EMERSON and Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. CRAPO 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 Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$96,100,000, shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHABOT:
Beginning on page 76, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 10 on page 77.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the Chabot amendment en bloc?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if I understand correctly, there is only one amendment. What is the en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment by the gentleman from Ohio addresses two consecutive paragraphs, which would require unanimous consent for consideration simultaneously.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Hearing no objection, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

□ 1230

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It strikes all funding to the National Endowment for the Humanities, and it saves the American taxpayers \$110 million.

Members will recall that it was a former chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the NEH, Lynn Cheney, who was head of that organization for about 7 years, from 1986 to 1993, who concluded that the NEH indeed does more harm than good and should be closed down once and for all.

My amendment does just that. There are many problems with the NEH. First, it is an agency that historically has squandered millions of tax dollars on silly projects that benefit few, if any, hardworking taxpayers. Second, it has come to breed a form of arrogance that only a true culture bureaucrat, as George Will would call them, could concoct. We have debated this issue before, so I will not recite the laundry list of questionable projects funded for the benefit of the cultural and academic elite at the expense of the average taxpayers. I will not dwell on Sheldon Hackney's national conversation kit, which ostensibly would teach us all how to talk to one another, all for the mere \$1.7 million to teach Americans how to talk.

I will not dwell too much on the NEH's highly controversial national standards for teaching history in our school systems or any of the other questionable projects deemed worthy of

our tax dollars by a handful of Washington bureaucrats. The NEH record is there for all to see. That is why when I offered a similar amendment to the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations bill, it was endorsed by groups like the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, Americans for Tax Reform, and those same organizations, as well as the National Tax Limitation Committee, Capital Watch, Frontiers of Freedom, the Competitive Enterprise Institute and others, are supporting it again this year.

Mr. Chairman, whenever I am called on to discuss the National Endowment for the Humanities, I cannot help but recall a letter that I once received from the top NEH bureaucrat in my State of Ohio. He told me, and it was a letter, so I cannot tell Members whether he had a straight face at the time he sent it or not. He said, "if there were no NEH, the public intellectual life of Ohio would shrink considerably." He really said that.

I can tell Members I spend quite a lot of time with the people of Ohio, and I have a little bit more faith in their intellectual abilities than do the NEH bureaucrats. I am pretty certain that without the NEH the people of Ohio would do quite well. In fact, I know they would do just fine. I am reasonably sure that very few of those taxpayers, save a handful of NEH functionaries and beneficiaries, would even notice the difference. Mr. Chairman, I think that most of us know that the NEH benefits the very few at the expense of all working Americans.

It is unfair that those taxpayers should shoulder the burden. A yes for this particular amendment I believe is a vote for the taxpayer. A no vote signifies support for the status quo, and another \$110 million tax for the culture bureaucrats to do with basically what they want.

I know there are many, many things that one can point out that the NEH arguably has done a good job at, some programs that have benefited some people. On the other hand, there have been an awful lot of abuses. More importantly, it basically is a matter of one's philosophy.

I happen to think that these things which are funded by the NEH, where some of them may be worthy, they should be privately funded, they should be locally funded, but they should not be funded by the Federal Government. These dollars should not be taken out of the pockets of hardworking taxpayers in this country and given basically to academic elites to do with what they want.

They have programs where we have summer institutes and seminars, where they junket elite academics in places such as Hawaii, which I am sure is a very nice place, and Germany and all around the world to essentially take a

vacation, pay them thousands of dollars to do that. I think these dollars ought to stay in the pockets of the hardworking American citizens. I do not think that we ought to give these dollars to academic elites.

Again, I am sure there are many Members who will say they do this, they preserve books, they do other things. All those things are fine. It is a matter of should Federal tax dollars go for these things. I would argue no, they should be funded privately, locally, and not with the money of the hardworking taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thought that after the effort of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] last year that perhaps we were not going to encounter the same kind of opposition from him that we now experience. I cannot understand how a nice person such as the gentleman from Ohio can offer a destructive amendment of this kind. How can a Member of the House be against an organization whose primary purpose is preserving and protecting the history of the United States and in teaching that history to our children? Is there any reason in our budget for the reduction of this very essential part of our culture?

The House has just signed and approved a \$268 billion authorization for our war machine. The money that is in this bill for the humanities is part of our peace machine. We have wars, we have people who have to be trained to try to stop wars and to make agreements before wars or after wars, and humanities makes a major contribution in that respect.

It has special projects to preserve history. It has a project to preserve the Nation's major newspapers so that they do not crumble into bits. They have projects to save the Nation's most important books which are burning up because they are being destroyed. It is helping to finance the leading universities in the country and their libraries in order to protect 20 million books which are now threatened with utter destruction by the fragmentation and yellowing of their pages.

What do we gain with this amendment? Yes, we will gain \$110 million for the taxpayer, but the losses will be enormous. The losses of the opportunities to teachers to improve their methods of teaching history, the opportunities of learning to teach philosophy, the opportunities of learning all of the social sciences that are so essential to the well-being of a democracy. Those will be lost.

I hope that the Members of the House will look at this amendment very carefully and that they will conclude with me that the work of the National Endowment for the Humanities is necessary to preserve and to foster the social fabric of our country and vote down this amendment.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I want to concur with the view of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I was unable to speak on the last amendment that failed, and I am pleased that it did fail. I think that the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities really represent a symbol of the preservation of the creative genius of us as Americans, as a part of our culture, as a part of the fostering of creativity. It is enormously important as an export product. Look at what we are doing in terms of the flourishing of ideas and free thought. I suppose that some of it becomes controversial, but if I look at John Stuart Mill or I look at others that have written in philosophy and religion, I am certain at times that their views were controversial, but that is the nature of this particular endeavor in the humanities and in the arts. It is coming to grips with issues that very often are not popular or may even be unpopular. This is an enormous reservoir in protection of the creativity which is the genius of this country, the pluralism of this country, one of our great strengths, the fact that these two entities at the Federal level have been so successful. Yes, there have been issues that are controversial.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. I think that if we look at the programs like the Poet in Residence in Olivia, MN, that goes to the grade schools, these are not the Robert Frosts of the world but they are people that are endeavoring in the arts and have basically given their life in terms of teaching, of helping and in fostering this creativity which is a great economic and I say a great strength in terms of who we are as an American people. To bring these amendments to the floor and to treat them and to point out the criticisms, yes, there will be criticisms wherever that occurs, but I think we have a great opportunity here to keep these programs in place. They are good programs, they are supported by the public, and they are really touching the quintessential fabric of what our Nation and what our people are about. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his opposition.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his very substantial contribution in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Chabot amendment. The National Endowment for the Human-

ities funds programs promoting history, English, literature, foreign languages, sociology, anthropology and comparative literature. The NEH provides grants to colleges and universities, to museums and libraries in all 50 States, and the State humanities councils reach out to increase our citizens' understanding of history and culture.

Mr. Chairman, the humanities are critical to our society. They teach us who we were, who we are, and what we might become for a cost of only 42 cents per American. NEH is the largest single source of support for research and scholarships in the humanities in the United States. It also funds preservation of millions of historically and culturally important books that are in need of being preserved.

Despite our low funding allocation in Florida, my State has reaped a substantial benefit from NEH grants, which have been used for projects as diverse as helping to restore libraries that were ruined during Hurricane Andrew to leveraging over \$2 million in local and State contributions just this year.

□ 1245

As the past president of the Florida Humanities Council, I am keenly aware of the importance of NEH funds and the negative impact of eliminating such funding. I urge my fellow Members to vote against this amendment and maintain the Committee on Appropriations' funding level.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this amendment and to second the things I have just heard from the last couple of speakers. It seems like that we forget in this time and age, when we are working so hard, to be sure and bring up equal opportunity to everybody, the electronic age and fiber optic networks and all these things, and then we decide to take a program that enhances and reaches out to everybody and start picking it apart. And I am a little bit appalled that this would take place.

So I rise opposed to my colleague's amendment to eliminate the funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities. This, modest by most government standards, program over the past 20 years has been able to provide literally opportunities for thousands of teachers through its training seminars and other programs, and these teachers have in turn been able to touch the lives of millions of our children.

The NEH supports scholarly research, education, public programs in the humanities through grants to individuals, institutions, and organizations for projects and programs. NEH provides many small grants for speakers and purchasing books for reading dis-

cussion groups. It reaches across the land in sparse and low-populated areas, poor areas, provides opportunities for people to have an equal opportunity to have part of those things being discussed so well. In Iowa many of these small grants are barely over \$1,000 each, but it touches a lot of lives.

A vote for this amendment is a vote to remain in the past. Our country depends on our teachers' ability to train our young people to continually look forward. So let us move to the light, not to the darkness. Do not support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities, NEH. I had hoped that all of our Members might have had an opportunity earlier this year to attend a gathering here on Capitol Hill when all the citizen and staff leadership of the humanities councils, the State humanities councils from around the country, had their meeting here. Their guest speaker was Stephen Ambrose, the author of the recently acclaimed book "Undaunted Courage."

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, also a distinguished former alumni of the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. BEREUTER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I am aware of that, and he is an exceptional graduate and has claims, I think, down in Tulane as well.

This Member is most familiar with the National Endowment for the Humanities through the activities of the Nebraska Humanities Council which consistently provides high quality humanities programming at very little cost to citizens of all walks of life in my State. It is not a program for the elite. Since 1973 they have funded programs in more than 200 different communities in all of Nebraska's 93 counties, reaching more communities each year. Some of those counties have fewer than 500 residents and are especially appreciative of this assistance. Surely the same type of examples that I am going to use could be cited for every State.

Now this is in direct contrast to what the gentleman from Ohio has indicated. That is to say, for example, in Nebraska, and I believe in most States, or maybe all, many, many of our taxpayers are beneficiaries of NEH funding. This is absolutely not an elitist program.

The Nebraska Humanities Council has been especially effective at reaching residents in the First Congressional

District of Nebraska. This Member's district encompasses Lincoln with its colleges and museums as well as the small cities and villages whose primary formal educational assets are their libraries and their consolidated public and religious schools.

For example, the council has developed a humanities resource center with a large speakers bureau, exhibits, films and videos that enable the smallest communities to benefit from the cultural resources of Nebraska's metropolitan areas and metropolitan areas from elsewhere in the Great Plains. The speakers bureau has been particularly helpful to Nebraska schools as they comply with the new requirement for multicultural education. Of course, the Humanities Council does not charge the schools for this valuable educational service.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, for these and many other reasons this Member urges the defeat of the Chabot amendment. The National Endowment for the Humanities is a highly appropriate use of a modest amount of public funds in a great and diverse country like the United States of America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the Chabot amendment, and here is why.

As my colleagues know, we are kind of getting involved in what policy should be or, I guess, what is good and what makes sense and so forth. But we should remember that just because something is a good program does not mean that it should not be recognized and supported locally as a good program, as opposed to Washington has to do everything because if we do not do it, it means we do not love humanity or people or little children or sex and gender studies or some of the other valuable projects the NEH gets involved in. But just imagine this, Mr. Chairman:

If a person were on a diet, if they were on a 6-month diet to lose 30 pounds, and they got to the fourth month and they had lost 28 pounds, would they stop dieting? As my colleagues know, this person is ahead of their time schedule, they had not reached their goal yet. Would they quit exercising and start eating ice cream again and say, "Hey, look"?

The situation that we are in right now is similar to that fiscally, Mr. Chairman. We have reduced the deficit greatly. The Wall Street Journal said yesterday we may have the deficit projection as low as \$45 billion, and I want Members of the House to think about this: If we can get within \$45 billion of balancing the budget, is it not incumbent on us as Members of Congress to do everything we can to go ahead and push toward that zero, to reach the goal? If we were on the diet, reach it in 4 months instead of 6 months?

As my colleagues know, this money, this appropriation for NEH, it is within the budget. But that does not mean it is good. That does not mean that everything about the budget is perfect.

What is in here that is so necessary? I think we should look at this question: Are our projects necessary for the Federal Government? Not just are they nice and are they pleasant, and does it make us feel intellectual or cultural or whatever.

And I know there are Members who do feel cultural when they see that \$400,000 went to Doran Ross at UCLA for, quote, "The Art of Being Kuna: The Expressive Culture of the San Blas Islands, Panama," \$400,000. Not many constituents in my district make that kind of money.

Or how about this one: \$108,000 to Howard Kushner of San Diego State University for "The History of Tourette's Syndrome."

How about this? A grant of \$135,000 to Edward English of the University of Notre Dame for "Sex and Gender in the Middle Ages." Boy, a burning issue in my district. This is from the year 1150 to 1450, for those of my colleagues who are interested in getting a copy of it. I do not know if it will apply, but it was a good old 5-week summer junket for 24 college students.

How about this one? A grant of \$201,000 to Laurie Kahn-Leavitt of Filmmakers Collaborative for "A Midwife's Tale: Discovering the World of Martha Ballard." Now has anybody read that? I mean all those defenders of NEH, tell me, was Martha Ballard's story a good one? I missed it.

As my colleagues know, my kids are dying to see "Jurassic Park" or the sequel, "Lost World", but we have not seen Martha Ballard. A grant of \$201,000; again, not many people in my district are making money like that.

Or how about this: \$34,500 to Carol Maier of Kent State for "Delirium and Destiny." Well, that is a good one.

What happened to private initiatives? What happened to spending State or local money if it is so important?

As my colleagues know, we are not really arguing here if NEH is good or bad. What we are really saying: Is it necessary, is it necessary to borrow children's money to pay for such projects? I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to have this program, and as long as we are \$5.4 trillion in debt we should be able to ask ourselves this question:

If this was coming out of my pocket-book, if it was coming out of my wallet, would I spend the money this way, or am I just doing it because it is taxpayers' money?

I would say to the Members of the House, if you can say yes, this is how I would, in fact, spend my money, than certainly they want to vote against the Chabot amendment. But if they are doing it just because somebody else is

paying for it, think about the \$5 trillion debt, think about the children who will be inheriting so much of this debt and vote for the Chabot amendment. And join, in doing that, the National Taxpayer's Union, the Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for A Sound Economy, Americans for Tax Reform, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Frontiers of Freedom, National Tax Limitation Committee and Capitol Watch.

Below are a few examples of how the NEH is wasting tax dollars. When the average salary in America is approximately \$20,000 a year, does it really make sense that the taxpayers are giving:

\$150,000 to Jacquelynn Baas at UC Berkely for "Interpretive Programs for 'Face of the Gods: Art and Altars of the African Diaspora'";

\$400,000 to Doran H. Ross at UCLA for "The Art of Being Kuna: The Expressive Culture of the San Blas Islands, Panama";

\$108,000 to Howard I. Kushner of San Diego State University for "History of Tourette's Syndrome";

\$140,000 to Devon G. Pena of Colorado College for "Upper Rio Grande Hispano Farms: A Cultural and Natural History of Land Ethics in Transition, 1850-1994";

\$135,000 to Edward D. English of the University of Notre Dame for "Sex and Gender in the Middle Ages, 1150-1450," supporting a five-week summer institute for 24 college teachers;

\$201,000 to Laurie Kahn-Leavitt of Filmmakers Collaborative for "A Midwife's Tale: Discovering the World of Martha Ballard" to support production of a test reel for a feature length documentary film on the life and world of 18th-century midwife Martha Ballard;

\$34,000 to Mary Ann Smart of SUNY research Foundation/Stony Brook Main Campus for "Representations of Gender and Sexuality in Opera," "to support a conference to examine new ways to understand the cultural context of opera texts and music, focusing on how new musicological work on gender can be applied to the study of opera";

\$210,742 to Charles V. Blatz of the University of Toledo for "Humanities 2000: A Multi-Year Collaboration to Strengthen the Humanities Foundations";

\$34,500 to Carol Maier of Kent State University for "Delirium and Destiny"; and

\$114,000 to Catholic University to support the preparation of a database of indices for the Gregorian chants found in ten major manuscripts, to be disseminated on diskettes and on the Internet?

Among many, many other such projects, remember, too, that:

The American history standards released by the NEH have been widely criticized as very flawed. Former NEH chairman Lynne Cheney has publicly disavowed the project. Indeed, she recently called for an end to federal funding for the NEH altogether.

Current NEH head Sheldon Hackney is spending \$1.7 million to promote a "national conversation." Over the objections of his own National Council, Hackney pushed through a "national conversation" television program.

"Do you really think voters in your home state will understand why these programs were killed?" the NEH lobby asks in its most recent ad. A better question might be, why were the programs funded by the federal government in the first place? They are worthy programs, surely, but why do they need federal tax dollars at this time of massive deficits?

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

Mr. Chairman, I could not help but rise, having attended "Midwife's Tale" with Martha Ballard, and it was done in Maine, and it was done through a grant through the National Endowment for the Humanities. It was a story about a midwife working in rural Maine in the early 1800's. It was a story of women working and women's roles in a part of Maine and a part of this country that had never been told before, and without that grant and without that research would never have been known. I attended that film to a packed hall, and it was in northern Maine.

My district is the most rural district east of the Mississippi. There are 32 rural health clinics in my district. My district borders Canada, New Hampshire, and the rock-bound coast, and without the support from the National Endowment for the Humanities we would not have been able to see performances like this. We would not be able to get the arts and humanities involved and we would not have been able to have that involvement.

One of the greatest studies that has been accomplished has shown us that students involved in arts and humanities programs, and this is through testing, have been able to improve their SAT scores by 50 and 60 points. Arts and humanities is not an appetizer, it is part of the main course. The more that we understand, like in a diet that was referred to earlier as balanced nutrition, nothing in excess and everything in moderation, it is how we ought to look at arts and humanities. It is a lot more important.

This weekend is the birthday of Andrew Wyeth. He is going to be 80. It is going to be celebrated at the Farnsworth Museum in Maine, and how fitting to have a discussion here in the national Congress as to how unimportant arts and humanities are, and being able to pick on particular projects that are being done in particular areas without really knowing what those projects did.

The arts and humanities are going to allow a hundred small towns in Maine under the century project to do oral history projects. Some of the great histories in minds over time have told us that if we can take the culture of a previous generation and be able to mix it with the next generation, that that is the product of success.

So I think our strength comes from our culture. It is our glue that holds our communities together, and if the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are going to provide the glue that is going to hold our families, communities and counties and States together and help to do that, then those are the things that we ought to be encouraging.

It seems to me that the money that is being spent in proportion to the national Federal budget is very minuscule for the impact that it is making because these are matching grants. They require contributions at the local, private, State level to be matched. Those are the kinds of the things that we want to nurture.

Mr. Chairman, I would think that a party that is interested in family values and community values and in bringing people together and in breaking down those barriers would be very much supportive of these kinds of efforts. So this is a program that has a proven track record, one we ought to support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to the Chabot amendment. I would point out initially that the amount of money that we are talking about here in the funding, the \$110 million, is a reduction from a substantially higher amount, closer to \$200 million, which has been done as a reasonable step in conserving the taxpayers' money.

□ 1300

I am a strong supporter of what we have been able to do with the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Delaware Humanities Forum is an organization which funds the humanities in Delaware. It receives nearly 90 percent of its money from the NEH.

I was in Bridgeville, DE. Let me explain where Bridgeville, DE, is. If anyone has their senses about them, they are going to go through it on the way to Rehoboth, DE. That is how you get there, you go right through, on your way there. It is a lovely farming community in Sussex County, DE.

I was there on October 18 of last year with most of the elected officials locally and in the State of Delaware. It might have had something to do with the fact that the election was a couple weeks later, too. It was for the world premier of this movie, "If You Lived Here You Would Be Home Now," which is a slogan they use and which other towns use.

It is a film about the life and work of a painter whose name is Jack Lewis. Jack Lewis came to Bridgeville, DE, as part of a work project many, many years ago, in the thirties. He is 82 years old now. This is an incredible film. It was shown in the high school gymnasium; 700 people showed up to see this film because of their pride in Jack Lewis. They had to have a second showing, and I understand that was almost sold out as well later in that particular evening.

Mr. Chairman, the movie is interesting. I will read what it says on the back of the container for it. It says:

In Bridgeville, Delaware, a town known mostly for the amount of scrapple, apples,

and chickens it produces, New Deal artist Jack Lewis has integrated his art and murals into the lives of its citizens, and empowered these working people to express themselves on their own. By following how this artist has touched the lives of people who would not normally be exposed to art, the film explores larger issues about the role of the artist in society, public funding for culture, and cultural elitism, all from the perspective of a small town.

I can tell the Members that the people of that town, to a man or woman in that audience, embraced that movie as they have embraced this artist who has taught the children, has taught the disabled, has taught the disenfranchised young people that had no place to go, has been in our prisons, has done so much for Delaware. It has been shown all over the State of Delaware. We have tried to get it, and may still do it, on public television.

A review in the Washington Post said that perhaps there is a lesson in that story there about learning to love what is all around you, which is how Bridgeville has come to love art; it is everywhere you look. Because of Lewis, it has seeped into the lives of the barbers, dry cleaners, firefighters, undertakers.

This was \$50,000 that was put in by the Delaware Humanities Forum, which they say gets its money from the National Endowment for the Humanities to help make this film which has pleased so many people in my State, and in my judgment could please people around the country if they had a chance to see it.

In short, Mr. Chairman, like everything else there is some risk, and there are some things that perhaps should not be funded, but the bottom line is so many wonderful things have happened through the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I would strongly urge every single person on the Republican and Democratic side of the aisle to reject this amendment, to realize that we have already made sufficient cuts, and to realize that if we manage the National Endowment for the Humanities well, it can do a wonderful job in teaching us so much about our history and all the other things that other speakers have spoken to.

I strongly embrace the National Endowment for the Humanities funding as put forward by the committee, and I would urge everybody to oppose the Chabot amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have to rise today in opposition to the amendment. I do so from a background in the humanities. In fact, as I mentioned yesterday, my first exposure to Congress was when I chaired the California Council for the Humanities and was national president of the Federation of

State Humanities Councils, and I had the privilege at that time to meet the committee that was chaired at that time by my congressman, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SIDNEY YATES.

I think I am here because of the background that I have had with the humanities. I have profound respect for the work that has gone on under the sponsorship of the National Endowment for the Humanities. I have to say that I resent the accusation that the work of NEH is conducted primarily by and for the benefit of academic elites and bureaucrats.

My own background is in the University of California, and I have sometimes been described as an academic elite, but the situation with NEH is that they stand as the one clear agency in the country that is dedicated to overcoming that kind of gap.

Most of the programs that NEH sponsors have a very definite and required public dimension. I am thinking of all the programs we have watched on public television. I think of the programs for young scholars, some of whom are academically certified, some of whom are not yet but have shown unusual promise. Scholars all over the country have had their careers boosted, and energized by support from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I would like to call attention to two specific projects that NEH has funded and supports that have had profound ramifications around the country. I think first of all of the State programs. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BE-REUTER] mentioned the great work of the Nebraska Council on the Humanities. The same is true for the one in California, and all of the States have these public programs that bring people together.

The NEH lifelong education. Education does not end at the age of 22, at the end of a college career, but should be lifelong, and it is the NEH that has been chiefly responsible for energizing lifelong education in this country.

Second, I would like to point out that 50,000 schoolteachers, have participated in the summer seminar program that has been sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Think of the reverberations from that. Fifty thousand schoolteachers, hard-working men and women, not making any money on this, giving up their summertime to come and work with a scholar in order to perfect their skills and to perfect their teaching ability. Then they go back home. Think of the ramifications of that in the classroom and how many students are touched by the work that has happened in those seminars.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I think that a nation should be judged on how it relates to its intellectual heritage. That is really what is at stake here. I stand in very strong oppo-

sition to the amendment, because I am a full-scale believer in the work of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Chabot amendment and in very strong support of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The National Endowment for the Humanities supports long-term collaborative projects of national significance that could not be funded by any single State or single institution.

For instance, the NEA funded the Ken Burns series, "The Civil War," "Roots," "Baseball." Think of the number of Americans whose understanding of our history was enlarged by those series, but in addition, they also increased tourism at our national battlefields and other Civil War sites by one-third. The Civil War series created real dollars to real communities, because Americans were more knowledgeable about their own history. The NEH funds projects like the Brittle Books project, to preserve the manuscripts that record our early history but were printed on paper that is disintegrating. Those national treasures must be preserved with national dollars. That is not a project that any State or any institution could undertake.

In addition, the NEH leverages millions and millions of dollars to enable local and State organizations to better educate their people and better preserve their history. In Connecticut alone, challenge grants from the NEH have leveraged \$1 billion. Many, many have benefited: little towns, small cities, children, schools, adults, and town libraries.

In Bristol, CT, the American Clock and Watch Museum was able to put on a presentation of the Origins of the American Industrial Revolution in Connecticut. Clock-making, enriched our understanding of that small city's role in a very important industry. The New England Carousel Museum is another Bristol beneficiary along with all who tour that gem of a museum. Falls Village and Canaan got money to help plan the Depot Museum in Heritage Park.

This will go not only to help those small towns in Connecticut bring their history into focus and display it in a way that others can understand, but also to create a tourist attraction that will broaden their economic base and better support their people, thus enriching the knowledge and understanding of the people of that corner and all who pass through it, while strengthening its economy.

In Farmington, CT, NEH money has helped us uncover the history of the Farmington Canal, preserve that canal, and educate people about it. Those are

the kinds of projects that no individual small town can support and be responsible for entirely, but that are of not only local and State significance, but also of national significance.

In Litchfield, preservation of the Nation's first law school is something that we all should care about, we all should be interested in. Certainly the local community is interested and the State has been as well, but critical NEH dollars have helped us succeed with that project. I could go on and on with projects, and examples of educational series that our art museums have been able to offer because of the NEH grants, but my point is clear NEH affects the lives of every one of us in small towns and very rural communities and throughout America.

It also does things like sponsoring seminars for teachers, enabling them in the summer to work with outstanding scholars, and deepen their understanding of the subject matter they are responsible for teaching to our young people.

Recently the Carnegie Foundation completed a study that showed that there was a direct correlation between children's achievement in our public schools and the depth of subject matter expertise of their teachers. So this kind of effort to give teachers the opportunity to work with outstanding scholars in their area has a direct effect on the achievement of our children in our public schools.

Over 3 million Americans have taken part in NEA-sponsored reading and discussion programs in libraries in all 50 States over the last 16 years. Lifelong learning makes a nation strong, creates understanding and spirit that not only enriches individuals but whole communities and the fabric of our society.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment and support of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have gone through a number of pieces of legislation here today, and the sum total of what we are doing seems to say, bring on the darkness; that if we came out of the dark ages and went into the renaissance, if we put this Congress in charge, they would try to shut down thinking.

The idea that a great country can be sustained while there is no central government playing a critical role in thinking and in education, in preservation, that is an idea that other countries have tried. If Members go to them, they would not want to stay there.

Everybody understands there ought to be some balance in what we do in government. If we can give the head of Microsoft a \$6 billion or \$9 billion tax savings, driven by the Members on the

other side of the aisle, it seems we can take a few of those pennies back to make sure that the intellectual matter that has built this country is preserved.

Mr. Chairman, this book is now preserved. It is by Melville. Without the preservation funds, when you turn or crease the page, it comes apart. So our choice is simple. This country has prospered because we tried to make sure that the broadest base of our citizenry had access to information, to knowledge, to science. The question is, Are we going to cut one activity that is critical in many aspects to get at the small communities?

It is almost like the Post Office; if you live in New York City or Boston, you do not need us. What you produce helps the rest of us, often, but the critical mass, to have an arts program or what have you, saving books, that will occur at the great institutions in the large cities. But for those of us who represent average people in smaller communities, what these programs provide is the enlightenment. It is an opportunity to build a society with a broad recognition of what is out there in the world.

I would venture to say when we talk about trade balance, when we talk about a competitive country, there is nothing more important than what we are fighting about here today.

Reject this amendment. Members should understand their responsibility as national legislators, building a future for this country. Do not turn back to the darkness and end the enlightenment.

□ 1315

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise the Members what we plan to do is have a vote on the Chabot amendment. That will be all we will do for the rest of the day. We will rise immediately after the completion of that vote. So this will enable those that are planning for airplanes and so on, there will be one more vote and then we will rise.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment that is being brought to the House is an example of Members who understand the cost of everything and the value of nothing.

I just heard a prior speaker, a few speeches ago, lecture us about the \$100 million-plus a year that this endowment costs the taxpayer. It is true. It does. But the same gentleman who spoke voted last week to require this country to buy nine B-2 bombers that the Pentagon did not want. Each one of those B-2 bombers cost \$1.2 billion. This Congress chose, over the advice of

the Pentagon, to buy nine of those. The cost of those nine B-2 bombers would fund this account for the next 99 years. So who is kidding whom?

This is not about whether taxpayers' money is going to be saved or not. This issue is whether or not we are going to make a small investment to preserve the best of American heritage and to help us to the best of our ability to rise above the lesser aspects of our natures.

That is what the humanities are all about. Let me explain what the National Endowment for the Humanities does. It provides exhibits. It helps libraries all over the country to preserve some of their prize possessions. If you ask any historian what is the greatest historical loss to mankind's base of knowledge in the history of the world, they will say it was the loss of the Egyptian library at Alexandria. We lost all of the treasures, all of the institutional memory of that ancient age. And it took humanity literally hundreds of years to begin to re-accumulate that knowledge and that understanding.

This endowment helps to preserve books. It helps to preserve documents. It helps to preserve archival material. It helps to preserve historical newspapers. It has produced films which have won Peabody awards, Emmys, you name it. It does not serve the cultural elite of this country. The cultural and economic elite of this country, any time it wants, has access to this kind of material. They have got the bucks to pay for it. They have the leisure time to experience it. And they have the family history that makes children sensitive to it.

It is the average family in this country that does not live in a city which has a great university, it does not live in a city with one of the outstanding libraries in the country. Members of Congress take for granted the fact we can go down to the National Archives, see the great documents of our history. We think nothing of that. Most Americans would give their eyeteeth to have that opportunity.

It is the small towns, it is the people of average means, it is the people of average life experience who most need the benefits that this appropriation produces.

Yet we are told we cannot afford that. We are told that by one of the same Members who stood on the floor or stood on the floor of the Committee on Appropriations just 3 days ago and argued that we ought to continue subsidizing tobacco.

I ask my colleagues, what is a better investment in American tax dollars? There is very little doubt in my mind. Has the Endowment occasionally been embarrassed by an idiotic use of one of their grants? Yes, they have. Have you ever been embarrassed? Has any Member of Congress ever been embarrassed by an idiotic act that we ourselves

have committed or an act of our staff? Of course we have.

I wish any Member of this House had a batting average as good as the National Endowment for the Arts or the Humanities. We make as many mistakes in a day as they make in a year. Members can vote any way they want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, those of you who know me know that I often quote my favorite poet, Archie the Cockroach. It is not my religious bible, but it is my philosophical bible.

I want to read my colleagues something that Archie wrote a long time ago: He wrote it about the movies, but you can just as easily say it in reference to the arts or the humanities. He said this:

They are instinctively trying to preserve for the public some kind of stuff that wins an audience away from the often sordid surface of existence. They may do it badly. They may do it obviously. They may do it crudely. But they do have a hunch that what the millions want is to be shown that there is something possible to the human race besides the dull repetition of the triviality which is often the routine of common existence. And every now and then they blunder into doing something with just a touch of the universal.

Now, to me that is what the Endowment for the Arts and the Endowment for the Humanities is all about. I would just suggest that if Members want to save money, I can show them 50 line items in appropriation bills that I will serve the American public. This is a tiny little amount, but it is crucial to seeing to it that we can spread the basic foundations of our society and western values as broadly as possible in this society. Is it done error free? Of course not, because everyone is human. But I say that the routine of common existence would be just a little less rich without the services that this appropriation provides, and this Congress would be out of its head to pass this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, many colleagues on both sides have stood up and said that maybe it is just a little bit of money. National Endowment for the Arts, which I did not get a chance to speak on in the last amendment, it is only a little bit of money, \$100 million a year. I swore that if I ever spoke that a million dollars was a little bit of money, that I would leave this body, because it is a lot of money and I think we need to take that into account.

There are Members here and they have the right to that opinion that government can do things better. I think Charlie the Cockroach, whatever his name, would feel better if he had

the right to control his own destiny instead of other people controlling it. That \$110 million a year for the NEA and \$100 million for the NEH adds up to a lot of dollars. Let us take a 10-year period.

When the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about the real future and the light of the future, I think the real light of this great country was born on individualism, from people creating their own destiny, not Federal Government. If we look at what the NEH does, have they done some good things? Sure, I am sure they do. And the NEA, have they done good things? Yes.

But when we take a look at what the real light is, is it giving back tax-paying Americans dollars instead of sending it to Washington? You have to borrow the money. That \$200 million a year, you have to borrow that money to be able to spend it and then make people think that you are giving them a good deal.

I submit that it is not a good deal, Mr. Chairman. We have people in San Diego, in my area like U.S.S. Grant Sharp, Adm. Grant Sharp, four-star admiral, we have Wally Schirra, an astronaut. I would love the humanities to come in and talk about their history. But we do that with PBS and private funds. The Government does not have to do that.

The gentleman from Maine that talked about this great program in Maine that they have. If it is so important to Maine, I have never seen it. Joe Sixpack in my State or county has never seen it. Let people from Maine, if it is so important, support it. Why should Joe Sixpack from all the other districts fund this?

There are some great individual programs. The gentleman talked about the B-2, a controversial issue. I would submit to take a look, is there a need for the B-2? Is there a mission in the future for it? I say yes. And if not, what would you do, spend another \$12 billion just on the R&D that goes on with what the new B-2 is or whatever replaces it? That is going to cost more in those dollars.

I would submit that the gentleman from Wisconsin has not sat over the top of Hanoi like I have and watched two B-52's go down in flames, with the horror of watching those men die because they were flying in 40-year-old airplanes. Yes, there is an issue. I think the perspective is different.

But the perspective of the American people is not to have the Federal Government do it. It is awful hard to outspend a liberal. We will give a figure to balance the budget and you will give a higher figure. Then you will say we are cutting, whether it is Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment or these programs, and look how wonderful they are.

The President wants a \$3 billion literacy program. Mr. Chairman, we have

14 literacy programs in the Federal Government. What is wrong with paying for one and fully funding it and getting rid of the bureaucracies and getting rid of the bureaucracy of the NEA and funding down the arts where parents and children and schools can make those decisions? No, they want the Federal Government.

If you take a look at whether it is health care controlled by the Federal Government, whether it is education controlled by the Federal Government, or history standards controlled by the Federal Government in which they had more study about Madonna and McCarthyism than they did the Magna Carta, or whether it is private control of private property. No, I am not talking about the Federal Government. I am talking about the Communist Manifesto written by Karl Marx and Engels about control of everything that goes on in River City, in Washington, DC, and by Government.

I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that we change those things. Yes, the cockroach would be much happier if he had the destiny of his own life to live instead of people that borrow money here that do not have to pay it back, they do not, even the people they spend it on do not have to pay it back. Americans have to pay it back.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment to abolish the National Endowment for the Humanities. This House seems intent on doing an interesting day's work. First let us destroy our support for the arts, that is in the morning; and in the afternoon let us destroy the humanities.

That is a good day's work. The humanities are critical to any free and democratic society. The study of history, the study of philosophy, literature, religion, how are people supposed to make intelligent decisions and govern ourselves if we do not support the study of history and philosophy and literature and religion? The purpose of the National Endowment for the Humanities is to promote this, to promote research in education and the preservation of knowledge, to promote the preservation of our cultural heritage. This House is willing to spend, we are this year appropriating somewhere in the neighborhood of \$270 billion to the Department of Defense for our physical defense.

One can think, as I do, that that is a little too much, but no one will quibble that we should spend a lot of money for our physical defense.

□ 1330

But the NEH, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts, that is money spent for our cultural and civil defense, for our cultural heritage, so

that we have a country that is worth in every sense defending.

The NEH funds professional development for teachers to preserve our heritage for the next generation. Fifty thousand teachers have benefited from its summer seminars, and they have reached in turn 7½ million students.

NEH grants are being used to fund multimedia database programs on the Supreme Court, the Civil War and the philosophies and civilizations of ancient Greece and Rome, from which we learn so much.

The endowment provides national leadership for efforts to digitize and make more accessible such important texts and documents as the Dead Sea Scrolls, ancient Egyptian papyrus fragments and the works of Shakespeare. The endowment has preserved 750,000 brittle books and 55 million pages of American newspapers.

It is crucial to our efforts to preserve the writings and ideas of American culture. In fact, the NEH is crucial to efforts to preserve the writings of American Presidents, including those of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Dwight Eisenhower.

I hear the gentleman from California saying we do not need the NEH to do this; let people spend their own money to do it. Who would preserve our cultural heritage? Who would spend the money to physically treat books, physically and chemically treat books so that their pages do not fall apart with age, books that are 50, 100, and 200 years old? The private sector will not do it. Government has to do it because it is essential that it be done to preserve our heritage. But the private sector will not do that.

Do we want to eliminate funding for a program whose primary purpose is to preserve American history and culture? We have cut funding for this substantially. Two years ago the funding was \$172 million, about .01 percent of the budget. The current fiscal year it is being slashed to \$110 million, but that is not enough. They argue it must be eliminated.

To argue that this is too large an investment to preserve our cultural heritage is absurd. As was mentioned before, we voted for nine B-2 bombers in the current budget that the Pentagon says it does not need to defend us. One B-2 bomber, the cost of it, could fund the NEH for a dozen years.

The NEA has made mistakes on grants, the NEH has made mistakes on grants. Sure. But that is the real motive for eliminating them. But that makes about as much sense as saying that people have cheated on Medicare, some insurance companies have overbilled the Government, some doctors have overbilled the Government, so let us eliminate Medicare. No, let us have better protections.

The decisions that we make on spending are reflective of what kind of

a country it is we want. Do we want a Nation that values learning, that rewards curiosity, that devotes resources to learning about the past so that we know how to seek a better future? If that is the kind of Nation we want, it is crucial we continue our commitment to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues not to compound the damage we did this morning on the NEA. Reject this amendment to eliminate the NEH. Let us not be totally shameful today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am from Ohio, and I think Ohio has a stake in this debate because it is my colleague from Ohio who would like to eliminate the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The charge has been made that this is an endowment which supports the cultural elite. Now, it is true that the city of Cincinnati, OH, is one of the great cities in this country. It is a city where the arts are valued and the humanities are valued and where many wealthy people contribute to both.

However, I represent a different part of Ohio. My part of Ohio is a part of Ohio where the largest city is only 25,000 in number. In my part of Ohio the median family income is \$22,000 a year. My part of Ohio needs the National Endowment for the Humanities. I can say that in my district alone, since 1970, the National Endowment for the Humanities has contributed nearly \$80,000, but that has been used to leverage almost \$350,000.

In my small counties numerous worthy projects depend upon funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities. In Athens County, WOUB radio, Ohio University; the telecommunications center at Ohio University; in Clinton County, Wilmington College benefits, as well as does the local library; in Gallia County, the University of Rio Grande and the French Art Colony; in Jackson County, the local library; in Meigs County, the Pioneer and Historical Society benefits from the National Endowment for the Humanities; in Ross County, the Ross County Public Library and the Ross County Historical Society; in Scioto County, my home county, the Southern Ohio Museum and Cultural Center benefits; Shawnee State University, which is Ohio's newest and smallest State university, benefits from the National Endowment for the Humanities; in Vinton County, which is Ohio's smallest and poorest county, the local library benefits; in Warren County, the county library; in Washington County, Marietta College and the local library. On and on and on.

These are not cultural elites. These are citizens in small communities in one of the most historic and beautiful parts of our Nation who need the Na-

tional Endowment for the Humanities in order to continue very worthy programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleague from Ohio to reconsider, to reconsider this misguided attempt to eliminate the National Endowment for the Humanities.

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

Mr. Chairman, the National Endowment for the Humanities was established more than three decades ago because, in the words of the Columbus, OH, Dispatch, democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens.

Now, the more responsible amendment that we should be debating today would be one that would restore the \$40 million to this budget that was cut in this bill from the President's request or the \$14 million cut from last year's funding level. That is what we should be doing, and we could have compelling arguments to do that and, I would think, win on that debate. But, instead, here we have to defend a program that has justified itself for 30 years, that has made a difference in almost every community across the country.

In Alexandria, VA, right across the Potomac River, 150 years ago Alexandria was part of Washington, DC, but there was a vote to retrocede. Because the African-American citizens could not vote, that vote won, and Alexandria went on to become one of the principal slave capitals of the South. For the next 150 years there was a struggle that required the highest levels of courage and character and leadership on the part of our African-American citizens to transform our community and that of northern Virginia and the Washington metropolitan area. They had to risk beatings, they had to risk persecution and oppression when they would go in and integrate libraries, integrate the school system, the stores, the drugstores; and over a long history, they succeeded.

Now, why is that relevant to this discussion? Because it is the National Endowment for the Humanities that is bringing that history alive to the children of our school system, black and white alike, and throughout the Washington metropolitan area.

Now, it took years for the citizens of our community to meet the exacting standards of the National Endowment for the Humanities. But once they met them, then we were able to draw upon substantial sums of other money to make history come alive, to enable our schoolchildren to realize the strong shoulders on which they stand today. That is what inspires leadership, that is what keeps our country a great country, that understanding of history, that understanding of the kind of character and courage that gave us the foundation upon which we progress.

NEH has proven itself in the same way that the principles of this country

have proven themselves. But it is integral to sustaining our principles as a democratic free country that believes in free speech, that believes in education, that believes in inclusiveness of all of our citizens.

NEH needs to be expanded, not cut back, but certainly the least we can do for our country and its people is to defeat this amendment today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the full 5 minutes but I do rise in opposition to the Chabot amendment. I urge our colleagues to defeat it and to defeat it resoundingly.

In the earlier debate we talked about the importance of the arts, of music to our country. If the arts and music touch the heart of our country, certainly the humanities enhance the soul of our great country.

The National Endowment for the Humanities supports scholarly research, education and public programs in the humanities. The NEH preserves our national heritage by helping to keep our historical record intact. It builds citizenship by providing a way for citizens to study and understand principles and practices of American democracy. It strengthens our communities through State councils and local grants.

"No, the marketplace," as Ken Burns said in his recent article, "will not produce the good works of the endowments." He said further, "It is my sincere belief that anything that threatens these institutions weakens our country."

I hope that my colleagues, when they vote, will vote to strengthen our country. In his article, Ken Burns, and I want to quote because I think it would be interesting to Members, also said, "Without a doubt, my film series on the Civil War or Baseball could not have been made without the endowment. It not only provided one of the largest grants, thereby attracting other donors, but some of its grants to archival institutions made possible the restoration of historical photographs we used," he said, "to tell our story."

He further said, and I will close with these remarks, "Early on, Thomas Jefferson and the other founding fathers knew that the pursuit of happiness did not mean a hedonistic search for pleasure in the marketplace but an active involvement of the mind in the higher aspects of human endeavor; namely, education, music, the arts and history."

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of our Founding Father Thomas Jefferson, to support the humanities and vote no on the very destructive Chabot amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, and in so doing I would like to applaud the comments of the two previous speakers, the gentleman from northern Virginia and the gentlewoman from California, for their eloquent remarks in defense of their position opposing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would make a few observations. First of all, while I stand in vehement opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, I think in one sense he has done this body a great service, and that is to provide an opportunity for many of my colleagues to march into the well of this House and to inform other Members of Congress and the American people of all of the vital services provided by the Endowment for the Humanities, and to do so with great eloquence and great precision.

Second, I would like to make this observation. A couple of weeks ago the Committee on National Security brought the military budget for this fiscal year to the floor of the U.S. Congress. In my capacity as ranking member of that committee I tried to point out, on more than one occasion, that one of our significant vital national security interests, Mr. Chairman, is a well trained, well educated, well informed citizenry that is capable of engaging the economic, cultural, and civic affairs of our Nation.

I would argue with my distinguished colleague that this amendment striking all of the funds for the National Endowment for the Humanities strikes at the heart of a vital national security interest of this Nation, and that is to have an informed, vitalized, intelligent, capable citizenry in this country.

□ 1345

One of the previous speakers, arguing in defense of this amendment, challenged some of the activities of the National Endowment of the Humanities because it opened us up to ideas. Only an ignorant society, Mr. Chairman, would run from ideas.

What makes us brilliant, what makes us capable is that we expose our youth and our children to the magnificence and wonder of great ideas. The day that we begin to censor ideas and to censor thought is the day that we go back into the 19th century and do not walk into the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest things that we have is our children; and one of our greatest contributions to our children is a contribution to their education, allowing them to function and to cope in a society, in a world that is rapidly changing, growing with increasing complexity and increasing challenges.

I would suggest, with those observations, Mr. Chairman, that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle re-

ject this amendment and say to our people, young and old alike, across the myriad of perspectives in this country, that we would not strike at a very important, vital national security interest of this country, and that is the education and the information that needs to flow to the people of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I strongly oppose the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT], and I want to tell this Congress why we should focus our attention on doing just the opposite. We should focus our attention on trying to centralize the amount of moneys we are going to give to the humanities.

I have heard many arguments this morning, Mr. Chairman. Many of them seek to sort of disperse the power and the money for the humanities. That is a wrong approach, Mr. Chairman. What it does is it proliferates weakness.

My colleagues say they want to give it in block grants to the States? That is one proposal, to give States a block grant. It does not make sense, in that there would be no centralized entity to focus, to leverage, to try to get the most of the small amount of Federal money that they are now dispensing.

First of all, if someone in this House is against an idea, it does not make sense to try and kill that idea through appropriations, because through appropriations we have never looked into the rationale of this program. We really do not know exactly what they do.

We do know that many of the things that they do are very, very good and some of the things that the National Endowment purports to help this country with are not good. That is so with all of our programs.

Our beloved leader and ranking member has tried very hard for about 25 or 30 years to build the arts and humanities in this country; and, with one fell swoop, we are going to wipe out both of these efforts. It does not make sense. What they are doing is dissipating the amount of moneys we have already put into this area, and now they are going to say they are not good, they are not good enough for our scrutiny, so we are going to wipe them out.

First of all, how is any school system or any other entity in this country going to be able to leverage the moneys that the Federal Government has put into the humanities or that it purports to put in there? There is no one agency in this country that can leverage that money as much as they have done it.

So they strengthen our communities and, most of all, they seek to maintain a historical perspective, Mr. Chairman. And we must, we must maintain that historical perspective. If we do not, we cannot keep the legacy of this country going, and it must be kept going. We must continue to remember what has been done in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question: Whether or not when we disburse this money to every different entity or agency that we can find, just to get it away from the National Endowment for the Humanities, they are going to leverage in different ways, they are going to have a diverse kind of programming. We do not really know what we are going to get, a mish-mash.

So, in closing, Mr. Chairman, we can stimulate local economies through the National Endowment. It forces the people who are teaching. Are we going to have 59 or 60 ways of teaching? The National Endowment for the Humanities has brought in all of these people who are offering or trying to do something in the area of the humanities and giving them a series of forums and workshops to teach them ways to do this.

I beg of this House, Mr. Chairman, to defeat this amendment, because it is one that will kill the humanities movement in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I was back in my office listening to the debate, and I really felt that I would not forgive myself if I did not come to the floor and add my voice to those who were saying that this is not an amendment that this House should vote for.

I think this is a basic philosophical difference. Some of my colleagues, well-intentioned, have the attitude that any government is bad, that the Federal Government is bad, that somehow or other government and programs of government are inherently evil.

I do not come from that perspective. We are one great Nation. We are 50 States, but we are one great Nation. And, certainly, the National Endowment for the Humanities teaches us that we are one great Nation, we have so much in common, that there is so much to preserve, that there is so much that we need as a Nation to bring us closer together.

The National Endowment for the Humanities does that. It is the largest source of support for the humanities nationwide. Federal support is vital in order for the infrastructure of humanities to continue to exist.

The next largest source of giving for humanities is the Mellon Foundation, which gives about \$30 million annually, compared to \$110 million for the NEH.

Government is important when the private sector cannot do the kinds of things that we need it to do. The NEH, to me, is public and private partnership working at its best. It gives grants that stimulate various humanities projects. Without these grants, without the seed money, these projects would never come to fruition.

We are one great Nation. We are a great country. We have a Federal Government. The Federal Government

should be doing the kinds of things, in my opinion, that the National Endowment for the Humanities does.

Now projects like collecting and editing the papers of the Nation's Presidents, Washington, Jefferson, Grant, Eisenhower, would more than likely stop production, many would close down all together if the NEH was abolished.

NEH funding is often the lifeblood of support for such large, complex research undertakings. A half million American school children would be deprived of the benefits of being taught by the thousands of humanities teachers who each year refresh their knowledge and understanding of humanities in our great Nation by attending NEH-sponsored summer seminars and institutes.

The NEH, as my colleagues have said, is a good buy. The cost to each American is only 42 cents a year, which is one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. The activities of the State humanities councils all across America would probably close, most would go out of business, if this amendment were to pass.

Some of my colleagues might say, "Well, so what? If it cannot be sustained by the private sector, let it close." But I think this is a very, very shortsighted attitude. If things can be sustained by the private sector, then they well ought to be. But, again, if we can have this public-private partnership that works, why would we not want to reward success?

This is a program that has been working. It has not been a failure. Where there are Government programs that have been failures, we should eliminate them. When there is too much fat in the budget, we should cut the fat. But when there is a program that is working, like the National Endowment for the Humanities, we ought to be strengthening these programs, not cutting their legs out from under them.

Access to humanities programming would be closed off to millions of Americans in rural areas who are less well off. I represent an urban area, and we would probably have these things continuing, but people in rural areas would not be able to do that. Without NEH, who else would have provided the vital seed money to nurture a landmark event in our Nation's cultural life like the Library of America series? Those of us who are familiar with that series know how important and vital it is and what a vital role the NEH played in that.

So let me just say, in summation, that I think that this amendment is a very, very shortsighted amendment. Again, where there is fat in the budget, we ought to cut it out. Where the private sector can fill in, then Government ought not to do it. But when we have a public-private partnership that

works, this kind of funding works, this Congress ought to be saying thank you and we ought to be strengthening it and nurturing it and, yes, even adding additional dollars to it, rather than trying to cut it out.

I do not come from the philosophy that Government is inherently bad or evil. I think we need Government. We do not need too much Government, but we do not need too little Government either. And where Government provides vital resources such as the NEH, those resources should be supported by this Congress, not have the legs cut out from under them.

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise the Members that we will conclude debate on this today but will roll the vote until next Tuesday, so that those Members that have airplanes to catch, there will be no more votes today. We will just go on until the debate is concluded, and at that point we will roll the vote.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas must yield to the gentleman from Illinois for the parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the chairman to say that there would be speaking as long as Members wanted to speak? Is that only on this amendment or on other amendments?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, this amendment only. When the debate on this amendment is concluded, we will roll the vote and rise.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question. I have just been told that one Member of the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has indicated that if this bill goes down on final passage, that all Democratic projects are going to be stripped out of the bill. I would like to know if that kind of blackmail is going on on the part of his leadership or not.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I know absolutely nothing about that, and I think that is misinformation. There has been nothing of that type by way of

information or discussion transmitted to me. It is totally news to me.

Mr. OBEY. I would certainly take the gentleman at his word. I would simply ask that he check with his own Whip's office to make certain that that is not the case. If the majority party wants to really blow up this place, that is a good way to do it; and I do not think it would be very smart to try it.

□ 1400

Mr. REGULA. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I think that the gentleman knows me well enough to know that that is not the way we approach things. He can see that in the way the bill is constructed. It is very bipartisan.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I know that is the way the gentleman approaches things, but as he knows sometimes things are decided above our pay grade, and I think we need to know whether we are operating in the atmosphere of reasonableness or of sharks.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Would the Chair please provide me the amount of time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining of her 5 minutes.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas was allowed to proceed for an additional 1 minute.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I respect my colleagues who have had a great deal of concern with both the National Endowment for the Arts and with the National Endowment for the Humanities. I know that many have done it out of an earnestness of what they believe the values of this Nation should be. But even though with respect for their position, I cannot accept it.

Just as I thought the amendments dealing with the elimination of the National Endowment for the Arts were foolish and foolhardy, both the amendment to eliminate and the amendment that did not pass that would have in essence eliminated under the Ehlers amendment the NEA, this amendment, the National Endowment for the Humanities, to eliminate it is similarly foolish and foolhardy.

Might I share with Members as a youngster growing up in America how important it was as the learning process unfolded before me to understand that I was not alone with respect to my history. I was not alone as an African-American in this Nation without history or roots. Although the educational system as I was growing up was not as detailed and as clear about the richness of African-American history, I am very proud today to say that many research projects that have been funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities have given depth to the rich and diverse culture of this Nation.

It has given depth to the very rich Indian American culture, the culture of the original natives of this great land. It has funded projects so that our schoolchildren could understand the value of American Indian history. It also has responded to the emerging Hispanic culture and in its research funding grants has seen the value of training teachers who understand multi-culturalism.

Tears came to my eyes in 1977 when an account by Alex Haley that was then fictionalized into a movie called "Roots" began to unfold for all of America what the slave history was about and the subsequent history of the 1800's, and then the entrenchment of this divide in this Nation, but yet the joys that came about.

I, too, celebrated in that fiction, fiction as it was put to story in a movie, but yet as it was told in truth in Alex Haley's book "Roots." It was exciting for those of us who had finished most of our education because, sad to say, in the 1950's and 1960's, there was little diverse history taught in our schools. But the National Endowment for the Humanities, independent and free as it is, with public dollars, when this country began to accept the multiplicity of its very diverse culture, began to train teachers to teach those of us who wanted to learn about the richness of this history.

He is now telling us that he would cut off the opportunity for my children and grandchildren to be able to believe in a Nation that is so diverse. How many of us fully understood, even as it was told, the Civil War story? But yet the NEH had enough courage to support the Burns' effort in this Civil War story that so many of us looked at on PBS, the Public Broadcasting System.

Likewise, the NEH supported a documentary history of the emancipation from 1861 to 1867. It included the fact that we in Texas only knew of that emancipation in 1865, two years after the emancipation in 1863. But it had to be an independent body that helped all of the Nation understand what emancipation meant.

And so I am saddened that we have this divide and that we would use the issue of arts and the issue of the humanities as a wedge issue and a budget-cutting issue when in fact, as I have said before, a people who continue to trample on its arts, its culture and its history are doomed to perish.

I believe that this amendment will bring about a perishing of the rich cultural diversity and the long and rich history that this Nation is developing. Vote down this amendment and support the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words in order to engage in a colloquy on an unrelated matter with the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. REGULA], the chairman of the subcommittee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to engage the gentleman from Ohio in a colloquy to receive his views and to receive and understand the subcommittee's views on the nature of the matching requirements that will apply to the completion of the Lewis and Clark Trail Interpretive Center in Nebraska. It is my understanding that the matching requirements for the additional fiscal year 1998 appropriations for the center, plus the previously appropriated \$391,000 in total can be matched by cash, materials, and services. While it is my understanding that a substantial cash contribution will be required, it is further my understanding that such materials, services and activities in non-cash contributions could include contributed architectural and engineering plans or planning activities, construction materials, landscape planning and plant materials, survey activities, utilities installation and/or relevant new artwork creations.

Mr. Chairman, is my understanding of the nature and the anticipated matching contributions for the center correct?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. As the gentleman knows, I have held all these types of interpretive centers to strict cost-share requirements including substantial cash. That is because we have so many requests and we try to stretch our dollars. However, the other services the gentleman detailed are also acceptable as a portion of the matching contribution necessary to meet the subcommittee's requirements.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his statement, patience, assistance and good will, and I also thank his staff for similar reasons.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to prolong this discussion nor this debate. But I think one of the reasons that so many people have spoken on this particular issue is because of the depth of their feelings with reference to how effective the National Endowment for the Humanities has been. In my own city, the city of Chicago, a city that is the essence of diversity, a city that has ethnic enclaves all over its landscape, through this kind of programming people have been able to come together to interact, to explore, to take hard, good looks, to be involved in things like

Imagine Chicago, to be involved in programs at the Newberry Library or to be involved in finding out how other groups actually live and function in this great Nation that we call the United States of America.

I would think that any diminution of these activities would go against the grain, because one of the things I have learned is that in order to make democracy real, there is a need to understand how the other fellow thinks, how the other person feels, even the opportunity to walk in his or her footsteps and shoes. I would stand with all of those who have suggested that this program, and for the money that is expended on it, is worth its weight in gold, because it provides the golden opportunity for Americans to truly learn about each other and the contributions that we have all made. I join with those who are in opposition and say let us keep America interacting rather than shutting Americans away from each other.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have always understood that the most important obligation that each of us as a private citizen in America has is to somehow translate the history of this country and to make sure that the children that come in the future have a full and knowledgeable understanding of the history of this Nation and what makes it great, what makes it operate, and who the people are in the length and breadth of this land.

In order for the people of this House who represent this Nation to fulfill that solemn obligation, to extend who we are to the future, this Congress 30 years ago decided that we had to have a National Foundation for the Humanities in order to make sure that the history of this Nation and our understanding of it as it began and as it grew and as it is today and as we would like it to be in the future has the awesome support and foundation in a national kind of responsibility, and that is why the Endowment was created.

Each of us represents about 600,000 or 700,000 persons. We cannot begin to really express each and every person within our constituency, though that is our obligation. And so as we come to the House to meet our challenges, to extend the security of this Nation through education, we look to the National Endowment for the Humanities to help us in this endeavor.

And so at this moment in our debate, to kill this national organization seems to me to not understand why it was created in the first place. It is to take each of us, 435 Members of Congress, each from diverse backgrounds, each from very different districts. Most of us cannot comprehend the districts that some Members represent. But

surely we are the product of our district, our education, our cultural experience, our academic training and so forth and we come here with the responsibility to represent that constituency. But in this House, we know that we have far greater responsibilities than our own district. We have to represent the Nation. This Nation has a huge responsibility, and, that is, to unite this diverse entity called America and to understand it and to make sure that those things that are important, that began it continue on, to motivate our young people, to carry forth the noble traditions and principles of this democracy. If we simply let the States and the school systems and the private entities decide what is important for us as a Nation on an individual basis in our cities and in our school systems and in our States, we will lose that very important influence of the national unity of this country.

This is America, the United States of 50 States and territories. It is our obligation as the Federal Congress to understand our responsibility. That is exactly what the National Endowment for the Humanities is, to bring forth that rich history of our country, to understand the diversity of this Nation, to pull all these diverse people together, and to let us march down into history as one people with the fundamental principles of Americanism and freedom and liberty and all the things that are important for the future of this world into the essence and spirit of America. That is what the National Endowment for the Humanities stands for. To destruct it and to say, well, private sectors and the individual States can carry this forward, they cannot. Because no individual private foundation, no individual State can represent the spirit of America in the way that it must be represented if we are to be one country and one nation.

□ 1415

So I plead with those who seek to destruct this organization to understand what they are doing. It is not just to save money, it is not to try to express some conservative belief that less government is better government. It is a failure to understand our individual citizen responsibility that we represent the United States and that we have a fundamental responsibility to carry forward to the future the history, the understanding, the diversity, the culture, what makes us a special people in this universe.

I ask my colleagues not to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Ohio for the work that has gone into this bill; I thank my colleague from Cincinnati for his effort that has gone into this amendment. I do not

agree with it, but I must say that there have been few amendments brought in recent weeks that have provoked a more constructive dialog on this floor than this one. It has invoked the deep sense of what it means to be an American.

As my colleagues know, 4 months ago this body in its common judgment decided to abandon this Capitol to go away to a small place in Hershey, PA to talk about those things that bind us together. We talked about the things that were important to us as Americans representing 260 million Americans in all of our diversity. We came together and listened to David McCullough, the noted historian, who in his moving keynote address invoked the words of Daniel Boorstin, another noted historian and a former Librarian of Congress, when he suggested that one cannot grow a garden by planting cut flowers. His point was that we need to understand the genesis of where we come from in order to have a flourishing garden. He was suggesting that we need to know where we have been in order to have a sense of where we are going.

We have been in this place before. We have been in a time when this body and this Nation, locked in a time of change, has been at intellectual war with itself. And yet we have known that we can grow beyond that and to conduct this conflict of ideas in a way that is civil and it makes some sense to the Nation.

A hundred years ago in 1892, Benjamin Harrison and Grover Cleveland conducted a campaign one of the most lackluster campaigns in the Nation's history at a time when it may have been more important to understand what the causes of history were at that time. They, like many of us, found themselves in a time when political leaders knew more than they dared to say and who worried more than they dared to show. It was a time when the illustrious Committee of Ten came forward to make recommendations to this Nation to bring about healing in a time of change, and the Subcommittee on History, which included even Woodrow Wilson relatively early in his career, argued that the importance of history, just as Boorstin and McCullough suggested, was at the heart of what it took to be Americans.

Today, we face the same kind of demands. The Bradley Commission on History, a decade ago, articulated the same kinds of things when they suggested, as we need to derive from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the importance of developing a shared sense of humanity, to understand ourselves and others, to understand how we resemble and differ from one another, to question stereotypes of ourselves and others, to discern the difference between fact and conjecture, to grasp the complexity of historical cause, to distrust the simple answer

and the dismissive explanation, to respect particularity and avoid false analogy, to recognize the abuse of historical lessons, and to understand that ignorance of the past may make us prisoners of it, to recognize that not all problems have solutions, to be prepared for the irrational, the accidental, in human affairs, and to grasp the power of ideas and character in history.

Perhaps no one said it better than did Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who in addressing the graduating class of the Harvard Law School in the 1880s suggested that perhaps the greatest service that one can do in a democracy is to see the future as far as one may, to feel the force behind every detail, to try to hammer out products that are sound and come back to seek to make them first rate, and to let the results speak for themselves. No more cogent articulation of the importance of understanding where we have been and where we are going has been put before the Nation.

The work that has gone into this bill is enormously important. I look at the kind of effort that has gone into the national heritage corridors, living examples of our history, understanding the forces that bound us together a century and a century and a half ago and that are every bit as important to us today. In concrete terms they represent what the National Endowment for the Humanities represents in conceptual terms, our living history embodied in the work that we do today.

I thank the chairman for the work that has led to this bill. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, for provoking this debate, and I thank all my colleagues for listening to it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, if we eliminate the Federal commitment to the arts by eliminating or severely reducing the National Endowment for the Arts, I believe we do a great disservice to the American people. Likewise, if we eliminate our commitment to the Humanities, we do a great disservice to our entire democracy.

Investments in our cultural institutions, like the NEA and NEH, are investments in the livability of our communities. For just 38 cents per year per American, NEA-supported programs help enhance the quality of life for Americans in every community in this country. For just 68 cents per year per American, NEH-supported programs to preserve our heritage by keeping our historical records intact and building citizenship by providing citizens to study and understand principles and practices of American democracy. In fact, Congress established the NEH because "Democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens."

But the NEA and NEH do not perform this important function alone—the Nation's cultural support system is a complex structure pieced together from many different sources, including earned income, private donations, corporate donations, and government grants. The cultural heritage of our communities rely upon all those sources to remain whole—including

the Federal commitment. It's the partnership formed by all these entities, from private investors, to cities, States, and the Federal Government, that makes the system work.

Adequately funding the National Endowment for the Arts, in particular, is absolutely critical to the State of Oregon, which has suffered in recent years from cutbacks at the State and local levels. Portland and other cities in Oregon have managed to make this work by using public funds to leverage as much private investment as possible. Portland arts groups manage to attain about 68 percent of their financial resources from the box office, which is higher than the national average of 50 percent. Portland companies have stepped up to the plate—doubling their investment between 1990 and 1995. The public investment, particularly the investment from the NEA, is absolutely critical to preserving these opportunities.

Why is it important to preserve these cultural investments? A commitment to culture pays many dividends—dividends that promote our economic development and our understanding of the world around us. Economically, an investment in culture as helped promotes tourism. People flock to cities that support the arts and humanities, benefiting hotels, convention centers, restaurants, and countless other businesses related to entertainment and tourism. In fact, the nonprofit arts industry generates \$36.8 billion annually in economic activity, supports 1.3 million jobs, and returns \$3.4 billion to the Federal Government in income taxes and an additional \$1.2 billion in State and local tax revenue.

An investment in culture also helps previously disenfranchised groups gain access to new cultural experiences. The NEA, for example, provides fun and educational arts programs for children that help students and teachers develop arts, environment, and urban planning curricula. Public funds, like those from the NEA, are also critical to keeping ticket prices low, giving lower income individuals and seniors the opportunity to attend cultural events. If ticket prices reflected the entire cost of the event, cultural events would by necessity be denied many of our citizens, especially the young and elderly.

We won't be able to balance the budget by eliminating spending on our Nation's cultural heritage—and if we do so, we will lose much more as a society and a nation than we would ever gain in deficit reduction. This approach is shortsighted and doesn't recognize the long-term economic and social benefits an investment in culture convey to our communities and the Nation as a whole.

The President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities recently released a report that could help focus our priorities for American cultural resources, if we listen to their recommendations—restoring Federal funding for cultural activities; enhancing the ability of the Endowments to attract and accept gifts; and ensuring that our Tax Code helps encourage charitable contributions.

We have the tools, infrastructure and innovative spirit in place to make communities across the Nation more livable through cultural opportunities. What we need to promote is a national commitment to improving the livability of our communities by investing in culture. We can develop and promote that national commitment through the NEA and the NEH.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, if a civilization is judged by its culture, Republicans have gone a long way toward destroying America with their actions in the past 2 days. Yesterday the GOP voted to eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts, which makes theater, symphonies, and art programs available to Americans across the Nation.

Today, Republicans are trying to eliminate the National Endowment for the Humanities, which plays a vital role in advancing the educational and cultural health of our Nation, and in preserving the landmarks of our history. The NEH has made possible a wide range of activities to improve the quality of education and indeed, the very quality of life in communities throughout the country.

Let me tell you about just one of the projects that could not have happened without the help of the NEH. The Yale-New Haven Teacher's Institute brings public school teachers from New Haven together with faculty from Yale University and gives them the opportunity for in-depth study of a variety of subjects. It gives teachers the opportunity to bring new materials back to their students in the public schools of New Haven and add to their curriculum.

This project is seen as a model for collaborative efforts of universities and public schools to improve education throughout the United States. Yet it may not have happened without a \$750,000 challenge grant from the NEH—which spurred a fundraising drive of \$3 million in private funds to permanently endow this development program.

The NEH and NEA make up just a tiny portion of our budget—and that investment pays off in so many ways, spurring jobs and private investment and preserving our heritage for generations to come. Who knows how many children have had their interest sparked in a whole new subject thanks to an NEH sponsored program. Don't put out that spark. Don't destroy our heritage. Vote against destroying the NEH.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 181, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] will be postponed.

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. CHABOT) having assumed 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. 2107), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, July 11, 1997, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT MONDAY, JULY 14, 1997, FILE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Monday, July 14, 1997 to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug Administration and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT MONDAY, JULY 14, 1997 TO FILE REPORT ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Monday, July 14, 1997 to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and related

programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM HONORABLE RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, July 11, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 40003 of Public Law 105-18, I hereby appoint the following individuals to the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education:

Dr. Blanche Touhill, St. Louis, Missouri.
Dr. Walter Massey, Atlanta, Georgia.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 14, 1997

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JULY 15, 1997

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, July 14, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 15, 1997, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business

in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS FOR 1996—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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 Education and the Workforce:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my pleasure to transmit the Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts for 1996.

One measure of a great nation is the vitality of its culture, the dedication of its people to nurturing a climate where creativity can flourish. By supporting our museums and theaters, our dance companies and symphony orchestras, our writers and our artists, the National Endowment for the Arts provides such a climate. Look through this report and you will find many reasons to be proud of our Nation's cultural life at the end of the 20th century and what it portends for Americans and the world in the years ahead.

Despite cutbacks in its budget, the Endowment was able to fund thousands of projects all across America—a museum in Sitka, Alaska; a dance company in Miami, Florida; a production of a Eugene O'Neill play in New York City; a Whistler exhibition in Chicago; and artists in schools in all 50 States. Millions of Americans were able to see plays, hear concerts, and participate in the arts in their hometowns, thanks to the work of this small agency.

As we set our priorities for the coming years, let's not forget the vital role the National Endowment for the Arts must continue to play in our national life. The Endowment shows the world that we take pride in American culture here and abroad. It is a beacon, not only of creativity, but of freedom. And let us keep that lamp brightly burning now and for all time.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 1997.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL YEAR 1998 BUDGET REQUEST ACT OF 1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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 Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 202(c)(5)(C)(ii) of the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 ("the FRMA Act"), I am transmitting the Council of the District of Columbia's "Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Request Act of 1997."

The Council's proposed Fiscal Year 1998 Budget was disapproved by the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (the "Authority") on June 12. Under the FRMA Act, if the Authority disapproves the Council's financial plan and budget, the Mayor must submit that budget to the President to be transmitted to the Congress. My transmittal of the District Council's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents. The budget also does not reflect the effect of my proposed Fiscal Year 1998 District of Columbia revitalization plan.

The Authority is required to transmit separately to the Mayor, the Council, the President, and the Congress a financial plan and budget. The Authority sent its financial plan and budget to the Congress on June 15.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 1997.

□ 1430

STUDY ON OPERATION AND EFFECT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT) 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 Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Study on the Operation and Effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), as required by section 512 of the NAFTA Implementation Act (Public Law 103-182; 107 Stat. 2155; 19 U.S.C. 3462). The Congress and the Administration are right to be proud of this historic agreement. This report provides solid evidence that NAFTA has already proved its worth to the United States during the 3 years it has been in effect. We can look forward to realizing NAFTA's full benefits in the years ahead.

NAFTA has also contributed to the prosperity and stability of our closest neighbors and two of our most important trading partners. NAFTA aided Mexico's rapid recovery from a severe economic recession, even as that country carried forward a democratic transformation of historic proportions.

NAFTA is an integral part of a broader growth strategy that has produced the strongest U.S. economy in a generation. This strategy rests on three mutually supportive pillars: deficit reduction, investing in our people through education and training, and opening foreign markets to allow America to compete in the global economy. The success of that strategy can be seen in the strength of the American economy, which continues to experience strong investment, low unemployment, healthy job creation, and subdued inflation.

Export growth has been central to America's economic expansion. NAFTA, together with the Uruguay Round Agreement, the Information Technology Agreement, the WTO Telecommunications Agreement, 22 sectoral trade agreements with Japan, and over 170 other trade agreements, has contributed to overall U.S. real export growth of 37 percent since 1993. Exports have contributed nearly one-third of our economic growth—and have grown three times faster than overall income.

Workers, business executives, small business owners, and farmers across America have contributed to the resurgence in American competitiveness. The ability and determination of working people across America to rise to the challenges of rapidly changing technologies and global economic competition is a great source of strength for this Nation.

Cooperation between the Administration and the Congress on a bipartisan basis has been critical in our efforts to reduce the deficit, to conclude trade agreements that level the global playing field for America, to secure peace and prosperity along America's borders, and to help prepare all Americans to benefit from expanded economic opportunities. I hope we can continue working together to advance these vital goals in the years to come.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 1997.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks a monumental breakthrough for resolving conflict over forest management in our national forests. By passing the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997, we sent a message to

America that local compromise and community consensus is the new way of doing business on environmental issues. For more than 15 years environmentalists and members of the forest products industry have waged war over managing western forests.

In 1993, Bill Coates, Plumas County supervisor from Quincy, CA, took up the challenge of breaking the gridlock over forest management. He did so by arranging a meeting with environmental attorney Michael Jackson and Sierra Pacific Industries forester Tom Nelson. They met in the library because they knew they wouldn't yell at each other. QLG is now a coalition of 41 local environmentalists, forest products industry representatives, public officials, and concerned citizens who meet each month at the Quincy Library to discuss ways to improve local forest health. This program has been endorsed by local environmental organizations including the Plumas Audubon Society, the Friends of the Plumas Wilderness, the Sierra Nevada Alliance, and the Shasta-Tehama Bioregional Council. At the heart of their discussions is the overriding threat that fire will destroy the forests before any action can be taken. Nationwide, last year more than 5.8 million acres burned with total fire suppression costs close to \$1 billion. The group turned to the best science available, including the recently released Sierra Nevada ecosystem project [SNEP] report which defines, among other things, the elements of a healthy forest. H.R. 858 takes the first vital step toward conflict resolution of environmental issues across the Nation by implementing the QLG proposal as a 5-year pilot project on three of northern California's national forests.

This legislation passed with a recorded vote of 429 to 1. It is fitting that a plan born from consensus would, in the end, pass the House of Representatives with a strong consensus vote. The QLG plan represents an entirely new approach to managing our Federal forests. We now have a local group bringing local solutions to Washington instead of Washington forcing solutions on local communities. I want to thank everyone who played a part in making this happen. This could never have happened without all 41 members of the Quincy Library Group; especially Bill Coates, Tom Nelson, Michael B. Jackson, and Linda Blum. This is truly their legislation. I want to salute them and their efforts. This is the way government should function. I also want to thank DON YOUNG, HELEN CHENOWETH, DAVID DREIER, BOB SMITH, Speaker GINGRICH, TOM DELAY and the entire leadership, JIM SAXTON, WAYNE GILCHREST, TOM CAMPBELL, SHERRY BOEHLERT, VIC FAZIO, PETER DEFAZIO, GEORGE MILLER, and every one of the 429 Members of Congress who supported this legislation. I would also like to thank the committee staff whose understanding and dedication brought this legislation to fruition.

Particularly I would like to thank Duane Gibson, Bill Simmons, Anne Heissenbuttle, Lloyd Jones, Liz Megginson, Dave Tenny and from my own staff John Magill, Fran Peace, Rich Nolan, Steve Thompson, Dallas Scholes, Dave Meurer, Dave Oleander, Mike Digiordano, Patsy Atkins, Kathy Summers, Donna Burton, Lemoine Sharpe, Ron Shinn, Katy-Duke Chamberlin, Annette Gatten, Lisa Strohman, and George Morris. This is a great

victory. We have finally shown that compromise and bipartisan effort does pay off. Again, thank you for your support and for helping us save the environment in northern California. I hope this bill will move expeditiously through the Senate and eventually be signed into law. I would also encourage that we take the momentum from this bill and use our new-found ability to compromise in a way that makes this Congress a success for America.

THE AGENDA OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I took out this 5-minute special order to hopefully bring some perspective to some of the things that were said here in the House this week.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said over and over again that the agenda for the majority party, at least, in the House over the past several weeks has been threefold; one, to move toward a balanced budget; two, to reduce the tax burden on the American people; and three, to save Medicare.

I would like to talk about the first two of those three issues for just a couple of minutes, as I said, to try to bring some perspective to this week's debate. I recently read an article that was written, an op ed piece, by an individual that I know who is quite famous in the economic world. His name is Milton Friedman. He is a fellow at the Hoover Institute. He wrote about the economy of this country and, because of what has happened, is in the process of happening in Hong Kong, compared our economy with the economy and the historical perspective of Hong Kong.

He noted in his article that the economy of the United States on a per capita basis used to be seven times larger than the economy of Hong Kong. In other words, for every man, woman, and child in this country, we had seven times more economic power than an individual in Hong Kong.

Over the years since as we have moved through history the two countries have actually come much closer together, because today on a per capita basis we are no longer seven times bigger than the Hong Kong economy. As a matter of fact, we are almost the same; a difference of just 7 percent. In other words, our total economy on a per capita basis is just 7 percent larger than Hong Kong's. In other words, we have come from a situation like this to a situation on a per capita basis where we are almost the same.

The majority party here recognizes that the kind of growth that we would like to see economically is, in a sense, demonstrated by Milton Friedman's remarks in his article, because we would like to see our economy continue to

grow, and for individuals to prosper as they once did. That is exactly why we think it is very important to balance the budget and to reduce taxes.

Mr. Speaker, a lot was said around here this week about reducing taxes. We believe that it should be done in an extremely fair way. That is why, as this chart to my left shows, 76 percent of the tax relief that the Republican party has presented to the American people and in fact passed goes to people who make less than \$75,000 a year. They are the workhorses in our economy. They are the families who sit around the dinner table each night and talk about the day's activities. They are the families that also plan for their tomorrows.

We wanted those people to have the benefit of the tax cuts. That is why we did it in a very balanced way, as the next chart also demonstrates. This shows American taxpayers from the lowest income 20 percent, through the highest income 20 percent. We tried to balance our tax cuts so we would not change the distribution of who pays how much in terms of the total tax load that is sent here to Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, under the current tax plan as it exists today, 63 percent of the total dollars that are sent here are paid by the highest 20 percent. That is way over on the other end there, demonstrated by the red bar. The yellow bar shows that under the Republican tax plan, 63 percent will still continue to be paid by the highest 20 percent.

The same is true of the next percent, the percentage between 60 percent and 80 percent. Under the current tax plan passed in 1993 by the Democrats and Bill Clinton, 21 percent of the total tax load is paid by that quintile, as we call it, and under the Republican tax plan, 21 percent will be paid by that same quintile. The same is true of people who are in the third quintile, in the second quintile, and in the very lowest quintile, which does not change either.

So as we move toward a smaller Government, as we move toward a less expensive Government, as we move toward an economy that is what it used to be, we believe it should be done in a balanced and fair way. That is what my friends on the other side of the aisle have been disagreeing with throughout this week.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO NORM THOMPSON, ITS EMPLOYEES AND ASSOCIATES, FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTION AND EFFORTS TO HELP WEST VIRGINIA FLOOD VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, during today's long and sometimes contentious

debate we often look for good news. I am happy to say that as the legislative day draws to a close, I have good news to report to the House of Representatives, good news and also some thanks to offer; thanks to the company Norm Thompson, a well-known national mail order business whose corporate distribution center is in Kearneysville, WV, relatively close to Washington, DC, about an hour and a half's drive from here in Jefferson County, because week after next Norm Thompson is going to make an \$800,000 donation to a West Virginia charity to assist flood victims.

That \$800,000 donation is going to take the form of 44,000 units of men and women's clothing and footwear to be distributed to flood victims throughout our State of West Virginia. Norm Thompson will partner in this endeavor with Roadway Express, and they will transport the merchandise free of charge from the Norm Thompson distribution center in Kearneysville to Charleston, WV, on the other side of the State, for distribution by the West Virginia Commission for National and Community Services.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important gift and effort by Norm Thompson. Five times within the last year and a half West Virginia has been torn by major floods. I have one county in my congressional district, Randolph County, that has four times in the last year and a half been declared a Federal disaster area. We had four floods in 1996, and then again in February of 1997 a flood that tore through 16 counties, including many of our most populous areas.

So this effort by Norm Thompson and the hundreds of men and women who work for this corporation, headquartered in Oregon, but with its major warehouse distribution center in West Virginia, this effort will assist thousands of West Virginians as they recover and begin to rebuild their lives.

I think it is important to note that the chairman, John Emrick of Norm Thompson, said the donation is the first of many planned, noting the number of floods that West Virginia had had, and also saying, it is important to match our donation to the immediate needs of helping flood victims get back on their feet again. They are donating this to the West Virginia Commission for National and Community Services, a nonprofit corporation. They will in turn distribute this across the State.

Norm Thompson is a relatively new member of our corporate community in West Virginia, a very valued one, but already employing hundreds of West Virginians. I know, having met personally with the CEO and the other top management, as well as many of the employees, I know how excited we are in West Virginia to have them as a corporate citizen.

I want to thank Norm Thompson and its many employees and associates for making this gift possible, and for their obvious commitment to West Virginia; not only for doing good business, but for being a good citizen, corporate and otherwise. I know that thousands of West Virginians as well thank Norm Thompson for this extremely generous gesture. We look forward to working with them in the future.

We thank them for recognizing needs that are present and we are excited about the opportunities that Norm Thompson offers, not only, as I say, in business, but also in being a member of our corporate community.

DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS SHOULD USE THE SAME NUMBERS TO COMPUTE THE BENEFITS OF THEIR RESPECTIVE TAX RELIEF PLANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about tax relief, tax relief which, in my opinion, and I think in the opinion and view of the vast majority of American families, is long overdue.

We were talking earlier with some of my colleagues about college commencement addresses. Some of us are asked to give a commencement address during the late spring and early summer of the year, and most of us do not remember who the commencement speaker was at our own commencement, particularly our college commencement.

I am one of the few who probably does remember, because the director of the United States Census was there to give our commencement address when I was in college. It was interesting to look back about what it was like growing up then, and the difference then. I was a baby boomer. I was born in 1951.

The Speaker that spoke at our commencement address, the director of the United States Census, told us on that day that there were more kids born in 1951 than in any other year. I represent the peak of the baby boomers. I remember, we were talking about what it was like to grow up in the 1950s.

One of the important things when we talk about taxes is to remind ourselves of how much has changed since I was growing up and since the baby boomers were growing up, because when I was a child I was fortunate enough, my father worked in a factory, I am a blue collar guy, and my folks were able to raise three boys on one paycheck. Part of the reason they could do that, Mr. Speaker, was because the largest single payment they made was their house payment.

Today, unfortunately, the average family pays more in taxes than they do for food, clothing, and shelter combined. Let me say that again, because I do not know if most people really, I think they know that down in their bones, but I do not know if they have really internalized what that all means. But the average family in America today spends more for taxes than they do for food, clothing, and shelter combined. So this Congress has been working very hard to balance the budget, to save Medicare, and to provide tax relief to working families.

We are having a rather interesting debate here the last several weeks over who would really benefit from these tax cuts. Frankly, I think we need to spend some time talking about how relatively intelligent people can reach entirely different conclusions about who benefits most from this tax relief.

I would like to talk a little bit today about our tax plan, our method of coming to these conclusions, how we actually do the arithmetic to come to some of these conclusions, and compare it to exactly how our friends on the left are doing the calculations. We are talking about real income for real families and real tax relief.

What some of our friends on the left are using is imputed income, potential taxes, and potential tax relief. I think if we could all use the same set of numbers, whether we are going to use one set or the other, if we use just the same set; if we want to use their set of numbers let us go ahead and do the calculations that way, and then let us do the calculations our way, and let the public decide for themselves who is right, who is telling the truth, and whose tax relief will benefit them the most.

Let us go through what the tax relief package that the House has passed and sent to conference is. First of all, the centerpiece of our tax relief package is a \$500 per child tax credit. A lot of people get confused between the tax credit and a tax deduction. A credit is money that you get to keep. If you pay taxes you get a credit. That is money that will be yours at the end of the process. So this is a credit. It starts out at \$400 next year, and it would go to \$500 ever year thereafter. Generally now the President agrees with this formula.

There is also nearly \$35 billion in post-secondary education incentives. Again, as a baby boomer, and I have one who just graduated from high school, I have one in college and one who is just starting into high school, and I can understand more than anybody the high cost of higher education. I think a lot of families that have children my age understand how difficult and how expensive it is to send kids on to post-secondary education. I think that is a great benefit to working families.

There is broad-based capital gains tax relief. Again, what we want to do is

make it easier for families to save and invest for themselves. This is where sometimes our friends on the left get a little upset, because they say, well, this is tax cuts for the rich.

□ 1445

The truth of the matter is there would be some wealthy people who would benefit from it. I will get down in a later chart to show you just how much benefit the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation say there really is for that group of people. Cutting capital gains is not about helping the wealthy. It is about helping middle-class families become wealthy because the only way that you can save and invest for your future is if you in fact put some of that money away. What we want to do is make it easier for people to do that. Unfortunately, what Washington has done for the last number of years is they have operated under a sort of an unwritten rule that no good deed goes unpunished.

If you work you get punished. If you save you get punished. If you invest you get punished. What we are trying to do is reverse some of those perverse incentives.

We also want to make it easier for people to use IRA's and to withdraw from those IRA's for educational expenses. There is also a significant reduction in the death tax. This is a tax that is particularly onerous to people who own a farm, who own a small business. They would like to leave that farm or that small business to their families.

So those are the cornerstones of the tax relief package that passed the House and is currently in conference committee. I would like to talk a little bit about what this tax relief package means and how the various points actually are scored and who benefits.

According to the Committee on Ways and Means, and I think these numbers have been scored both by the Congressional Budget Office as well as the Joint Committee on Taxation, which are the official scorekeepers on matters like this, this package is aimed directly at Americans in the middle-income brackets.

In fact, we say, and I think we can prove that over 75 percent of the benefit in this tax plan goes to families earning less than \$75,000. I want to talk about real earnings because that is also one of the problems we have in this debate because we are talking about real earnings, real taxes, real tax relief for real families. We will get into that in just a few minutes.

The way this thing has been scored and, if you break it out, those families under \$20,000 a year will benefit to the tune of about \$5.5 billion in this tax relief package. Those between \$20,000 and \$75,000 will get about \$83.5 billion worth of tax relief in this package. Families

earning between \$75,000 and \$100,000 will get about \$19 billion worth of the benefits, and those earning between \$100,000 and \$200,000 would benefit to the tune of \$6.7 billion, and those earning over \$200,000 would only get \$1.4 billion worth of savings under this plan.

As I said earlier, over 75 percent of the tax relief in this package goes to families earning less than \$75,000. I am not saying that. That is what the Joint Committee on Taxation has said. So why do we hear so often from our friends on the left that this tax package is designed to benefit those that they call rich?

Part of the reason I think is they use something that is called imputed income or family economic income. Let me try to explain how that works. This all started a number of years ago; I think the Treasury Department even under the Bush administration was trying to figure out a way to calculate family income in a different way. Why they do this, I have no idea. I want to read a quote from someone most of you who are watching and most of my colleagues that are here, watching back in their offices will recognize. I will do this first. I will read the quote, and then I will tell you who it is from.

"Finally, a few words about Federal taxes and what some of the great minds at the U.S. Treasury are thinking about. The Treasury likes to calculate the American people's ability to pay taxes based not on how much money we have but on how much we might have or could have had. For example, a family that owns a house and lives in it, the Treasury figures if the family didn't own the house and rented it from somebody else, the rent would be \$500 a month. So they would add that amount, \$6,000 a year, to the family's so-called imputed income. Imputed income is income you might have had but do not. They don't tax you on that amount. The IRS doesn't play this silly game. Instead, the Treasury calculates how much they could take away from us if they decided to. If that were the system, consider the possibilities. How about being taxed on Ed McMahon's \$10 million magazine lottery? You didn't win it, you say, but you could have. The Treasury Department must have something better to do. If not, there is a good place for Clinton to do some spending cuts."

Now, that is what David Brinkley said on "This Week With David Brinkley" on February 28, 1993. And as our friend Ronald Reagan would say, former President Ronald Reagan, there they go again. We are starting to use imputed income or family economic income to calculate how many people are wealthy. That is why the difference between what the Census says and what the Treasury Department says are so different. The Census Department says there are about 11 million American families that are above \$100,000 in

income. The Treasury Department says that number is 22 million. Americans sitting at home wonder how in the world could two Federal agencies come to such incredibly different answers.

The reason is, and the answer is, family economic income or imputed income that David Brinkley talked about.

Now, some of the people have said, again you have probably heard it on the House floor, again, tax cuts for the rich. But as the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the Joint Committee on Taxation has said, currently if you divide the population of the United States, all of the taxpayers into five groups of 20 percent each, the lowest 20 percent right now of the economic group in the United States pay 1 percent of all the taxes paid in America. After this tax relief is calculated, they will still pay only 1 percent of all the taxes paid.

The second quintile currently pay 4 percent of all the taxes paid in the United States and after this tax relief goes into effect, they will still pay 4 percent.

The third quintile, it is 11 percent. It remains 11 percent. The fourth quintile, 21 and 21, and finally that top 20 percent of income earners, the top 20 percent of taxpayers in the United States currently pay 63 percent of all the taxes paid in America.

The interesting thing is, according to these calculations done by the Joint Committee on Taxation, if this tax cut plan that passed the House were to go into effect signed by the President, there would be no change. The top 20 percent would still pay 63 percent of all the taxes paid in America.

I think it is important, and I will come back to this chart in a minute, I want to talk about this whole notion of imputed income. If you take that calculation, if you take a family, in fact we did a quick calculation of a family in my district. If you put that all together, and you can take a typical family and let us call them the Joneses who live in my district that earn approximately \$32,500 per year. The Jones' mom works, dad works. They have a youngster that is in high school and they have one who is just entering college. They make \$32,500 a year. That is what they really make. But if you use this imputed income, you literally can take that family from \$32,500 a year and you can easily get that over \$50,000 a year. That is not money that they have. That is money that they might have if they sold all their interest in their IRA's, if they converted their pension funds to cash, if they rented their house, if they had a sale lease back on their house and could get the rent on their house somehow back to them; it is a convoluted way to go.

The interesting thing is, if you take that to its logical conclusion, you literally could raise that family into a

much higher tax bracket. So if our friends on the left want to use imputed income to calculate people's income and push more people into the wealthy brackets, we are doing some calculations to find out what would they pay in terms of taxes under their tax plan with imputed income.

The answer is, over half of the families in America, if you used their calculations and their imputed income statistics, over half the families in the United States of America would actually see a tax increase under the Democrat tax plan.

That is interesting, is it not? That is a side of the story that has not been told.

The other side of the story is, and we have tried to mention this, but if you use imputed income to do those calculations, the only people in the United States of America who may be guaranteed under their plan to get a tax cut are people who pay no taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not my definition of fairness. I doubt if it is the definition of fairness that most Americans have.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there is a lot in this business, there is a lot of using statistics and so forth to justify a particular point of view. I do not expect the American people necessarily to believe me. In fact I think the American people are cynical and they should be cynical because politicians down through the years have not always told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. But I would encourage people to calculate the tax cut for themselves.

Any of you who would like to get a copy of this worksheet, there is one on a Worldwide Web page so that people can actually, through their computer, do their calculations themselves. If you do not have access to a Worldwide Web page, if you do not have access to the computer and the Web, we will actually mail one out to you. If people call us or write we will send them a worksheet so they can calculate it for themselves. They can decide for themselves how much the tax relief is worth to their family.

It is a fairly simple calculation. First of all, how many children do you have in your family that are under the age of 17? You fill in the blank. In 1998, you multiply that times \$400. In every year thereafter you multiply it times \$500. That is how much you will get to keep of your tax money.

Line 2, amount of capital gains. If you have a capital gains, if you have a gain, if you have sold a stock or a bond, if you have income, if your family income is more than \$41,200, you multiply that times 8 percent because that is going to be your savings under the plan that passed the House.

If your family income is less than \$41,200 per year, you multiply that times 5 percent. That is the capital

gains tax relief and that is how much you will get to keep with this plan.

Finally, how many children do you have in their first 2 years of either college or vocational school? Those children are worth \$1,500 in tax credits to you.

We have done some calculations for different families in our district and the differences range anywhere from obviously, one child that is under 17, it is worth \$400 next year, but for the average family in my district, this calculation works out to over \$1,000 a year that that family will get to keep and spend on their family to invest and save for their future.

That is what this tax relief is about. That is why I think it is important for America. In the end, one of the goals is to make certain that we have a strong economy on into the next century.

We have been very fortunate; 2 years ago this Congress when we passed our budget resolution, we said that in fiscal year 1997, I am going back 2 years, in 1995, this Congress said that we would spend no more than \$1,624 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1997.

The good news is, we are actually going to spend this year \$1,622 billion. So for the first time in my memory, the Congress is actually going to end up spending less than it said it was going to spend just 2 years ago.

The news gets even better because in that same time frame, because the economy has been stronger, there is more consumer confidence, there is more confidence in the business community, the economy has been much stronger than anyone would have predicted just 2 years ago; as a result of that, we have produced an additional over \$100 billion in revenue to the Federal Treasury. We have spent less. We have taken in more and as a result, we projected just 2 years ago the Federal Government would have a deficit this year of over \$174 billion. The truth is, according to our estimates, it would be about \$70 billion. There was a published report earlier this week that shows that the deficit could be as low as \$50 billion or even less. That is good news. We want to make certain that that keeps going in that direction and by offering some tax relief, by allowing families to keep more, to spend more, to save more of their money, we in fact can keep this strong economy, we think, long into the future. One of the other benefits of a strong economy is that we are moving families off welfare rolls and onto payrolls.

I think one of the greatest accomplishments of the 104th Congress was the welfare reform that we passed that requires work, that requires personal responsibility and gives the States an awful lot more latitude in how they can work to encourage people getting off the welfare rolls and onto payrolls. The good news is since that welfare reform plan passed, and the President

talked about this a couple of weeks ago in his Saturday radio broadcast, the good news is there are 1,023,000 fewer families who are trapped in the welfare cycle, that have moved off welfare and onto payrolls; 1,023,000 fewer families are on welfare today than just 1 year ago.

□ 1500

That is a huge benefit to all of us. And I have said before that the real goal of welfare reform was not about saving money, even though we will save money to the Federal Government, to the State governments and everyone else, but the real goal was not about saving money. The real goal was about saving people. It was about saving families. And most importantly it was about saving children from one more generation of dependency and despair. And that is really what the welfare system was about.

But if we are to keep the strong economy growing, we are going to have to encourage more investment, we are going to have to encourage more saving, and we are going to have to allow families to keep and save and spend and invest more of their own money.

I just want to talk briefly, too, about the progress we are making, because sometimes it is easy to forget in the heat of the battle. If we look at all of the red bars here, that is how much we said that the budget would be out of balance in each of the next 7 years. When we passed our original 7-year budget plan in 1995, we said that the deficit, for example, this year, would be \$174 billion. Right now it looks like it will be less than \$70 billion; it could be less than \$50 billion.

Now, when we update this, we will probably change these numbers slightly. But the good news is if we look at the blue bars in each of the years, we are clearly now running well ahead of schedule and, frankly, I think if we can keep the economy going at anywhere near the economic growth rate that we have today, we will balance the budget not by the year 2002, but, in fact, we will balance the budget probably by the year 2000 or maybe even earlier.

And when we get to that point, what we have to really talk about, in fact we need to begin that debate today, and I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin Mr. MARK NEUMANN, who has offered the National Debt Repayment Act, because I think that should be our next goal. It is not just about balancing the budget. It has to be about paying off that \$5.3 trillion worth of debt we have accrued and will fall on the shoulders of our children and our grandchildren.

Frankly, if we are willing to exercise the fiscal discipline that this Congress has been willing to discipline itself to over the last several years, not only could we balance the budget ahead of schedule, but I think we can begin the

process of actually paying off the national debt. I think that that is a goal that is worth fighting for, I think it is a goal that the American people can understand, and I think they will recognize we can ultimately set a goal and stay on that course of actually paying off that debt so that we do not have to pay over \$200 billion a year in just interest on that debt.

And I tell an awful lot of people back in my district when I give speeches that if we actually do all the calculations, we find that all of the personal income taxes, all of the personal income taxes, collected west of the Mississippi River, now goes to pay the interest on the national debt. That is a very scary statistic. The tragedy is, before we got to Congress in 1994, the elections of 1994, that line was moving further west every single year. Now we are at least beginning to push that line backward.

And I think we should have a goal of actually paying off that debt. Because I think there is nothing better that we could leave our kids than a debt-free future. So I encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join us in that great effort.

I would hope they would cosponsor the legislation of the gentleman from Wisconsin, the National Debt Repayment Act, because what it does is, very simply, it says as we begin to reach a surplus in the Treasury, which we think we can no later than 2002. But, frankly, we think if things continue to go anywhere near where we are right now, it could actually be before that, but when we have reached that goal and disciplined ourselves to restrict the growth in spending at 1 percent less than the growth in revenues, and that does not require draconian cuts, we will still see spending at the Federal level growing faster than the inflation rate, but it will not be growing as fast as it has in the past.

So if we slow the rate of growth in spending and get control of entitlements, we cannot only balance the budget, but we can pay off the national debt and, at the same time, take a third of those surpluses and apply them to additional tax relief so that American families can keep and spend more of their own money.

Mr. Speaker, I know a lot of my Republican colleagues are headed for airplanes and it is a getaway day, and we are all eager to get home, but I want to close by saying that I am very proud of the work that is being done in this Congress. I know that sometimes the American people see some of the debates and some of the arguments here on the House floor and they sometimes miss the big picture. But the big picture is that before 1994 the United States and this Congress was headed in the wrong direction. We were spending more than we took in.

In fact, from 1975 to 1995, for every dollar that Washington took in, it

spent \$1.22. Today, now, we are still not quite to a balanced budget, we are still spending more than we take in, but we are down to \$1.04.

If we stay on the path we have set over the last several years, we will get to that balanced budget ahead of schedule, we will do it under goal, and we are going to allow families to keep more of what they spend and earn. Because for 40 years Washington had it wrong. For 40 years Washington believed that Washington knew best; that somehow they could spend money smarter than American families; that a Federal department of housing was better than a family department of housing; that a Federal department of human services was better than a family department of human services.

Now, there are still legitimate needs of the Federal Government, and there are still people who are dependent on the Federal Government, and we are not talking about pulling the rug out from under people. But we are talking about people getting a little gentle nudge so that we reinforce some of those time-tested principles, things like faith, family, work, thrift, and personal responsibility. Those are the things I think Americans want us to underscore, but for too long under the liberal agenda what we did was we undermined those values.

The good news is I think the tide is turning. The tide is clearly turning. We are on our way to a balanced budget, we are saving Medicare, and for the first time in 16 years we are going to allow families to keep and save and invest and spend more of their own money. That is the direction I think the American people want us to go, that is the direction we are going, and with the help of the American people, we are going to win that fight.

SAVE TIAA-CREF; STOP TAX HIKES ON THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund, which has been dubbed TIAA-CREF for short, provides retirement benefits exclusively for employees of U.S. colleges, universities, independent schools, and other nonprofit educational and research organizations. Nearly 2 million current and retired employees at over 6,000 institutions nationwide are served by TIAA-CREF. Participating institutions contribute amounts on behalf of their employees where they are invested in self-directed, tax-exempt accounts. Upon retirement, the amounts accumulated

are used to purchase annuities to provide lifetime income. Like other pensions and annuities, distributions to retirees are taxed as ordinary income when received.

Now, I do not know how many of my colleagues are aware of this fact, but the House Republican tax bill would repeal, would repeal the tax-exempt status of TIAA-CREF's pension program. TIAA-CREF would then be treated for Federal tax purposes just like stock life insurance companies. While this change would raise about \$1.2 billion in revenue over 10 years, it would have a major impact on the operations of TIAA-CREF's pension program.

Revoking the tax exemption for the pension system of TIAA-CREF, granted by the IRS in 1920, would cause irreparable harm to higher education institutions, their employees, and the education and research community as a whole.

The Senate Finance Committee has recognized this fact and has not included this provision in their version of the tax bill.

This measure in the House Republican tax bill will impact virtually every public and independent college, university, and education research organization in the country, including 260 tax-exempt colleges and universities in New England, 16 of which are in my own Third Congressional District of Massachusetts. The next effect of revoking TIAA-CREF's tax exemption after 75 years would be to significantly reduce the earnings of current employees' retirement accumulation as well as the pension income of retired employees. In effect, this measure would increase taxes on the individuals served by TIAA-CREF by up to \$1.5 billion and would reduce pension benefits by 3 to 5 percent. This would cut pension income for retired educators by \$30 to \$50 each month. Over a typical 25-year payout period, a retiree would lose as much as \$15,000. In Massachusetts alone, 106,542 individuals would be affected by this provision.

Mr. Speaker, this assault on our Nation's academic community is a scandal. There is no rational justification for such an attack on the financial and retirement security of working families who make up our academic and research community. With neither hearings nor public comment, this provision was slipped into the House Republican tax bill, and it is an outrage.

Pension trusts for other American workers are entirely exempt from the kind of taxation embodied in the House Republican tax bill, and TIAA-CREF's not-for-profit pension operations are essentially equivalent to those of a multiemployer pension trust.

Unlike for-profit commercial insurance companies, TIAA-CREF's pension assets are exclusively used for the benefit of pension participants. Its pension reserves can be used for no other pur-

pose than to support participants' retirement benefits. In addition, since 1986, TIAA's nonpension insurance business is already subject to taxes.

TIAA-CREF has been widely lauded as a model of pension portability. Not only does it provide the advantages of a fully funded, fully portable retirement plan, TIAA-CREF provides benefits in the form of a lifetime annuity. Some would argue that public policy should encourage this type of pension model, not penalize it.

TIAA-CREF provides pensions to those who dedicate themselves to education, despite the relatively modest salaries available in the field. By imposing this unprecedented tax, the House Republican tax bill would not only undermine the recruitment and retention of men and women in teaching professions, but would significantly undercut efforts by the Congress and by the President to improve educational quality and opportunities for America's young people.

I have expressed my concern over this measure in the House tax bill to President Clinton and to the House and Senate conferees. If education is truly to be America's priority as we head into the 21st century, then we must support, not undermine, the economic security of our hard-working and modestly rewarded academic and research workers.

There are many other taxes affecting students, faculty, and academic staff in the House Republican tax bill that concern me very deeply, and I have also brought these to the attention of the President and the House and Senate conferees. I hope these education taxes can be remedied in the conference.

It is both cynical and dishonest for Congress to claim to be committed to tax relief while raising taxes on the hard-working members of our academic community.

I call upon my colleagues to support efforts to remove these ill-advised and ill-considered provisions from the tax bill in the conference. I want to commend and salute the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], who has circulated a letter to her House colleagues on TIAA-CREF and other education tax issues. I hope most of my colleagues will join in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an article from the July 8 edition of the Boston Globe.

[From the Boston Globe, July 8, 1997]

GOP UNLEASHES A SNEAK ATTACK ON
TEACHERS' PENSIONS
(By Robert Kuttner)

The Republicans want to cut taxes for nearly everyone. But they've finally identified a group whose taxes they don't mind raising—retired teachers.

The House tax bill would repeal the tax exemption of the nation's largest pension plan—TIAA-CREF. The \$195 billion nonprofit company manages pensions for most college teachers and retirees from other nonprofit organizations.

The surprise measure, unveiled at a June 9 press conference by Representative Bill Archer of Texas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and passed by the full House, was never the subject of hearings. It would levy \$1.2 to 1.5 billion in taxes on TIAA-CREF over 10 years, thereby reducing pension income for members by an estimated 3 to 5 percent.

Why TIAA-CREF? There are several theories. For one thing, college professors are a bunch of pointy-headed liberals. Their unions tend to support Democrats. The House bill targets two other tax benefits for educators. It would end the tax-free status of tuition scholarships for graduate students and for children of professors.

More concretely, key staffers to Archer don't like TIAA-CREF, which has been tax-exempt since 1918. In the 1986 tax reform bill, which required some nonprofits to pay some tax, Congress voted to tax profits on the life insurance that TIAA-CREF sells but to retain the tax-exemption on its core activity annuity plans for teachers.

However, Ken Kies, chief of staff to the congressional Joint Tax Committee and a key Archer adviser, has long believed that TIAA-CREF should be taxed like a commercial company.

Other likely culprits are TIAA-CREF's for-profit rivals. A Houston commercial insurance outfit based in Archer's home town, the Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., competes directly with TIAA-CREF. VALIC's chairman recently told a trade paper that ending TIAA-CREF's tax exemption was "long overdue."

VALIC's corporate parent, the American General Group, is an Archer campaign contributor and gave \$115,000 in soft money to the Republican National Committee. More broadly, the organized right has lately mounted an attack on large nonprofit institutions, painting them as unfair competitors to tax-paying entrepreneurs.

The irony is that TIAA-CREF efficiently serves a goal that has long eluded most working Americans and policy makers—fully portable pensions. Roughly half of US workers are in some pension plan (the fraction is dropping). But pension contributions are lost if a worker frequently changes jobs.

A 1974 reform, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act—ERISA—requires that workers' pension credits be vested (locked in) once they have five years of credit with an employer. But ERISA does not make pensions fully portable.

TIAA-CREF was created precisely to solve this problem for educators and researchers. Teachers often have itinerant careers. Thanks to TIAA-CREF, educational institutions pay into a common pool so that all pension credits count. TIAA-CREF has long been a model for legislators seeking universally portable pensions.

The only other Americans with truly portable pensions are workers, mostly in construction trades, who participate in common pension plans jointly controlled by companies and unions under the Taft-Hartley act; and most state and local employees, who are typically members of an umbrella pension system within the civil service. But Archer is not proposing to tax the pension plans of construction workers and public employees.

The Senate tax bill has no TIAA-CREF provision, and it remains to be seen which version will prevail. The Clinton administration has not made the issue a priority.

There is one other smelly aspect of this affair. For a decade or so, after the Watergate reforms, Congress conducted most business

in public. In the late 1970s, committee "mark up" sessions, where bills were drafted, were generally open.

Since the 1980s, a new custom has crept in. The committee chairman and senior staff simply write the bill in private. They unveil it all at once and count on party discipline to carry it through.

This secretly drafted bill is pretentiously called the "chairman's mark," a term redolent of bourbon, smoke-filled rooms, and raw power. The tax on TIAA-CREF materialized from nowhere in Archer's June 9 "chairman's mark."

It would be salutary not just to bury this sneak attack on teachers' pensions. Congress should write a rule that no measure can be approved by a committee for floor debate unless it was the subject of prior hearings. But don't hold your breath. Republicans are now the majority, and it's payback time.

THE PLIGHT OF DR. STANISLAW BURZYNSKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 of this year a Federal jury found Dr. Stanislaw Burzynski of Houston, TX, innocent of all charges stemming from an FDA inspired indictment and criminal investigation. We have heard of Dr. Burzynski in this Congress and also in the last Congress from his 400-plus cancer patients who brought their own plight as well as his plight to our attention.

The Government's conduct in this case was disturbing to me and to many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] and other Members have raised the issue of Dr. Burzynski's case in past hearings of the Committee on Commerce.

It would appear that the Government's handling of this case placed cancer patients at jeopardy at one point, and the treatment of Dr. Burzynski by the Government was, at times, reprehensible. Taxpayer money and resources were badly utilized on two Federal trials.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] and my other colleagues to get accountability from those involved in this situation. What happened, Mr. Speaker, to Dr. Burzynski and his patients should never be allowed to happen to any other doctor or any other patient. This is another reason why I support the Access to Medical Treatment Act, H.R. 746, which I have cosponsored with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DeFAZIO], so that Americans can have their legal right to pursue the medical treatment of their choice without fear that their Government will impede their access or, in certain cases, even jail their doctor.

I urge my colleagues to support this needed legislation. Perhaps with Dr. Burzynski's vindication, the FDA will

now focus all of its attention and resources to work with his cancer patients and his drug discovery. I hope that is the outcome of this ill-fated and these two ill-fated trials.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAWYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAXTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, on July 16.

Mr. HERGER, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAWYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PICKETT.
Mr. SANDLIN.
Mr. BLUMENAUER.
Mr. EVANS.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. OBERSTAR.
Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAXTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Ms. KELLY.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. CASTLE.
Mr. BASS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLUNT.
Mr. HEFLEY.
Mr. GINGRICH.

Ms. DELAURO.
Mr. MINGE.
Mr. BASS.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. BLUMENAUER.
Mr. FARR of California.
Mr. LEVIN.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. EVANS.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. CASTLE.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1901. An act to clarify that the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act apply to the members and personnel of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to design and construct a permanent addition to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial in Washington, D.C., and for other purposes.

□ 1515

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 14, 1997, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4177. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Maritime Security Program (Maritime Administration) [Docket No. R-163] (RIN: 2133-AB24) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4178. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commercial Driver's License Program and Controlled Substances and Alcohol Use and Testing; Conforming and Technical Amendments (Federal Highway Administration) (RIN: 2125-AE16) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4179. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Qualifications for Tankermen, and for Persons in Charge of

Transfers of Dangerous Liquids and Liquefied Gases (Coast Guard) [CGD 79-116] (RIN: 2115-AA03) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4180. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Charlestown Navy Yard Salute Gun Fire, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, Massachusetts (Coast Guard) [CGD01-97-033] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4181. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: New Haven Harborfest Fireworks Display, New Haven, CT (Coast Guard) [CGD01-97-047] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4182. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Yampol Family Fireworks Display, Cove Neck, NY (Coast Guard) [CGD01-97-048] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4183. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulations; Savannah, GA (Coast Guard) [COTP Savannah 97-004] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4184. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulation; SeaFair's Blue Angels Air Show, Lake Washington, Seattle, WA (Coast Guard) [CGD13-97-012] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received July 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2158. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X Committee on Rules discharged from further consideration. H.R. 856 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN:
H.R. 2151. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to correct the tariff treatment of costumes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2152. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for annual screening mammography for any class of covered individuals if the coverage or plans include coverage for diagnostic mammography for such class, and to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of annual screening mammography; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of the Medicare program of paramedic intercept services provided in support of public, volunteer, or nonprofit providers of ambulance services; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 2154. A bill to provide for food stamp eligibility for aliens who were receiving supplemental security income benefits on August 22, 1996, or aliens who are eligible for supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEUMANN:

H.R. 2155. A bill to authorize continuation of a nationwide permit for discharges of dredged or fill materials into headwaters and isolated waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 2156. A bill to provide financial assistance, directly and through States, to support jointly with government entities, educational institutions, businesses, and nonprofit public and private entities, opportunities for the people of the United States to participate in the arts and the humanities; and to increase understanding and appreciation of the cultural heritage of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of public transportation systems by allowing individuals a credit against income tax for expenses paid to commute to and from work using public transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 65: Mr. TALENT and Mr. SCHUMER.
H.R. 66: Mr. BONO and Mr. CONDIT.
H.R. 76: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 107: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 176: Mr. SAWYER.
H.R. 303: Mr. REYES and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 404: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 409: Mr. EVERETT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. UPTON, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BONO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mrs. NORTHRUP, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. NEUMANN.

H.R. 611: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 695: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 715: Mr. RIGGS.
H.R. 836: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 872: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROGAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 952: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 964: Mr. CONDIT.
H.R. 977: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 983: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 988: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 991: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1010: Mr. KLUG, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1060: Mr. BASS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1062: Mr. HERGER and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 1114: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CAPPS, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 1165: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1260: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1270: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 1353: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1373: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1398: Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1415: Mr. QUINN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1426: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1437: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1438: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1480: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1507: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1534: Mr. PAXON, Mr. BRADY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 1578: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1579: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1580: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1609: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 1614: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1619: Mr. CRAPO and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1679: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1715: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1716: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1763: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 1766: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. BOYD.
 H.R. 1773: Mr. HALL of Texas and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 1799: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 1864: Mr. LUTHER.
 H.R. 1909: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. RYUN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BRYANT.
 H.R. 1946: Mr. MASCARA.
 H.R. 1972: Ms. DUNN of Washington and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.
 H.R. 1984: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1993: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 2122: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2140: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.J. Res. 71: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. COLLINS.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. FLAKE.
 H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SABO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H. Res. 26: Mr. VENTO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H. Res. 37: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
 H. Res. 139: Mr. ROYCE.
 H. Res. 182: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HOLDEN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2158

OFFERED BY: MR. GREEN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Before the period at the end of the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES" insert the following:

Provided, That, using amounts made available under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall establish, within the field office of Department of Housing and Urban Development that is located in Houston, Texas, an Office of Community Planning and Development and an Office of the Inspector General and shall provide sufficient personnel for such offices