Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—114

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lofgren
Lowey
Manton
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mink
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rothman
Rush
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Snyder
Stark
Tanner
Tierney
Torres
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman
Baker
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Coble
Coburn
Danner
Dixon
Ehrlich
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Hefner
Hilliard
Jefferson
John
Kennelly
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Markey
Martinez
McDade
Millender-McDonald
Moakley
Norwood
Ortiz
Pelosi
Poshard
Riggs
Roybal-Allard
Stokes
Thompson
Towns
Traficant
Yates

□ 2120

Mr. BERRY and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 301, the Wicker amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of taking up a rule, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Chairman pro tempore 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. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–637) on the resolution (H. Res. 504) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res 301.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRETT Of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district earlier today, and I missed four votes. If I had been here, I would have voted the following: On rollcall No. 297, H.R. 3874, I would have voted "aye". On rollcall No. 298, H. Con. Res. 208, I would have voted "aye". On rollcall 299, H. Con. Res. 392, I would have voted "aye". On rollcall 300, H. Con. Res. 301, I would have voted "aye".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1998, on rollcall vote 274, I am recorded as not voting. I was hosting the Vice President in my district on that afternoon. This bill provides for restructuring the management of the Internal Revenue Service by establishing an oversight board to oversee the agency's operations. Along with expanding certain taxpayer rights, the conference report also reduces from 18 months to 12 months the time a taxpayer must hold an investment before being eligible for the 20 percent tax rate on capital gains.

Had I been recorded on that vote, I would have voted "aye".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for recorded votes earlier today. If I had been present for the following votes, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall 297, H.R. 3874, "aye"; rollcall 298, H. Con. Res. 208, "aye"; rollcall 299, H. Res. 392, "aye"; rollcall 300, H. Con. Res. 301, "aye".

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 442 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. 2183.

□ 2125

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. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARR of Georgia (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kentucky, Mrs. Northup, has been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLATTE to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE ___—VOTER REGISTRATION REFORM

SEC. ___01. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR STATES TO PROVIDE FOR VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding "and" at the end;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO UNIFORM MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—(1) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is amended by striking section 9.

(2) Section 7(a)(6)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–5(a)(6)(A)) is amended by striking "assistance—" and all that follows and inserting the following: "assistance a voter registration application form which meets the requirements described in section 5(c)(2) (other than subparagraph (A)), unless the applicant, in writing, declines to register to vote;".

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is amended by striking section 6.

(2) Section 8(a)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(a)(5)) is amended by striking "5, 6, and 7" and inserting "5 and 7".

SEC. ___02. REQUIRING APPLICANTS REGISTERING TO VOTE TO PROVIDE CERTAIN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(c)(2) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–3(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(F) shall require the applicant to provide the applicant's Social Security number.".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5(c)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–3(c)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting after "subparagraph (C)" the following: ", or the information described in subparagraph (F)".

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect January 1, 1999, and shall apply with respect to applicants registering to vote in elections for Federal office on or after such date.

(b) ACTUAL PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP.—

(1) REGISTRATION WITH APPLICATION FOR DRIVER'S LICENSE.—Section 5(c) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–3(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) The voter registration portion of an application for a State motor vehicle driver's license shall not be considered to be completed unless the applicant provides to the appropriate State motor vehicle authority proof that the applicant is a citizen of the United States.".

(2) REGISTRATION WITH VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES.—Section 7(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–5(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) A voter registration application received by a voter registration agency shall not be considered to be completed unless the applicant provides to the agency proof that the applicant is a citizen of the United States.".

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(a)(5)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(a)(5)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: ", including the requirement that the applicant provide proof of citizenship;".

(4) NO EFFECT ON ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Nothing in the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as amended by this subsection) may be construed to require any absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to provide any evidence of citizenship in order to register to vote (other than any evidence which may otherwise be required under such Act).

SEC. ___03. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN REGISTRANTS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(d) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3)(A) At the option of the State, a State may remove the name of a registrant from the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office on the ground that the registrant has changed residence if—

"(i) the registrant has not voted or appeared to vote (and, if necessary, correct the registrar's record of the registrant's address) in an election during the period beginning on the day after the date of the second previous general election for Federal office held prior to the date the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent and ending on the date of such notice;

"(ii) the registrant has not voted or appeared to vote (and, if necessary, correct the registrar's record of the registrant's address) in any of the first two general elections for Federal office held after the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent; and

"(iii) during the period beginning on the date the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent and ending on the date of the second general election for Federal office held after the date such notice is sent, the registrant has failed to notify the State in response to the notice that the registrant did not change his or her residence, or changed residence but remained in the registrar's jurisdiction.

"(B) A confirmation notice described in this subparagraph is a postage prepaid and pre-addressed return card, sent by forwardable mail, on which a registrant may state his or her current address, together with information concerning how the registrant can continue to be eligible to vote if the registrant has changed residence to a place outside the registrar's jurisdiction and a statement that the registrant may be removed from the official list of eligible voters if the registrant does not respond to the notice (during the period described in subparagraph (A)(iii)) by stating that the registrant did not change his or her residence, or changed residence but remained in the registrar's jurisdiction.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(i)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(d)) is amended by inserting "or subsection (d)(3)" after "subsection (d)(2)".

SEC. ___04. PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PRIOR TO VOTING.

(a) PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.—Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.—A State may require an individual to produce a valid photographic identification before receiving a ballot (other than an absentee ballot) for voting in an election for Federal office.".

(b) SIGNATURE.—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

"(k) PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PROVIDE SIGNATURE.—A State may require an individual to provide the individual's signature (in the presence of an election official at the polling place) before receiving a ballot for voting in an election for Federal office, other than an individual who is unable to provide a signature because of illiteracy or disability.".

SEC. ___05. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT STATES PERMIT REGISTRANTS CHANGING RESIDENCE TO VOTE AT POLLING PLACE FOR FORMER ADDRESS.

Section 8(e)(2) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(2)(A)" and inserting "(2)"; and

(2) by striking "election, at the option of the registrant—" and all that follows and inserting the following: "election shall be permitted to correct the voting records for purposes of voting in future elections at the appropriate polling place for the current address and, if permitted by State law, shall be permitted to vote in the present election, upon confirmation by the registrant of the new address by such means as are required by law.".

SEC. ___06. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office occurring after December 1999.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Shays-Meehan substitute. This amendment contains common sense reforms that will restore integrity to our elections.

Mr. Chairman, voting is the most important responsibility of any citizen in a democracy. Many brave men and women have given their lives to protect our right to vote, to determine for ourselves the shape and direction of our government.

When individuals are allowed to abuse our electoral process, it destroys the integrity of our democracy. It erodes public confidence in the system and sends a signal to the American people that their vote does not count. It suggests that government is not really the people's but rather a tool of those who would corrupt it for their own personal gain. This breeds cynicism and destroys the motivation of our citizens to participate.

This amendment addresses the real problems of voter fraud that demean our democracy. In the past several years, Congress has tried to make it easier for American citizens to participate in the democratic process by enacting legislation which relaxes regulation and voting requirements.

We can all agree that this is a noble and responsible goal. In this effort, however, Congress has denied the States the ability to maintain reasonable requirements that protect the security and integrity of our elections. Therefore, we must act now to restore vital protections that ensure our elections will truly represent the will of the people.

This amendment restores integrity in our electoral system by targeting three major areas, the voter registration application process, the maintenance of voter rolls, and voting on election day. It is modeled after legislation I introduced last year and is also similar to legislation considered by the House earlier this year.

To address shortcomings in the voter registration system, the amendment requires anyone registering to vote to show proof of their citizenship. To make this provision feasible and to further improve the registration process, it repeals the Federal requirement that States must permit individuals to register by mail.

Let me be clear on this point. This amendment does not prevent States from allowing voter registration by mail. It simply gives States a choice by removing the current Federal mandate of mail in registration.

□ 2130

Currently there is no way to ensure that individuals registering by mail are actually United States citizens or if they are even who they say they are. The American people may be shocked to know there is essentially nothing to prevent an individual from mailing in a registration card with phony information and being allowed to vote.

Second, the amendment includes provisions to improve the ability of State election officials to maintain accurate voter rolls. It allows, not requires, but allows a State to purge the rolls or remove the names of voters from the Federal election rolls if they have not voted in two consecutive Federal elections and do not respond to a confirmation notice.

In addition, my amendment addresses the problem of double voting by repealing the provisions of current law that allow individuals who have recently moved within a county or district to vote at the voting location of either their old or their new address.

To combat voter fraud on election day, my amendment implements two important provisions. First, it permits, but does not mandate, that States require voters to sign their name before entering the voting booth. Then, if it becomes necessary to investigate an election, States will be able to compare the signatures on the voting lists with the signatures on the voter registration forms to verify identity.

Second, my amendment permits, but does not mandate, that States require individuals to produce photo ID's in order to vote in a Federal election. The amendment also includes a provision clarifying that none of these provisions interfere with the law governing overseas and military voting.

Mr. Chairman, the American people expect their elections to be clean, fair, and honest. This amendment restores the prestige that has long been an integral part of our Nation's electoral process.

I urge my colleagues to support this common sense amendment protecting our elections from fraud and abuse.

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

Mr. Chairman, this proposal has nothing to do with campaign reform. What it would do would be to turn back a law that we passed a few years ago.

Why is it being done? It was said in a different time that money is the mother's milk of politics, but, unfortunately, increasingly there has been a poisoning of politics by money. Now, in order to thwart the effort to take the endless flow of money out of politics, to have responsibility and accountability, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is essentially presenting a poison pill, a poison pill to bring down Shays-Meehan. He knows very well, as should anybody who votes for it, that Shays-Meehan cannot become law with this provision in it.

The President has made clear his position about the motor-voter bill. It is very clear on this side of the aisle where we stand, and I am hopeful that those on the majority side who really want Shays-Meehan will say this: Look, we will argue motor-voter, but some other day.

The bill before us relates to the flow of money into politics. There are endless electoral provisions, endless, that could be brought up at this point that are not essentially related to money.

So what does this bill do? It essentially requires Social Security numbers on voter registration applications. Though there is question whether that is even constitutional, I think it is bad policy. You talk about intrusion by the Federal Government, and you want that requirement? You do not want to leave it to the States?

Also, there is a requirement regarding photo identification. Now, look, under present law, States can provide or require that kind of identification, as long as it is done in a uniform, nondiscriminatory way and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act. Essentially, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) wants to repeal this part of the Voting Rights Act.

Also the provisions regarding mail-in requirements, now, I understand why some people do not like this. There are some who have made a calculus that the more who vote, the worse it is for them.

But that is violative of the democratic process, in my judgment. We should all be for encouraging more voters, not less. There are also provisions here about dropping people from the rolls for not voting, and I understand there is some controversy about this, about the law that we passed several years ago. But let us take it up in a forum, in a format, that does not threaten this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would just close with this: We have an opportunity to act. Everybody sitting in this body knows better than anybody else the contamination caused by the endless anonymous flow of money. Everybody, worthy people who know more than virtually anybody else about this. And we should be the ones leading reform, not the ones waiting for an uprising.

This amendment, if adopted, would kill Shays-Meehan. If attached to the freshmen bill, if that were to come up, it would kill it. I think that is perhaps why it is being introduced here.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its defeat. Let us take up campaign finance reform as promised, and we will take up these other issues some other day.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, our act only amends the so-called Motor-Voter Act, which is superseded by the Voting Rights Act, which is not affected by this legislation in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support this amendment by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman and I have worked for a long time about trying to take fraud out of the motor-voter laws and out of the laws that exist today, the potential for fraud, throughout this Nation. I know the gentleman has no intention to offer this for any other purpose than to advance that cause.

There are two provisions within the gentleman's amendment identical to those which I put in in a separate bill for a separate session of Congress, two provisions that are supported by all 67 supervisors of elections in the State of Florida, both Democrat and Republican.

One of those that they all find critical to being able to fight voter fraud is to be able to purge the rolls every couple of years. They are not now permitted to do it. The cost that they have, they are enormous in carrying these rolls. There are many duplications on those rolls.

It is ridiculous to require that you cannot purge, and that is what the law today says, you cannot remove names. If proper notice is given, like the Goodlatte amendment requires, and confirmation notice follows it up, everybody is given an opportunity, if you have not voted in two consecutive Federal elections, the supervisor's office should certainly be allowed to purge the role and eliminate the name.

The other is the Social Security card question. Right now most supervisors do not feel that they have the authority to require the production of a Social Security number when somebody registers to vote. Having that number on record is very essential to avoid the duplication that occurs. Potentially when people have the same names, it is very, very bad. Twenty-one Jane Smiths do exist out there. What about people in other counties?

It is very important to have that provision in the law, and I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment for both of those reasons, but I fully support the entire provisions that are in this amendment, and urge a yes vote on the Goodlatte amendment.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform bill. Since my first day in office, I have been working hard with these two colleagues and many others to deliver meaningful, sensible reform of our beleaguered campaign finance system for the American people.

I am dismayed that some Members of this House have played partisan politics with common sense legislation. The amendment currently under debate is another attempt to derail Shays-Meehan and kill finance reform. The Goodlatte amendment would effectively repeal the mail-in registration provision of the motor-voter law.

During my recent special election, a massive vote-by-mail drive conducted both by my campaign and my opponent's campaign led to overwhelming voter participation. In fact, our special election witnessed the highest voter turnout in a special election in the history of elections in California. Without mail-in registration, many hard working men and women would not have been able to vote.

Registering to vote and getting to the polls is often difficult for people who struggle to balance their jobs with the need to drive their kids to and from school and other activities. Terminating mail-in registration would also, for obvious reasons, disenfranchise elderly and disabled voters. The current motor-voter law has been tremendously successful. Currently we have the highest percentage of voter registration, 73 percent, since reliable voting records were first made available in 1960.

Mr. Chairman, do we only want people to register to vote who are young, able-bodied and have flexible schedules? Clearly the answer is no.

I am also very concerned with the provision in this amendment which would allow States to require a photo ID in order to vote. A variant of this idea was implemented during my special election in March, and it had disastrous results.

The Secretary of State of California asked poll workers to request that voters voluntarily submit their driver's licenses to clean up the voter data base. This seemingly innocent request led to many troubling incidents. One elderly Santa Barbara woman went to her polling location only to be told she could not vote because she failed to produce a driver's license.

This woman, who no longer drove a car, had voted in every election as long as she could remember. She no longer had any need for a photo ID and was distraught when told she could not vote. Finally a poll worker allowed the woman's husband to vouch for her identity.

In addition, poll workers did not consistently enforce the Secretary of State's request. Voters in areas that have larger Hispanic populations were required to show driver's licenses more often than voters in more affluent, predominantly white neighborhoods.

This program, which was scheduled to be implemented throughout the State, has since been cancelled. Actually voter registration, when effectively implemented, provides the voter with all the ID necessary. If you are adequately registered, you have the right to vote.

Requiring voters to show a photo ID is intimidating to new voters who are still unsure of the process. This action inadvertently leads to discrimination against voters of different races and nationalities. In all likelihood, someone who looks like me would not be asked to produce a photo ID at my polling location, but a Latino American or Asian American would be.

We need to be implementing laws that encourage voter participation, rather than chasing away eligible voters already engaged in the process. I urge a no vote to this amendment, and I hope we will pass the Shays-Meehan bill very soon.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Goodlatte amendment to restore integrity to elections. There is no more revered right of citizenship than the right to vote. The 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act made it both a Federal crime and a deportable offense when noncitizens vote.

Allowing noncitizens to vote cheapens the right for the rest of us. There is currently no satisfactory way for local registrars to ensure that there are no noncitizens on their voting rolls or for the Justice Department to enforce the penalties. Attempts have been made to check voting rolls against Immigration and Naturalization Service records in order to identify noncitizens. However, INS data, at best, can only tell us that a voter is a legal immigrant or a citizen. INS data cannot tell us whether a voter is in fact an illegal alien.

I want to thank my friend from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for offering this amendment. The enactment of the motor-voter law and the loosening of voter registration requirements have released a flood of voter irregularities and illegalities across the country. Not only has motor-voter failed to increase voter turnout, it in fact has encouraged voter fraud.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and let the American people know that we will protect and honor their right to vote, and restore integrity to the election process.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, it is ironic in a bill designed to encourage the faith of the American people in the political process we would see an amendment like this that is a veritable wish-list of provisions to discourage voter participation. Our rate of voter participation is low enough as it is. We should be encouraging people to get involved, not throwing up roadblocks.

□ 2145

This amendment actually allows the State to remove one from the voter rolls if one fails to vote in two consecutive elections. Now, I wish everyone would vote in every election, but since when does one have to vote in every election to maintain one's right to vote, or in every two elections? I think most Americans would find that outrageous. This is a constitutional right we are talking about taking away, and why? Because the person missed an election? Voter registration by mail is an important option for people who are homebound or who have limited access to transportation. Why would we take away that option? What evidence is there that this is encouraging voter fraud?

Perhaps worst of all, this amendment gives the States free rein to require additional information to vote, including a photo I.D. and so-called proof of citizenship, yet we already know from the now totally discredited Dornan investigation that our, meaning the Federal Government's current records, produced all sorts of mistakes. Nuns and our own military men and women were falsely accused of illegal voting. We know that selective enforcement of such I.D. will be applied to those who may not have blond hair or blue eyes or otherwise be considered typically American. Is that the type of system we want to make nationwide? I hope not.

The question is, are we going to encourage voter participation and make it convenient for our citizens to vote, or are we going to turn the voting process into a system of government background checks, interrogations and false accusations?

The ballot box should be a place of sanctity and freedom, not of distrust and suspicion.

This amendment should be defeated. It is anti-voter, it is anti-participation, and it is anti-democratic.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in strong support of this amendment, because far from being a poison pill, it carries to the logical conclusion what we should all be about in this Chamber, and that is the elimination of corruption in the campaign and election process. The election is the logical culmination of the campaign. Mr. Chairman, we should stand foursquare for the legitimate rights of United States citizens to vote in open and honest elections. The Goodlatte amendment helps ensure this.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent part of this weekend in the Pleasant Valley of Arizona in the tiny hamlet of Young, and people there came and asked me, they said, "When we go to the city and go to buy something at a grocery store with a check, we have to show two forms of identification. But under current United States law, we require no identification to claim citizenship to vote."

Mr. Chairman, reasonable people would call for this rational reform for open, fair and free elections.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a leader in this entire effort.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am sitting here tonight wondering what is happening to us. Have we become so suspicious of our own country that we do not believe in democracy anymore? This debate is supposed to be about campaign finance reform, and now we are debating an amendment that says we do not trust the people who are asking to participate in our democracy.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I were both in the Peace Corps. We were so proud of talking about what is the governance structure of this country. I have to tell my colleagues that this amendment tonight is going too far. This says we do not trust the people out there; we do not want to be a government by the people.

We are sitting here in this room with all of these law-givers around us, and I realize that not one of them, except for Thomas Jefferson, was a citizen. But how could we prove he was a citizen, because when he was born, there was no country. So the people we respect we now deny with these kinds of amendments in saying that if one is an American, one has to prove it.

Which one of us walks around with any kind of proof that shows that you are an American citizen? Show me. There is not one thing on your body that has it. Not a driver's license, not a credit card. It does not say you are a citizen of America, but this amendment is going to require it, an I.D. with a photo. One has to have a Social Security card and put down Social Security numbers, driver's license numbers?

The American public is going to say, what are you doing to us? Is this what you require of us to participate in a democracy that is of the people, by the people and for the people? My God, this is the country that did away with literacy tests to allow people to vote, and poll taxes, and now we are putting it back on in indirect ways.

We should look before we leap with these kinds of amendments. This is a bill about congressional campaign reform, about finance reform, about how we pay for elections; not how we distrust the voters of America. I think we are doing a pretty good job and I think our forefathers would be ashamed of us in thinking of this kind of an amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we recently had an election in Louisiana under the "motor voter" law. That election left us with a huge and extended voter inquiry by the Senate committee questioning the outcome of that Senate race. The reason that happened in our State was, the allegations of people registering improperly and then voting multiple times by simply changing outer garments and coats and walking back in the polls and voting again, the reason all of that happened was because the election safeguards in our State completely broke down. The Senate committee that investigated that election ended up saying, "We cannot tell you whether or not voter fraud occurred in Louisiana, because all of the systems by which we ought to be able to tell whether it occurred broke down."

A newspaper in Lake Charles using the motor voter law attempted to register 21 fictitious individuals and ended up registering 19 successfully. One of them was a dog, and anyone representing themselves to be that person that was a dog could have shown up on Election Day in Louisiana and voted because this was no requirement in the law then to produce any photo I.D. Since that time, the Federal Government has finally allowed Louisiana to require a photo I.D. It is now the law of Louisiana, now approved by the Justice Department in our State following that terrible, indeed questionable election in Louisiana.

What this amendment does is to do two things that I think are vitally important to improve the motor voter law in our country. It says that the States can indeed provide mail balloting if they want to, mail registration, but that if they do, proof of citizenship should be required.

We ought to know who is registering. We should be able to prove who we are; and then, secondly, when one shows up to vote, there ought to be some identifiable photo, just as one would present a photo when one checks one's luggage at an airport or try to buy tobacco in a grocery store, some identifiable indication of who you are, that you are the person who is registering. Those two changes are critical for valid elections in America.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), surely a leader in the campaign reform effort.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my generous friend for his kind comments.

If I might engage the author for just a second of clarification, I would be so

grateful, if he would care to respond. I would inquire of the gentleman, does the gentleman's amendment require the use of the Social Security number in order to vote?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the amendment does call for a Social Security number and proof of citizenship to register to vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman answering me. The gentleman from Virginia has been honest and fair in his representation of his amendment; nevertheless, it greatly troubles me, and I am sorry that the gentleman added that to his bill. We should not require the use of the Social Security number in that way.

I will tell my colleagues why. First of all, it gets pretty close to the national I.D. and I have always tried to prevent that from happening. Secondly, the Social Security number is a matter of privacy to a whole lot of us, and if we require it, we are going to have that on the voter registration rolls and people are going to find out what one's Social Security number is, and from that a lot of things can be done to identify somebody that they may not otherwise have.

It probably is not the gentleman's intention, but he moves us one step along the way that motor voter moved us, and I voted "no" on motor voter because I thought it was too much Federal intrusion into States' rights in establishing what are the qualifications for voting.

The Constitution says that it is the States that are responsible for determining the qualifications for electors. The Constitution says it is the same qualifications as electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. So we in California, we get to decide that. You in Virginia and in your legislature would get to decide that. But motor voter said no, we are going to have Federal rolls.

Well now, again, no doubt with the best intentions, I think the gentleman from Virginia is moving us farther along that way by saying the Federal Government mandates that this shall also be a qualification for election, namely the use of a Social Security number, even though the Constitution says for Federal elections, for Federal elections, it is the business of the States. I regret I must oppose this amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to quickly say that this in no way establishes a national I.D. card. This is simply for the purpose of the security of the ballots.

I agree with gentleman's concern about the motor voter laws that mandated so many requirements on the States, and this repeals a great many of those mandates upon the States, and it does not use that number for any purpose, nor does it permit it for any additional purpose other than an establishment of the individual's citizenship in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. What we are talking about is the elimination of what we Californians who are aware of what is going on call the illegal alien voter registration act, which was called by this body the motor voter act.

This amendment makes real the alleged purpose of the bill that we are talking about. We are talking about reforming the political process to ensure that election results will reflect the will of the American people. Well, there is nothing better that we can do to accomplish this end than to protect the rights of our own people by making sure that the election process and the sanctity of the ballot is protected, to ensure that American votes are not made meaningless by the votes of millions of noncitizens, many of whom have come here illegally.

Back in 1993 when the Democratic Party controlled both Houses of Congress, they established rules that went far too far to open up the system, and thus they left the system opened up to incredible abuse. We are trying to bring balance back to that, ensure the sanctity of the ballot for the will of the American people. Support this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Could I ask the Chairman once again to give us the time remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Virginia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

I wonder what President Johnson would have thought as he signed the Voter Rights Act of 1965, where so many people had been left out of the circle of empowerment, were denied the right to vote, but on the sweat and tears and the advocacy of those who watched and walked, those of us who looked like me were able to vote.

This legislation is the killer weed legislation. It is to destroy campaign finance reforms. It stings and it hurts. It denies truck drivers and welfare mothers and laborers and domestics who have inflexible time the ability to go and vote. It purges people from the right to vote, from the voter polls, and it is unconstitutional.

A 4th Circuit case in 1993 said that if you require someone to use their Social Security number in order to vote, you deny them the right of the 1st and 14th Amendments. It is unconstitutional. We know what you are saying here. People with different names, people that come from different walks of life, whose skin color is different, this is to get these kinds of folk off of the polls.

What are we talking about here in America? The right to vote. My view is that all Americans want everyone to have the right to vote, yes, and to vote legally.

□ 2200

The States can determine whether one is legally able to vote. They can require ID when voters go to the polls. Mr. Chairman, this is not campaign finance reform. It is killer bee legislation. It is destructive legislation. It destroys the right to vote. It infringes on privacy.

It says to those who could be intimidated, "We will intimidate you," and it says to those who died for those to vote that their life was in vain.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote against this bill that destroys democracy in America.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him on his proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up in California where we had honest elections. We did not at the turn of the century, but a great progressive Republican governor, Hiram Johnson, turned that State around.

We no longer have honest elections in parts of California. The fact is in my own district, a section of San Pedro, the person who was the assassin of the Mexican presidential nominee happened to live in my district. He registered twice. He was not an American citizen.

I think anyone who says, hey, that it does not matter whether a voter is a citizen, I cannot believe it. People come here to become citizens. My father was an immigrant and his proudest day was when he became a citizen and could vote.

There is no reason we should not require proof. Photo ID? We do not get on an airplane flight in this country without showing a photo ID. Do my colleagues who oppose this amendment mean to say that an airplane flight has greater weight than proof of citizenship in an election at the polls? Of course the proof of citizenship should be there.

The fact is we just voted for a proposal to stop the walking around money. Now we know in Texas and other areas there is great use of some of the walking around money. People coming across the border. The Duke of Duval County decided Texas elections

by hundreds and thousands of votes that he illegally put on the rolls.

On the purging of the rolls, I recall our friends on the other side of the aisle who in 1993 dominated that Congress. When it was put to them: Should we not purge the rolls at least in 5 years or 10 years? "No, you cannot do it," they said. How about 25 years? "No, you cannot do it." How about 50 years? Can we not say that those people who have never voted for 50 years and are still on the rolls must not still be around? "No," we were told by the then majority "sorry, cannot do it." And then we got to a hundred years in an amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] who knows where fraud is.

Mr. Chairman, I would say let us back citizenship when it comes to American elections. Let us have honest elections.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a poison pill proposal designed to kill campaign finance reform. Pure and simple. But what is amazing about what the Republicans are doing here tonight is that it is anti-American, that it disregards States rights, that it is an intrusion into the privacy of American citizens.

Just a little while ago we voted with the Republicans to deny the right to spend one dollar to help a senior citizen to the polling place on Election Day. Now we have a proposal that would say voters have to present a Social Security number and card and proof of citizenship. Well, all of this is undermining the voting rights of all of our citizens and, of course, the Voting Rights Act that so many fought and even died for.

What are my colleagues on the other side doing? Are they taking us back to the time that many of us know too much about? Literacy tests? Poll tax?

Well, some of us and our forefathers have been in this struggle. They have been in this fight to get rid of that kind of discrimination and marginalization and denial. Some of us even joined to help our friends in South Africa against national ID, known as pass laws. We are not going back there.

Mr. Chairman, if this is some attempt to kill the bill, let me just tell my colleagues this. It does not matter whether or not they are able to convince people on this floor to vote for this kind of anti-American proposal. We will beat them in the courts on this, because this is unconstitutional.

So I would hope that my colleagues would live up to who they are supposed to be. I cannot imagine what the American people will think about the kinds of things that they are doing that are so anti-American. This is unconstitutional, and I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, a very fundamental question in the American democracy is how do we ensure that voters are legal voters? What is the purpose of voter registration? It is, pure and simple, to prevent fraud.

We have to recognize that the laws of this land are written to control the bad folks, not the good folks. And I do not think it is an insult to Americans to have voter registration. But if we have registration, there has to be some requirement that the people have met the requirements of the registration laws. How do we do this? By checking identification when someone registers to vote.

If we prohibit that, if we have simple mail-in voting registration for anyone that wishes, then why have registration at all? Why not just simply use the poll directory or the telephone directory and check people off on that as they vote?

If we are going to have a voter registration and the purpose of it is to prevent fraud, we have to ensure that fraudulent behavior does not take place and this bill will do that.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), coauthor of this legislation in the battle for reform.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the motor voter bill and I did so as a Member who represents Stanford, Norwalk, and Bridgeport. I represent the problems that we have in urban areas and the need to encourage people to register and vote.

I am troubled that this amendment requires a Social Security number to register to vote. I am troubled that the State would put more requirements on voter ID. States are allowed now to have voter IDs, but there are certain requirements that they be done uniformly.

I believe if citizens have not voted they should not be dropped from the rolls. I just happen to believe that. And this would allow States to drop voters who happen not to vote.

It would repeal the Maryland registration, which has done a wonderful job of registering not just Democrats, as everyone feared, but Republicans and Independents. In fact, more Independents have registered than Democrats or Republicans. I think this has increased involvement in the process, and I regret sincerely that in a vote on campaign finance reform we have this issue which is dealing with something very, very different.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to any measure that seeks so-called citizenship verification. At a time when voter turnout is lower than low, we must encourage rather than discourage citizens of this great Nation from voting.

Clearly, the history of discrimination against voters in this country should admonish this Congress that State and local governments may interpret Federal laws differently. Yet this amendment would allow States the privilege of requiring voters to provide proof of citizenship and a Social Security number when registering to vote.

I ask is this flawed process of verifying citizenship just another version of modern day Jim Crow? How many of our citizens are supposed to provide proof citizenship when neither the INS nor the Social Security agency kept naturalization records until 1978?

So I ask this Congress since when has a citizen's honor not been enough? When a person swears that they are indeed a citizen of the United States of America, they do so with the understanding that if they are incorrect they are perjuring themselves.

I say let us go forward, Mr. Chairman, and not backwards. Let us vote down this amendment and move America into the 21st century with democracy, equality and justice for all.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of closing the debate, it is my pleasure to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the gentleman from Virginia bringing this because it is amazing to me only the supporters of Shays-Meehan can define what reform is. Anybody else that brings anything to this bill are not supporters of reform. Well, I say that we just think reform is maybe a little bit different than the supporters of Shays-Meehan, and this is a perfect campaign reform bill.

Let us just get rid of all the red herrings that have been put out in this debate. This is not national ID cards. This is not using Social Security numbers to vote. This is not even a poison pill. What this is talking about is that just like if you were getting a driver's license, you have to prove that you are a certain age. You have to bring a birth certificate. You have to prove that you know how to drive to get your driver's license.

For the most important act that Americans can do, the right to vote, you would think that it would be an honor to bring proof of citizenship to the table when you are registering to vote; not every time you vote. When you do go vote you pull out your driver's license or whatever to show that you are indeed the person that you say

you are standing in front of the voting election judge and proving that you are that person.

What is wrong with that? It is very simple. Since enactment of the motor voter law, we have seen an increase in voting fraud across this country, and much of the increase is due to the provisions of the bill that prohibits States from removing registrants who fail to vote or who are unresponsive to voter registration correspondence.

Because of the lack of fraud provisions in the motor voter law, we have the modern world's sloppiest electoral system, according to political scientist Walter Dean Burnham. The year-long investigation of the Dornan-Sanchez House race established 624 documented cases of noncitizens voting, noncitizens voting, in American elections; another 124 voters cast improper absentee ballots; an additional 196 votes may well have been legal but only circumstantial evidence existed.

As of 1994, in Houston County, Alabama, a man who has been dead for 7 years has been recorded as voting regularly by absentee ballot. In Washington, D.C., an astonishing 1 of every 6 registered voters cannot be reached at their address of record. The city has lost 100,000 people since 1980, but registration has shot up to 86 percent of eligible voters from only 58 percent.

Felons, dead people, nonresidents and fictitious registrations clog the rolls in Washington, D.C., where anyone can walk up and vote without even showing an ID. The Miami Herald has found that 105 ballots in last year's undisputed mayoral election was cast by felons. Last month, a local grand jury concluded that absentee ballot fraud clearly played an important part in the recent City of Miami elections. This called into question the legitimacy of the results.

Nine dead San Franciscans in 1997 were recorded as casting votes from beyond the grave in the June 49ers Stadium election, according to an analysis of city voter files and death records.

Everyone supports the right to vote, but an equally important right is the guarantee of elections that are fair and free of fraud. Without the Goodlatte amendment, a growing number of States cannot guarantee the integrity of their results and that inevitably will lead to an increasing cynicism and disenchantment with the process. Let us help end voter fraud in America and adopt the Goodlatte amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend from Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE. This amendment includes several anti-fraud provisions targeting both illegal registration and illegal voting.

Since enactment of the Motor Voter law, we have seen an increase in vote fraud across the country. Much of the increase is due to the provisions of the bill that prohibits States from removing registrants who fail to vote or who are unresponsive to voter registration correspondence.

Because of the lack of fraud provisions in the Motor Voter law, "We have the modern world's sloppiest electoral systems," according to political scientist Walter Dean Burnham.

The yearlong investigation of the Dornan-Sanchez House race established 624 "documented" cases of non-citizens voting. Another 124 voters cast improper absentee ballots. An additional 196 votes may well have been illegal, but only circumstantial evidence existed.

As of 1994, in Houston County, Alabama, a man who has been dead for seven years has been recorded as voting regularly by absentee ballot.

In Washington, D.C., an astonishing one of every six registered voters can't be reached at their address of record. The city has lost 100,000 people since 1980, but registration has shot up to 86% of eligible voters from only 58%. Felons, dead people, non-residents and fictitious registrations clog the rolls in Washington, where anyone can walk up and vote without showing I.D.

The Miami Herald has found that 105 ballots in last year's disputed mayoral election were cast by felons. Last month a local grand jury concluded: "absentee ballot fraud clearly played an important part in the recent City of Miami elections." This "called into question the legitimacy of the results."

Nine dead San Franciscans in 1997 were recorded as casting votes from beyond the grave in the June 49ers stadium election, according to an analysis of city voter files and death records.

Everyone supports the right to vote, but an equally important right is the guarantee of elections that are fair and free of fraud. Without the Goodlatte amendment, a growing number of states can't guarantee the integrity of their results, and that inevitably will lead to an increasing cynicism and disenchantment with the democratic process.

The Goodlatte amendment will help end voter fraud in America. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

□ 2215

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WICKER TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKER to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE _____—PHOTO IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VOTERS

SEC. _____01. PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.

Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subjection (k); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with the other side, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes per side.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opponents of this amendment agreeing to a further limitation on time to speed the debate along. We have already debated, actually, a good bit of this amendment in the previous amendment.

What this amendment amounts to is simply a portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). It is that portion permitting States to require voter I.D. This amendment does not deal with citizenship requirements, it does not deal at all with registration, it simply says that States have a right to determine when someone comes to vote that they are who they say they are and that they may do so by the means of photo I.D.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a mandate on States, which some of my colleagues are very fearful of, but simply permission. It is the essence of Federalism. One of my colleagues from the minority side of the aisle mentioned the issue of States rights. I was delighted to hear her say that just a few moments ago. This is Federalism. This permits States, if they choose to, to require photo I.D.

We have heard a lot of talk during the course of this debate over time about corruption of our political process. I am one, Mr. Chairman, who feels that there is corruption in our political process, but it is not caused by too many commercials being run on TV, it is not caused by too much money being available to buy too many advertisements. The corruption is in voter fraud.

In far too many States and districts there are ineligible people voting. There are people going to the polls saying they are someone and, indeed, it turns out that they are not eligible to vote. Now, none other than the distinguished Professor Larry Sabato, from the University of Virginia, concurs in this feeling. Professor Sabato believes that the enactment of the Federal Motor Voter Law of 1993 will cause an increase in voter fraud. This amendment amends only a small portion of the Motor Voter Law. And, as I said, it takes that portion of the Goodlatte amendment and allows States the right.

We have heard the information provided by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) tonight about the Louisiana election, and the Louisiana legislature in response to the allegations there. They may have thought, we do not know exactly what the facts are, we do not know who was right and who was wrong, but we do want to prevent this in the future. And what was the solution of the Louisiana legislature? It was to permit voter photo I.D. In Florida, the State legislature was so horrified at the 1997 mayoral election that the legislature there enacted photo I.D. The State of Hawaii already has such a requirement on the books.

We are simply saying that other States should feel clear and unrestricted in also pursuing that course and should not feel that the 1993 Motor Voter Law prevents them from doing so. In the United States of America we require a photo I.D. for millions of people to do any number of acts: To cash a check, to board an airplane, or to buy a beer. Why can States not require a photo identification for participating in Federal elections, one of the most solemn acts of citizenship?

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

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

This amendment, like the previous amendment, has nothing to do with campaign finance reform. States already are able to require identification at the polls. They simply cannot discriminate in the way that they apply the information that is required. Under Federal law presently States can require identification at the polls, but with a very important caveat: So long as such a requirement is applied in a way that is uniform and does not discriminate in compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

I would remind the gentleman from Mississippi that this country has a history and a record of discriminating against the rights of people to vote. That is why the Voting Rights Act was adopted in this country. This amendment would overturn and eliminate the protections that are in the Voting Rights Act against discrimination. It has nothing to do with campaign finance reform and would overturn very important protections against discrimination in this country. That is why this amendment is unnecessary.

Once again we have a sponsor of an amendment that does not support campaign finance reform putting up another obstacle towards passing this bill. And as we approach the hour of 10:30, there are still more efforts to water down and try to find a way to put up an impediment to passing campaign finance reform.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, they say those are fighting words down there where I come from, when you say somebody is from South Carolina.

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

We were rocking along here, I thought, talking about campaign finance reform, and all of a sudden we took off in a whole different direction. We are talking about reform, yes, maybe, but what do voter I.D.s have to do with campaign finance, what do registration requirements have to do with campaign finance, I am having a little trouble connecting up.

If we are going to talk about these kinds of issues, let us remind ourselves what democracy is all about. It is about allowing people and encouraging people to vote, not putting impediments in the way, not discriminating against citizens, not singling some people out and saying we do not like the way they look so we are going to deprive them of the right to vote by making them produce some kind of arbitrary identification or Social Security number or something.

A couple of years ago the South African folks finally had a democratic election. Do my colleagues think South Africa ever required anybody to register to vote? No. I always wonder, why is it necessary to even have a registration? If we allowed this identification process, and we did it in tandem with abolishing registration, then maybe it would be a good thing. Because people could show up, if they were citizens of the United States, and say I am a citizen, I have not registered, that is arbitrary, let me vote. That would further democracy.

But when we start putting impediments in the way of registration and then putting more impediments in the way of voting after one has registered, then we have to wonder, is this about reform, does it have anything to do with finance, is it even about democracy? And that is what we have got to keep our eye on; to encourage people to participate in our democracy, not put our country behind any other country in the world. When people talk about democracy, they ought to instinctively think about the United States of America. We should not allow them to instinctively think about a new democracy which has had only one election.

Mr. Chairman, we should defeat this amendment and pass the Shays-Meehan bill.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and in that 1 minute I have to close let me point out a couple of things.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say we are talking about campaign finance reform, not voter fraud. I have the title of this bill right here, Mr. Chairman. It is H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. The Campaign Integrity Act. I submit to my colleagues that if anything threatens the integrity of our elections in the United States of America, it is campaign fraud.

All this amendment does is, I will quote, "Permitting States to require voters to produce photo identification." And I quote, "A State may require an individual to produce a valid photographic identification before receiving a ballot for voting in an election for Federal office."

Mr. Chairman, this goes to the precious commodity of democracy in the franchise in this Nation. It is a very simple amendment and I move its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SNOWBARGER TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNOWBARGER to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

TITLE—ENHANCING ENFORCEMENT OF CAMPAIGN LAW

SEC. .01. ENHANCING ENFORCEMENT OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW.

(a) MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT FOR CRIMINAL CONDUCT.—Section 309(d)(1)(A) of the

Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "shall be fined, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both" and inserting "shall be imprisoned for not fewer than 1 year and not more than 10 years"; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

(b) CONCURRENT AUTHORITY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL TO BRING CRIMINAL ACTIONS.—Section 309(d) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) In addition to the authority to bring cases referred pursuant to subsection (a)(5), the Attorney General may at any time bring a criminal action for a violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to actions brought with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER).

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

I rise tonight to offer an amendment to the Shays-Meehan substitute to address a serious problem with our Nation's campaign finance system.

This problem really hit home to me as we were investigating various things in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight this year. Among the thousands and thousands of documents that were presented to us from the White House was a memo from the Clinton-Gore campaign which indicated in the memo that about $1 million was set aside in the campaign budget to pay fines.

□ 2230

In the margin of that document was the word "ugh" written in the President's handwriting.

It seemed to me at that point in time that one of the problems that we have with our current campaign finance system is the enforcement of that system. If it is merely a matter of making sure that they have enough money in their budget to cover the fines, then obviously the fines are not much of a deterrent to behavior that is possibly illegal.

Far too often Federal regulations have unintended consequences, and our campaign finance system is just one acute example of that. It is complicated. It is difficult to navigate. And in fact, the average first-time candidates have to consult both a lawyer and an accountant before mounting a serious campaign, and this is a serious problem I would like to see changed.

However, I think the biggest problem is that the system is not accountable and we need to make it more transparent and violations of existing law severely punished. My amendment tonight accomplishes one of these important goals by increasing the punishment options available to judges.

The current penalty regime for willful and knowing violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 provides for up to 1 year of imprisonment for these types of willful violations. My amendment would simply increase the penalty discretion available to judges to no more than 10 years and no fewer than 1 year. Hopefully, this will allow the judge to take all factors into account. And more importantly, Mr. Chairman, my amendment will force candidates that want to play fast and loose with the rules to think long and hard before they decide to engage in what I would term playing fast and loose.

One other provision of my amendment would allow the Justice Department the option of taking direct jurisdiction and not waiting for a referral from the Federal Election Commission before starting an investigation and a prosecution.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I would like to explain why. First, under the present law the fine is $10,000 or 200 percent of the fraudulent contribution; and we increase that to $20,000 or 300 percent in our legislation.

But if I am reading this legislation properly, I think the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) has a mandatory sentence of not less than a year, not fewer than 1 year, and not more than 10. And if the gentleman were willing to eliminate the mandatory sentence and reduce it to 5 years, I think we could find an accommodation. But it is a concern that there would be a mandatory minimum.

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

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

Just in brief response, Mr. Chairman, the requirement of a minimum amount of time is, in essence, what the bill is all about. What we are suggesting is that if somebody willfully violates the campaign finance laws, that there ought to be a criminal penalty for this and not just fines.

As I indicated earlier, one of the reasons that fines do not seem to work is that all they need to do is create a larger budget and raise enough money to pay those fines and that is not much of a deterrent to complying with whatever campaign finance law we have in place.

I can appreciate the offer of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and thank him for it, but I think it is the essence. Perhaps the upper limit could be reduced to a lesser amount. But I think the key to this bill is the minimum of one year and to stick with that.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The Chair will inform that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) has 1½ minutes remaining and has the right to close, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) to flesh out a little bit more what the amendment does.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I might be able to support it. I just wanted to ask a couple questions.

As the gentleman knows, we passed the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) earlier tonight. It is my understanding that his amendment brought the penalty for knowing violations of the foreign contributor provision up to 10 years. And what the Snowbarger amendment does is to amend the more generic part of the campaign finance bill so that all provisions will have an enhanced penalty.

The distinction, though, between the Smith and the Snowbarger amendments, Mr. Chairman, as I see it is that, whereas the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) might have allowed a judge to say, well, this is something that perhaps should get less than 1 year, the gentleman mandates that it must be at least 1 year. And if I am correct about that, I would just like to know that.

And secondly, whereas the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) did not speak about the question about giving the Attorney General the prosecutorial discretion, the Snowbarger amendment does, and that the Attorney General may proceed if the FEC is deadlocked, whereas otherwise under the Smith amendment it would require a referral by FEC to the Department of Justice.

If I am correct or incorrect in those two major distinctions between the Smith amendment and the Snowbarger amendment, I would appreciate hearing so.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is accurate that there is within the discretion of the Department of Justice the ability to take on one of these campaign finance cases without a referral, as the gentleman indicated with the deadlock.

The gentleman is also correct that there is a minimum amount of time that is required. As I indicated to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) earlier, if there is a problem with the maximum time period that is allowed in there, I do not mind working with that.

But I think it is important that we have a minimum time period. I think that candidates that are faced with the possibility of jail time are going to be much more cautious.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman had already answered the question, but I will just put it in this final form.

I think the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) did us a service. I supported his amendment. But it was an important part of my support and perhaps that of others that the trial judge did have discretion to take into account the sentencing guidelines.

I am a bit troubled that the judge's discretion is taken away at least insofar as it must be 1 year. Nobody has any sympathy for an intentional violator of the law. I know that is true of all of us. But I am concerned about taking away the trial judge's discretion where in her or his discretion the appropriate sentence ought to be time in jail but not a full year.

And I would yield the remainder of the time that was yielded to me to the author of the amendment to explain, if he could, why he does not urge upon us in the House tonight to give the trial judge discretion under the sentencing guidelines for that occasional case when it might be just to do so, to have the full panoply of discretion, as we agreed was the case with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) wants to close and he has 1 minute remaining as well; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) has 1½ minutes remaining and has the right to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, we currently have discretion of the judge to grant between zero jail time and 1 year.

I think that the fact that there is a possibility of no jail time still would weaken any campaign finance law that we have to pass. I think it is important that there be a mandatory jail time provided.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, because the gentleman was going to conclude to say that it probably would be better if we left the discretion of the judge to go from zero to 10, I am not sure it is enough to defeat his amendment but he might want to consider that. I appreciate his answers.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the 30 seconds remaining.

I know what the gentleman is trying to achieve. I think he does achieve it with the sentence potential of zero to 5 years and increased fines. I am just troubled that it would be a mandatory sentence, and would at this time oppose his amendment and vote against it. Obviously, we would love to find an accommodation, but I guess that is not possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has expired.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, again I just want to reiterate, what we are trying to do here is to make sure that there are sufficient penalties in the law to deter people from committing campaign finance law violations.

Thus far, we have put a system of fines in place. Sometimes those are large fines, other times lesser fines that are meted out. But the fact of the matter is the fine system has not stopped the violations of current campaign finance law. There is no reason to believe that fines alone would deter future adherence to the law, whatever that law might change to.

It is exactly for that reason that I think it is important that people understand there are serious consequences, there is jail time that is going to be required, there is serious jail time that is going to be required. And I would ask that my colleagues seriously consider this amendment, which I feel would put tough penalties into whatever version of campaign finance we end up with and, very frankly, would encourage us to pursue this under current law as well.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITFIELD to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —BAN ON COORDINATED SOFT MONEY ACTIVITIES BY PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

SEC. 01. BAN ON COORDINATION OF SOFT MONEY FOR ISSUE ADVOCACY BY PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES RECEIVING PUBLIC FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9003) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) BAN ON COORDINATION OF SOFT MONEY FOR ISSUE ADVOCACY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President who is certified to receive amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund under this chapter or chapter 96 may coordinate the expenditure of any funds for issue advocacy with any political party unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

"(2) ISSUE ADVOCACY DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'issue advocacy' means any activity carried out for the purpose of influencing the consideration or outcome of any Federal legislation or the issuance or outcome of any Federal regulations, or educating individuals about candidates for election for Federal office or any Federal legislation, law, or regulations (without regard to whether the activity is carried out for the purpose of influencing any election for Federal office).".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Which Member will oppose the amendment and be recognized for 5 minutes?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any objection to this amendment. I just wish the sponsor of the amendment will vote for our bill once we accept the amendment so we can get it passed and really have it become law. I do not know if he would change his mind on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot because I support the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) be allowed to claim the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) claims time.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for agreeing to accept the amendment. And if that is the case, I would be happy to have it accepted and sit down and listen to someone else talk about their amendment.

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

I just want to say that I am delighted to accept this amendment and I hope that the acceptance of this amendment results in us growing in even broader and more bipartisan basis support amongst my colleagues so that we can pass the Shays-Meehan bill.

I think all of us have seen over a period of the last several months support for our bill growing enormously, and I hope that accepting this amendment results in the gentleman supporting our bill and getting many of his colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just make one brief comment. I appreciate the acceptance of this amendment.

My real purpose in introducing this amendment, offering this amendment, was to be sure that in the presidential elections the candidates for President are the only Federal candidates that receive public funds; and initially, when they agree to accept these public funds, they also agree that they will not go out and raise additional money.

In recent presidential elections, that rule has really been violated by both sides. And during the hearings on the campaign finance abuses on the Senate side, Senator THOMPSON of Tennessee, who chaired that committee, pointed out very clearly that in the 1996 campaigns that it was not unusual that the President sat down and coordinated these ads, in fact, added the ads, in fact, decided where the ads of issue advocacy would be placed.

And while the Shays-Meehan bill talks a lot about abolishment of coordination, abolishment of soft money, the fact that the presidential campaigns are included under the Internal Revenue Code, I just want to be very certain that the presidential campaigns were included in this legislation. And that was my purpose in introducing the amendment. I appreciate very much his acceptance of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2245

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALVERT to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE ___—RESTRICTIONS ON NONRESIDENT FUNDRAISING

SEC. ___01. LIMITING AMOUNT OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS NOT RESIDING IN DISTRICT OR STATE INVOLVED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i)(1) A candidate for the office of Senator or the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress may not accept contributions with respect to an election from persons other than local individual residents totaling in excess of the aggregate amount of contributions accepted from local individual residents (as determined on the basis of the information reported under section 304(d)).

"(2) In determining the amount of contributions accepted by a candidate for purposes of this subsection, the amounts of any contributions made by a political committee of a political party shall be allocated as follows:

"(A) 50 percent of such amounts shall be deemed to be a contributions from local individual residents.

"(B) 50 percent of such amounts shall be deemed to be contributions from persons other than local individual residents.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'local individual resident' means—

"(A) with respect to an election for the office of Senator, an individual who resides in the State involved; and

"(B) with respect to an election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, an individual who resides in the congressional district involved.".

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) Each principal campaign committee of a candidate for the Senate or the House of Representatives shall include the following information in the first report filed under subsection (a)(2) which covers the period which begins 19 days before an election and ends 20 days after the election:

"(1) The total contributions received by the committee with respect to the election involved from local individual residents (as defined in section 315(i)(3)), as of the last day of the period covered by the report.

"(2) The total contributions received by the committee with respect to the election involved from all persons, as of the last day of the period covered by the report.".

(c) PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF LIMITS.—Section 309(d) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Any candidate who knowingly and willfully accepts contributions in excess of any limitation provided under section 315(i) shall be fined an amount equal to the greater of 200 percent of the amount accepted in excess of the applicable limitation or (if applicable) the amount provided in paragraph (1)(A).

"(B) Interest shall be assessed against any portion of a fine imposed under subparagraph (A) which remains unpaid after the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date the fine is imposed.".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

Mr. Chairman, in the 103d Congress I served on the House Republican Campaign Finance Task Force. As a member of that task force, I pressed for language to require that candidates receive half of the campaign funds from people they are seeking to represent. My amendment today would require candidates to adhere to this 50 percent rule.

The public's perception is that elected officials are beholden to the special interests that they believe finance the campaigns. As long as the public has this perception, it is important that every person running for public office restores confidence in our system. By requiring all candidates for office in the House of Representatives and the Senate to raise at least half of their campaign funds from individuals in the districts they represent, my amendment goes a long way toward restoring the people's trust.

The amendment is simple and straightforward. On the first report to the Federal Election Commission after an election, candidates would have to show that they raised a majority of funds for that election from individuals within their own district for House candidates or within the State for senatorial candidates. Money from political parties will be considered 50 percent in-district money and 50 percent out-of-district money. If it is determined that they have not met this requirement, they will be subject to a fine by the FEC of two times the amount of the margin between in-district contributions and the contributions from outside the district. Candidates will have 30 days from that determination to pay the penalty interest-free. If the deadline passes without payment, interest will begin to be assessed.

As Members of Congress, we owe it to our constituents to provide them with the security of knowing they are electing people to Congress to represent them, not special or remote interests.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, not because I do not think it is offered in good faith but because I disagree with the general thrust of limiting campaign contributions to a district. I believe the gentleman will face some constitutional hurdles given that it is within district, not within State. The gentleman, in other words, seeks to have 50 percent of all the contributions come within the district. I believe the courts would determine that within district would be a constitutional problem but within a State it would probably not be.

But, further, I seek to share and acknowledge the fact that we ourselves had attempted to do something similar to this in a larger Meehan-Shays proposal and realized that we simply could not build a coalition of support to pass this legislation. It may seem frustrating for some to argue against an amendment based on the fact that we then cannot pass the overall bill, but that is the reality. The fact is that if this amendment were to pass, it would be a very dangerous amendment for the purposes of putting a real dagger in a compromise that is in fact Meehan-Shays.

I also would say to Members that I speak as one on this issue who raises literally 99 percent of my money within district. I am amazed that that is the case, but in fact it is the case. If I were to acknowledge why, it would be that I come from a very wealthy district, if not the wealthiest district in the country, within the top five. If it is not considered the wealthiest, it is that I have the very wealthy but I also have a number of poor who live in Stamford, Norwalk and Bridgeport, my three urban areas. So it is without reluctance that I do oppose this amendment.

I would just acknowledge that for some in Congress, they can raise all the amount of money they need to within their district. I could probably raise all the money I need to if everyone on Round Hill Road in Greenwich contributed to my campaign. That four-mile stretch of road contains a tremendous number of wealthy people. I do not even have to go outside a community. I can focus within a particular town. But there are some Members who live in very, very poor districts. They would be highly vulnerable to a wealthy candidate who has wealth in that district and knows that that opponent not only does not have wealth but has nowhere within that district to raise the kind of sums necessary to compete with that wealthy individual.

I do not criticize the intention of my colleague. I know that they are done in good faith. In fact, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and I and others attempted to do the same thing. But then the more we analyzed it, we realized that it was clearly unfair to some Members and to some challengers, not just Members, and furthermore that we would not be able to build the kind of coalition we need to pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would say to the gentleman from Connecticut, as he knows, I have been in favor of this concept since I first came to Congress almost 6 years ago. I am happy to hear that he raises 99 percent of his campaign contributions within his congressional district. I would daresay that there are some folks here that raise 99 percent of their campaign contributions outside of their congressional district. And so at what level is a fair and reasonable amount to raise within your own congressional district?

I would think that most Americans, and I have seen polling documents as all of us have, that most Americans believe that you should raise at least half of your campaign contributions within your congressional district. The argument that folks in poorer districts would not be able to raise funds, all I would say is that all people who would run in that seat are playing under the same limitations, so that the playing field is leveled.

I think it is important that people back home realize that the people who are elected to Congress at least represent them, if money is important and the reason we are here tonight on campaign finance reform is that we are going back and building the base within our own congressional districts and raising money back home. I think in years past, that was the case. We have gotten away from that. I think that this amendment will go a long ways to bringing back confidence within the system. I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me this time and I thank him for cosponsoring this legislation, the underlying legislation on campaign finance reform.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT). He and I are cochair of the State society for California. Like him in the bill that I authored, H.R. 600, a comprehensive campaign reform, I really looked at this, because this is one of those issues where it really sounds good. But let me tell the gentleman from California why it is rejected. It is rejected because as he knows under Federal law, you do not have to live in the district to file for candidacy. What happens is that you can take a district that is a poor district under his law, say that 50 percent of the money has to be raised there, and you can shop around. So in a district in the inner city of Los Angeles or in the inner city of any large area where you do not have a large economic base, you look at the candidate who files and you say, well, that candidate is going to have to raise money to get elected. I am going to be a candidate who is going to use my own money. I am rich. I am going to go down there and file for the candidacy in that election. I want it. I can buy that election, because I do not have to raise a dime of money inside the district because I am not going to ask anybody for contributions.

There is the inequity, is that you set up a system which is designed to hurt minorities, because those are the people that often get elected from these inner city districts, and for people that are trying to get started in politics. I cannot think of any of us in this room that did not begin when we decided to get into public life, whether it was at the mayor's level or at city council or school board or county commissioner or even running for county sheriff by which this rule would not apply. You could raise money outside your district for any of those local offices.

But when you began this venture of getting into politics and noted that the average congressional campaign in America cost $600,000, that is a lot of money, and you began to say, "Where am I going to get that money?" You say, "Well, let's go to my family, let's go to my friends that I went to school with, to high school and college with, maybe that I was in the service with." The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I have mentioned before, we were both in the Peace Corps.

So people like that went out, and that is where you began your nest egg of how you are going to run for office. And you are soliciting money from people who know you best, who have actually worked with you, they know you better than anyone because you are just saying, "Based on what you know of me, please help me." Those moneys may not be coming from your district.

I think that this amendment where it sounds good is really kind of a poison pill. I think it is frankly, and I hate to say it this way, but I think it is really un-American. Because it does not apply to people in local office, it does not apply to people in State office, and essentially are we not trying in America to say that we want you to participate in government, we would love to have people running for office, and that we ought to be removing barriers, not creating more?

I think that is why I am so concerned about some of these amendments. I am

concerned about the message that we are giving in this great land of America about what we think democracy is. We are selling it short. We are cheapening it. We are distrusting it. We are saying we do not believe the voters. If you make one false move, you do not have an ID, you do not have a picture, you are elderly, you are locked up in a nursing home, you do not have a driver's license, you do not have any proof of citizenship because maybe you are in States, many States did not file birth certificates earlier than about 1910. So if you were born before that, you would not have any proof of citizenship.

So what we are doing is we are making it more and more difficult, and I think requiring, as I said, it sounds good, 50 percent, but if you are in a district where you do not have a lot of wealth and you as a candidate do not have any wealth or you are new to the business, you are not going to be able to raise funds, and you cannot run for office under this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would say to the gentleman that how much should the threshold be? If it is not 50 percent, should it be 40 percent? Should it be 30 percent? Should it be 20 percent? There are people who are elected to Congress who raise 95 percent of their money outside of their congressional districts. Is that what American people out there expect from their candidates? I do not think so.

I would point out to the gentleman that there are people who run for public office who are not from an area. The gentleman is correct. You do not have to have residency requirements as a requirement to run for congressional office, many of whom move into a congressional district and raise 95 percent of their money from outside of the district and a local candidate is not given the opportunity to get elected within the congressional district in which they reside, because they do not have the resources.

But I would say if there is a problem with a self-funded rich candidate running for such a seat, and I would say that that is a problem for any of our seats if someone of such wealth decides to run, in that case the party can add funds to the race. I would also accept a perfecting amendment that would waive this rule at a certain threshold of funds, say $100,000 is thrown in by a wealthy candidate.

But I would say that whatever district that a Member of Congress represents, he or she represents, if a wealthy candidate decides to run, you are in trouble under existing campaign law and will continue to be in trouble in the future.

□ 2300

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, in the H.R. 600 that I drafted, what it said is we put limits on what you could spend, because that was the real problem. In that, we said, if you were a wealthy candidate, you can only spend $50,000 of your own money.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, I understand, under the Constitution that the other gentleman pointed out, that we cannot restrict an individual from spending his or her own money. However, that is one of the reasons why I would accept a perfecting amendment that would waive the rule at a certain threshold and allow for dollars to be raised outside of a district if, in fact, that occurs.

But getting back to the point that I am trying to get at, that people within congressional districts expect their Members to represent their interests within their district. I would say that Members of Congress who raise 95 percent, 90 percent, 80 percent of their dollars outside of the congressional districts that they represent do not represent the districts as well as someone who raises at least 50 percent of their monies from their district.

I would hope that we would pass this amendment. I think the American public would be for it.

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

Mr. CALVERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, if we pass this amendment, is the gentleman going to support the Shays-Meehan bill?

Mr. CALVERT. I may. I may support the amendment. I do not know what the final bill is going to be after all the amendments are over with.

Mr. MEEHAN. Who does at this point? I am happy to hear that the gentleman has an open mind. Part of the problem is, if we pass the gentleman's amendment, the bill is going to die.

What we are trying to do is send a bill over to the other body that has a bipartisan consensus for both sides of the aisle. That is what we are attempting to do. Going through that process, we were unable to do that with this particular amendment.

I happen to take more than 50 percent of money from people from my district, and over 90 percent of my money is from my home State. But what we are trying to do here is pass a comprehensive, fair campaign finance reform bill. The only way to get that done is to work with Members on both sides of the aisle. This particular amendment will defeat our bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, I think that it is important to raise a significant amount of money within our congressional district. I would hope that most Members feel the same way about that. I would hope that that they would vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the freshman leader on campaign finance reform and, frankly, just a leader, be he freshman or seasoned veteran.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his continuing leadership on campaign reform.

I have been the democratic chair of a bipartisan freshman effort on campaign reform for the last year and a half. I point that out because the only way to do campaign reform is on a bipartisan basis.

This amendment, however well-intentioned, is a poison pill. This amendment, if added to the Shays-Meehan bill, will kill campaign reform, will kill the Shays-Meehan bill. That is one reason why it needs to be defeated.

I will talk in a moment about some of my problems with the merits; but just for a moment, let us begin with just how different different districts are around this country.

I think it is fair to say that, if you look at the Senate races around the country, some cost more, and some cost less. For example, it may cost tens of millions of dollars to run a Senate campaign in California. But in my home State of Maine, it may be a $1 million or $2 million proposition. But the basic campaigns are more or less the same: A certain amount of television, a certain amount of get out the vote drive. They look more or less alike, even though they are on the same scale.

The same is not true in the House of Representatives. In the House of Representatives, there are some districts where television is a factor. There are some districts in the House where television is not a factor because you cannot raise the money to run ads in New York or Chicago or Los Angeles in most cases.

The districts across this House are very, very different. Some, like the district of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), are wealthy. Some others are very poor. It is not true, in my opinion, as the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) said that everyone is subject to the same limits, and everyone is subject to the same effects if you have this kind of limit.

What this amendment would do is to magnify the effect of wealth, because in a very poor district, the man with deep pockets or the woman with deep pockets has a much greater advantage than he or she would in another district where it is possible to raise money.

That is why I believe that this amendment is bad policy because it magnifies the effect of personal wealth where what we are trying to do is contain that, trying to get control of the amount of money in politics. We are

trying to strengthen the voices of the ordinary citizen. That is what campaign reform is all about. This amendment moves in a different direction.

The fact is, as I said before, we simply cannot pass campaign reform with this kind of amendment tacked on. There are many Members of the minority caucus. There are many Members who come from very poor districts who cannot support the campaign reform bill with this proposal.

One of the things our freshman task force did at the beginning of our process, we said what are the poison pills? Let us identify them. This kind of in-district limit was clearly identified right at the beginning as a poison pill. It will not work. It will kill campaign reform for this session. We cannot let that happen.

Therefore, I urge all Members to vote against the Calvert amendment and make sure that we support the Shays-Meehan bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to this debate. The gentleman is objecting to 50 percent of the money being raised by all candidates in the district. I guess I would ask the question: "How about 10 percent?" Would the gentleman settle for that? That all candidates at least raise 10 percent of their campaign money in the district? I would just like to ask the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HORN. For the answer to the question, I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the proper number, if we could determine one, is different for different districts. I was talking about how varied the districts may be. In some districts, it is now the practice for very large amounts, maybe 70, maybe 80, maybe more percent that money may come from out of district. In some districts, that may be the only way to fund a congressional campaign.

So what is right for that district is not what is right for the district of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) or my district or the gentleman from California's district.

When we sit here with a great variety of districts around the country and try to come up with one number, I think we are on a chase that is not going to lead us in a healthy direction. It is not going to get us to pass a campaign reform bill. I think it is a mistake.

Mr. HORN. I have had a situation where my opponent raised only 1 percent of his campaign funds in the district when I had raised 70 to 80 percent.

I have to say: "Where is the connection with the electorate? Do the candidates who raise 1% in the district just go to all the eastern cities? They go into the gentleman's territory and get the funds together $1,000 at a crack. I have seen candidates that go up and down the east coast, just as the easterners come out to Hollywood in the celebrity area, and they secure funds at $1,000 at a crack.

It just seems to me there is a relationship in a democracy between, not only the voters in one's district and the sources who have provided the candidate with his real money? So I am willing to settle for 10 percent being raised in the district. I would prefer 50% or 100%. Ten percent would be a start.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just briefly?

Mr. HORN. Absolutely. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. I absolutely agree with the gentleman that there has got to be a connection between the candidate and the district. That is very, very important.

Mr. HORN. We have too many candidates who are under obligation to PACs and to everybody else, none of which have anything to do with some of the districts, certainly mine.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman will yield just briefly, often, PAC money comes from organizations that are based in the district.

Mr. HORN. Usually, they take the PAC money from everywhere, but they cannot get it in terms of the District. I would just say, let us talk about 10 percent. I am willing to start low.

I would just like to see some connection between the candidate and who he or she represents. If they are only going to represent the people in the east that give them $1,000 checks, I do not think they are going to represent a district in the west that provides the votes.

I do not care if it is a quarter or a dollar, the checks I am moved by the most are when I receive $10 from a person who is living on $500 a month from Social Security. I know that $10 hurts that donor. So it just seems to me that candidates should receive money from their district at least to some degree.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman from California for a question.

Mr. FARR of California. What do you do with the individual who is very wealthy and you are in a very poor district?

Mr. HORN. Do you know what I would do with the individual who is very wealthy? I would pass a law that could limit that amount of personal wealth to be spent in a campaign. I think it is a scandal what is going on in America. You are going to have plutocracy take over this chamber.

Mr. FARR of California. Maybe you can make that a perfecting amendment?

Mr. HORN. I will support that kind of an amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished professor from Stanford, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

□ 2310

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding me time and for referring to me by the best honorific I have ever had, which is professor.

I am in a bit of a bind, Mr. Chairman, because I have "can't vote-can't contribute" as one of the substitutes. I love this so much, I would make it 100 percent. And this dilemma yields to a solution to my good friend, my brother, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT). This will kill Shays-Meehan. That is a fact. You know it, I think. So, vote for mine, because I will not bring mine up if Shays-Meehan passes. If Shays-Meehan passes, I do not bring up the Campbell substitute. But if Shays-Meehan goes down in flames, then, boy, am I on the side of the gentleman from California. Then we can vote "can't vote-can't contribute."

What my proposal does is to say, "Boy, is he right." You ought to get all of your money from your district, from people whom you represent, except you have to make an exception for the constitutional requirement that people can express themselves under the First Amendment, so I have $100 as an exception.

But by putting it on to Shays-Meehan the gentleman from California, surely without this intent, but I nevertheless am convinced with this effect, kills Shays-Meehan. If Shays-Meehan has a chance, let us pass it. If it does not have a chance and it goes down to defeat, you will have the opportunity to vote for exactly this concept. Then, boy, will you hear me in my righteous fervor responding to the arguments that have been presented against the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

For example, the wealthy person. Well, we Californians told the wealthy person something this last election, did we not, he asks rhetorically. We rejected those who spent their own money attempting to become Governor of our state, attempting to become Senator representing our state. And the argument that it is unfair misses the fact that it is sauce for the goose and it is sauce for the gander.

Your district is where you ought to raise your money from, but, please, do not hurt Shays-Meehan's chances of passage. You know it will peel off votes, you know it will cause the bill to be unacceptable to so many.

So I give you a reasonable alternative. I wish you would take it. Vote for my bill if it comes up, but do not destroy Shays-Meehan.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say my head is spinning. The professor from California got very animated when he

talked about this amendment, but he called it like it is. He loves certain aspects of this amendment, but he does know that it would cause tremendous harm to a coalition of Members who all had to give up certain things that they wanted for a common good, and that was to ban soft money, the unlimited sums that individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups give to the political parties, that then get funneled right back to the candidate and make a mockery of our campaign laws.

We came to a compromise so we could recognize sham issue ads for what they truly are, campaign ads, and that means when it is a campaign ad, you follow the campaign rules. It means you cannot use corporate money, it means you cannot use labor dues. It meanings you have to disclose.

We codified the Supreme Court decision on Beck, which said that if a member of a union seeks to leave the union, that they do not have to have their agency fee which they are required by law to provide, that it should not include, if they choose not to, to have their agency fee include a political payment. Therefore, they pay a little less than the union dues.

We improve FEC disclosure and enforcement significantly, because we sought to come to a common ground between Republicans and Democrats, those who want campaign finance reform.

We seek to ban the franked mail, the district-wide mailing six months to an election. We did this through compromise. One of the things that did not survive the compromise was the very amendment that the gentleman is proposing.

We did this by compromise. We banned the raising of any foreign money and any fund-raising on government property. Now, it is not illegal to raise soft money from a foreigner, if they are not a citizen, because soft money is not viewed as campaign money. Therefore, it does not come under the statute.

Some could argue, and I am one, and we could have a disagreement, that raising soft money on government property, since it is not campaign money, does not come under the penalty. I realize others might disagree. But the bottom line is we came to a compromise in order to do these very significant things, and one of the things that did not make the compromise was the amendment suggested by my colleague, the gentleman from California.

So, we do need to defeat this amendment. I know that it has been offered in tremendous sincerity. I get down on bended knee and hope and pray that it is defeated, because it truly will blow apart a coalition of people who have sought to do something meaningful with campaign finance reform, and that is to restore integrity to the political process and to end the obscene amounts of money that we see in soft money, and to require those sham issues ads to be what they are, campaign issue ads.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my dear friend from California, I like his idea raising 100 percent of the money within the district. I recognize that that is probably not realistic, and so I believe that half of the money should be raised within the Congressional districts that Members represent.

We heard earlier that maybe not even 10 percent is an acceptable number. Well, what is an acceptable number? We know that there are people who run for Congress that 99 percent of their money is raised outside of their district. I do not think the American public agrees to that. As the gentleman from Connecticut knows, I came here six years ago almost and have been talking about this 50 percent provision since I came here to Congress.

I think most Americans believe that you should raise at least 50 percent of the money within your Congressional District. I do not think it is outrageous. I do not think there is anything wrong with this.

As far as a wealthy candidate running in a Congressional district, I would say that any of us would have a problem if we were running against a very wealthy candidate, any of us. But, saying that, I would accept a perfecting amendment that would waive the rule if a wealthy candidate gets involved in a campaign and spends, say, $100,000, to take care of that problem. I recognize that.

But what we are talking about here is 50 percent of the money within the district. I think it is reasonable. I think most people would expect folks to come back and raise money. It is difficult. None of us like going to all the fund raisers we need to go to back home, getting back home and putting together these events. It is a lot easier having an event here in Washington, D.C., or somewhere elsewhere where you can raise a significant amount of money. But this is, I think, an important responsibility.

I would hope that all Members would accept this amendment. I think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) will be postponed.

Mr. SHAYS. 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. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Chairman pro tempore 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. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MODIFICATION TO ORDER OF THE HOUSE OF FRIDAY, JULY 17, 1998, REGARDING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to go out of order, notwithstanding the order of the House agreed to on Friday last, and combine amendments listed as 40 to 45 into one, and make it as the next thing in order after the Calvert amendment, and that debate be limited to five minutes for and five minutes against the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

□ 2320

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 442 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. 2183.

□ 2321

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. 2183) to amend the Federal Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARR of Georgia (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) had been postponed.

Under the previous order of today, it is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. LINDA SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OF CONNECTICUT

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington to the Amendment No. 13 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut:

In Section 301(20) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(a) of the substitute, strike subparagraph (b) and add the following:

"(B) Voting Record and Voting Guide Exception—The term "express advocacy" does not include a communication which is in printed form or posted on the Internet that—

"(i) presents information solely about the voting record or position on a campaign issue of 1 or more candidates, provided however, that the sponsor of the voting record or voting guide may state its agreement or disagreement with the record or position of the candidate and further provided that the voting record or voting guide when taken as a whole does not express unmistakable and unambiguous support for or opposition to 1 or more clearly identified candidates,

"(ii) is not made in coordination with a candidate, political party, or agent of the candidate or party, or a candidate's agent or a person who is coordinating with a candidate or a candidate's agent; provided that nothing herein shall prevent the sponsor of the voting guide from directing questions in writing to candidates about their position on issues for purposes of preparing a voter guide, and the candidate from responding in writing to such questions, and

"(iii) does not contain a phrase such as 'vote for,' 're-elect,' 'support,' 'cast your ballot for,' '(name of candidate) for Congress,' '(name of candidate) in 1997,' 'vote against,' 'defeat,' or 'reject,' or a campaign slogan or words that in context can have no reasonable meaning other than to urge the election or defeat of 1 or more clearly identified candidates."

In Section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, strike paragraph (D) and insert

"(D) For purposes of subparagraph (C), the term "professional services" means polling, media advice, fundraising, campaign research or direct mail (except for mailhouse services solely for the distribution of voter guides as defined in section 431(20)B)) services in support of a candidate's pursuit of nomination for election, or election, to Federal office."

In Section 301(8)(C)(v) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, add at the end thereof,

", provided however that such discussions shall not include a lobbying contact under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in the case of a candidate holding Federal office or consisting of similar lobbying activity in the case of a candidate holding State or elective office."

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to say that I am happy that the gentlewoman has agreed to work with us. I think that her amendment makes some important clarifications to the voter guide and safe harbor provisions in the bill. I know that I have worked with the gentlewoman, as the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has, for some time on campaign finance reform, and this is a good opportunity to take a number of the amendments, and as the gentlewoman knows, we have many, many amendments left to go in order to get the Shays-Meehan legislation passed.

So I thank the gentlewoman for her cooperation. Both sides of the aisle have looked at this. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH).

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this actually is a group of amendments, all dealing with grassroots organizations' concerns. From liberal groups to conservative groups, they have been very, very concerned about their voter guides.

To begin with, it starts with clarifying some things that were never intended in the bill anyway. There was never an intention to restrict voter guides or individual grassroots lobbying, and yet some felt that this bill went across the line. To begin with, they wanted to be able to say, even if one guy is running, we want to be able to put out a record on him. We believe we should be able to do that.

So they have graciously said, sure enough, that makes some sense, and so we will allow one. The original said there had to be two or more candidates to be able to put out a voter guide, so this is a step in the right direction.

The second thing that is very much a concern of the groups is that they cannot explain why they were for or against an issue. Now, the makers of the bill felt that they had taken care of this, but many groups did not. So this simply clarifies that they not only are able to, but it clarifies that they can explain their positions and cleans up that problem.

Another issue that they were concerned about is that possibly collecting information to build score cards might be considered coordination. These amendments make it clear that that is not the case.

There are some other things that were of concern of the groups, and they were worried that their grassroots lobbyists could be in trouble, that this could be a problem if they were lobbying elected officials on issues, and that that could qualify as coordination. This language says no, that was not meant to be considered as coordination, so it cleans that up, and so there is no problem with the grassroots groups lobbying now.

Then there was a section that was a little more difficult, that has a purpose, a very important purpose, and that is where one finds that there are coordinated efforts of groups, vendors, and actually it comes out in kind of ugly things. One finds TV ads and radio ads and all kinds of things happening, and it is supposed to be independent but it clearly is coordinated.

What this does is clarify that and makes it very clear that it is not meant to deal with voter guides; that we are making it real clear that voter guides are not a part of the problem, and so again, we have made it very clear in this amendment that we are not aiming at them and definitely not even trying to get close to them.

So with that, this clears up a lot of the problems with the voter guides; it clears up a lot of the problems that the grassroots groups had with being able to lobby and being restricted from their lobbying and goes a long ways, I would think, to alleviating some of their fears.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I do not think I need a minute, but paragraph small "i" at the end where it says, "candidates," I believe that there is a printing error and after the comma, it should be "and," as we go to each of the paragraphs.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would clarify which paragraph he is in.

□ 2330

Mr. MEEHAN. Small "i" at the end of that paragraph, I believe it should say "and."

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

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The word "and" appears after the second little "i." So we have a comma, "and." Under normal rules of construction, that is a conjunction not a disjunctive. So, I do not believe the gentleman's point is necessary. Of course, it would do no harm to add the word "and." But we have a comma after little i, comma "and" after a little ii.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do so to recognize the contribution of the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH). The bottom line is that she has offered six amendments to deal with voter guides and advocacy because she is sincerely concerned that groups would be denied the opportunity to provide these voter guides.

Each of her amendments had some element of merit and in some cases we could have accepted the amendment in whole. But she has combined these six amendments and I think has dealt sincerely with the concerns that various groups have.

The bottom line is she has tried to perfect this legislation and made a tremendous contribution and I really appreciate the contribution of the gentlewoman to improve this bill and make it clear what the intention is of the supporters of this legislation. I am very grateful for her contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL). I do not know if I want to call him "professor," but I will call him "gentleman."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), my friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I join him in applauding the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH). From the first day that I met her, her concern was campaign finance reform and it continues to manifest itself in work such as this amendment.

In reading it, I would clarify the following points that I think are in its favor: The phrase is now that in order to qualify, the commentary on a candidate's voting record can appear just by itself. They do not have to have another candidate. And it is all right, so long as it falls short of expressing unmistakable and unambiguous support for or opposition to that candidate.

And I emphasize that, because in our earlier debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), our colleague and friend, the question arose as to whether a voter advocacy group could say here is the position of candidates and we happen to agree with this position. And whether under the unamended version of Shays-Meehan that would have been acceptable was the point that was contested.

I do not believe that it is in doubt anymore if this amendment is accepted. That if it purely communicates accurate information as to the position of a candidate and falls short of saying "and for this reason vote for the person" or "for this reason we overwhelmingly support," in other words, if it falls short of unmistakable and unambiguous support, then it is indeed what it purports to be, a voter guide.

Mr. Chairman, I also note that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington is preferable to the one offered by our colleague from California in that it preserves the prohibition on coordination. If the organization in question has coordinated the entire voter guide with a plan to assist a candidate, then it is not a voter guide. It is a sham. The gentlewoman preserves that.

Lastly, she repeats the so-called magic words test, which is the starting point, but for many of us it is not sufficient to handle the area of potential abuse.

So with those observations, I am pleased to add my voice to those of the unanimous membership who is speaking on this bill in favor of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to say that this is an issue that I struggled with in our bill. I compliment the gentlewoman. I think this is a great improvement on existing law, because it clearly separates what is express advocacy.

Express advocacy under this definition is any time one gets out and says this is the record of a candidate and this record is evil, do not vote for this person. Or this is the record of an angel, please vote for this person. That is express advocacy. That will trigger that the people who publish such things will have to disclose where their money came from. It would have to be hard money.

That is the kind of thing that we have been saying that we need to do. If we just say this is a voter guide, we do not agree with it. But you cannot say therefore vote against this person. That would be an example, because one does not advocate a position, as the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) said in the gentlewoman's words, of unmistakable or unambiguous support for or in opposition to one or more candidates. So you clearly have drawn a line between what has been the problem, which is these kind of hit pieces that have come out that the candidate knows nothing about, even the opposition knows nothing about because they are independent of either, and have been expressing sort of evil actions based on a record. I think that you are commended because this makes a clear distinction

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has one minute remaining.

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

I would just quickly say that the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH), and using the word "gentle" is sometimes a misnomer because she is extraordinarily strong, again has made a wonderful contribution to this process and has been a leader in campaign finance reform throughout the country. I thank her again for her contribution and would again yield my time to her to allow her to close.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his comments.

This particular area of campaign finance reform probably has had more objections, more confusion, than anything I have seen in my nearly 4 years in Congress. I do not think that this agreement or this amendment is going to make everyone happy but those that used to say we cannot even advocate our position of what we think is right in the voter guide, to them this is taking care of it. To those that do not want people to have any speech about what they think is a good position from their perspective, a group, to them they are not going to necessarily like it either.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH), to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington will be postponed.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, during the course of debate on campaign reform, I have

repeatedly voiced concern that the Shays-Meehan legislation, if enacted would threaten citizen participation in our democratic system.

Numerous provisions in Shays-Meehan restrict the right of the people to express their opinions about elected officials and issues through unprecedented limitations on text accompanying issue group voting records and restraints on citizen commentary prior to an election.

Why would any group of citizens distribute a voting guide or scorecard on a candidate when the Federal Election Commission (FEC) would be empowered to decide, after the distribution of the scorecard, whether it was written in an "educational" manner?

Why would a citizen's activist organization issue a "voter alert" to its supporters warning them to an upcoming vote in Congress, when they could be potentially fined for violating the burdensome "coordination" section of the bill?

Why would a group of citizens concerned about an issue like partial birth abortion or affirmative action run a television advertisement to try to influence the way their Member of Congress votes, when they could be fined for violating new free speech restrictions that are contained in the bill?

The Shays-Meehan bill contains a provision that prohibits non-citizens from contributing to campaigns. When you combine that provision with the amendment offered by Representative PICKERING, I believe political contributions by minorities would become suspect.

As a stand alone, the Shays-Meehan bill is patently unconstitutional on its face. It violates the First Amendment rights of all Americans. But it would be a mistake to compound those constitutional errors by somehow making suspect political contributions by Americans with non-western names. With these two amendments adopted, the threat to minority participation in our election process would compound the threat to freedom by the bill.

Mr. SHAYS. 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. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Chairman pro tempore 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. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CORRECTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JULY 16, 1998, PAGES 5719, 5720 AND 5721, DURING DEBATE ON H.R. 4104, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Add at the end of the bill:

Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, no funds in this Act may be used to require any contract to include a term for coverage of abortifacients.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) reserves a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, due to the lateness of the hour, I do not intend on taking the full 5 minutes.

Let me make it very clear that part of the problem with the Lowey amendment was that it did not define contraception. Many of us have been concerned that the pro-abortion lobby and the pro-abortion organizations over the years have tried to fudge the line of demarcation between fertilization post- and pre-fertilization. Many of the chemicals, many of the devices that are now employed that are permitted under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program do indeed result in many abortions, newly created human lives that are not permitted to implant in their mother's womb.

In a nutshell, my amendment is designed to clarify that if we are indeed going to force all of the Federal providers of medical care, the HMOs and all the providers as a condition of receiving reimbursement for all of their prescriptions, whether it be for penicillin or any other drug, that they have, to provide "a provision for contraceptive coverage", let us at least make it clear that the gentlelady's language excludes abortion-inducing chemicals. That is what my amendment very simply seeks to do.

Earlier in the day we pointed out during the debate, that while RU–486 isn't legal and, hopefully, never will be there are officials of Planned Parenthood who are already talking about it as a morning after pill. RU–486 is baby pesticide and destroys life, the newly created life, somewhere along the line up to the 7th week. This is a Federal funding of early abortion but many Members of Congress remain uninformed of that fact. I say with regret, that some abortifacients like IUDs can be provided by the health care providers under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. The question is should they be forced to. This says no one is going to be forced to do it. It is a conscience type amendment. Still the plain language of Mrs. LOWEY'S amendment only stipulates "a provision for contraceptive coverage"—a much, much, weaker version than the amendment she offered in her Appropriations Committee. Clearly, under her amendment, if a plan merely provided condoms or birth control pills, that would satisfy the obligation created by the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman clarify for me and for others, when he says to include "a term for coverage," what does that phrase mean?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for asking the question. It says very simply that a health care plan would not have to include those devices and chemicals that may have the effect of an abortifacient. Under my amendment it will not be mandatory. it will not be forced upon the HMOs and upon the health care providers even though the language of Mrs. LOWEY'S amendment requires only "a provision for contraceptive coverage" to satisfy the requirement.

Mr. HOYER. Am I correct then that the amendment means, "a term for coverage" would mean the term that refers to the abortifacients?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I understand the gentleman's question that is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) insist on his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise to engage the gentleman from New Jersey in a colloquy.

I would like to ask the gentleman to define further his amendment. Based upon the information that we have, the FDA has approved five methods of contraception. This is the established definition of contraception. It has nothing to do with RU–486 although, unfortunately, there were some letters sent out saying it did. RU–486 is not included among the five methods of contraception. It has nothing to do with abortion. There have been debates that have been going on among us, in the country, about when does life begin.

This takes some serious discussion, and I am sure that we can have some serious debates about this issue, but today what we are talking about very simply is the five established methods of contraception that have been improved by the FDA, nothing to do with abortion, nothing to do with RU–486.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentlewoman would yield, let me just ask the gentlewoman, because this will help me in responding, her definition of contraception. Is it before fertilization occurs or is it before implantation in the uterus?

Mrs. LOWEY. I am sorry. Will the gentleman repeat?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Part of the problem we have with the gentlewoman's first amendment, as well as the amendment that was offered and just passed, is a definitional one. How do you define contraception? How do define pregnancy?

For some, it is implantation. For some, it is fertilization.

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Contraception by definition should mean before a new life has come into being. There are many who want to blur that line and say that chemicals affect the implementation or even after that.

Mrs. LOWEY. If I may reclaim my time, could the gentleman explain whether this includes the pill?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. This will have to be determined. There is a body of evidence suggesting that IUDs, for example, may have the impact, and many women are unaware of this, may have the impact of preventing implantation.

What my amendment says, that is still permissible under Federal Employees Health Benefit Program but not mandated.

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, if I might ask the gentleman, I believe in response to my question as to whether the pill would be included, since the pill is one of the five methods of approving contraception from the FDA, you seem to be questioning this and I would ask the gentleman, if you are not sure whether the pill is an established method of contraception, what would the plans determine?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me just respond that there are several schools of thought as to what the operation is as to what actually occurs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, would the gentleman consider the IUD a form of contraception? This is an approved method of contraception. Or would you consider the IUD as abortifacient?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me make it very clear there has to be a determination made, and maybe it is about time, with all of the resources at our disposal, we really came to a firm conclusion as to how some of these chemicals and how the IUD actually works, because, again, even Planned Parenthood and others will say on their web page that one of the consequences of the IUD may indeed be preventative of implantation .

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, does the gentleman include the diaphragm as a form of contraception?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No. As far as I know, that has never been an abortifacient.

Mrs. LOWEY. I seems to me the gentleman has questions about the pill, questions about the diaphragm, questions abut the IUD, and I assume the gentleman has questions about Depo—Provera and Norplant.

Let me say this, there are five established methods of contraception. If the gentleman supports the amendment to not cover abortion, then you are saying that contraception cannot be covered; no method of contraception can be covered.

□ 2115

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not at all. Right now the HMOs, and all of the health care providers under the Federal Employees Health Benefits program, if they choose, can provide any of those methods that you mentioned, from IUDs to Depo-Provera. What your amendment, or what the thrust of your original amendment was to force them to do it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, I just want to make it clear to my colleague that the gentleman from New Jersey, it appears to me from your statement, is trying to make every method of contraception an abortifacient; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not at all, and that is putting words in my mouth, and I think that is unfortunate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. LOWEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, if I can make it clear, I think it is very important, my colleagues, that we realize what the gentleman is attempting to achieve with this amendment. He is stating that there is no form of contraception that may not be considered an abortifacient and, therefore, the American women have to understand——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentlewoman will yield, I did not say that at all.

Mrs. LOWEY. No, I will not yield. I will not yield. That the American people who are listening to this debate have to understand that this Congress wants to tell women that all forms of contraception are abortifacients and they cannot be considered.

I would like to make that point again. The majority of American women do support the use of contraceptives. These are very personal decisions, we understand that, and each person has to make it for themselves. But the majority of American women understands that.

Now, it seems to me from this discussion, that the gentleman from New Jersey is saying to every woman who may take a birth control pill or use another one of the five accepted methods of contraception that they are abortionists.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not at all.

Mrs. LOWEY. I think it is important to clarify what we are talking about because the FDA has approved five methods of contraception.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey to explain his amendment and to answer any questions he may have.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear to my colleagues that birth control pills and diaphragms are not abortifacients. IUDs and post-coital pills have the capability of that. That is where there has been very little conversation, especially with women, as to what might be happening when they think they are preventing fertilization when, indeed, implantation is what is being prevented.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is confusion about this issue, and if I may, from my experience, please lend some of that to our body, one; and, number two, also relay that I had a conversation with the gentlewoman from New York, and I do understand what her intention is and I do understand the intention of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). She has an honorable request. She won that in her committee, and it should be honored in that way.

But let me clarify for this body that, in fact, the diaphragm is not an abortifacient; that oral contraceptives are not an abortifacient; that morning-after pills, in fact, are; that IUDs are, in fact, abortifacients.

Now, there is not a medical question about how they work, and there is not a medical question about how oral contraceptives work. Their intention is to prevent ovulation or to prevent penetration of a sperm. That is not an abortifacient. And there is no question in the medical community about how they work.

So I would ask this body that if, in fact, we feel we want to make a decision based on what the request of the gentlewoman from New York really is, that we supply oral contraceptives to women in this country, that we accept the Smith amendment to that, and we can qualify and solve this problem and this will go through. If, in fact, not, then we will see we will have an extended debate on whether or not the bill will make it.

An honorable amendment was brought forth in the committee. An honorable amendment to the gentlewoman's amendment is now offered. The clarity cannot be any clearer than what I have stated. The Smith amendment does not limit oral contraceptives, it only limits those things that are considered abortifacients.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I think that Members have to be very sensitive to what my colleague from New Jersey is attempting to do here today.

Is there no limit to my colleague's willingness to impose his concept of when life begins on others? Conception is a process. Fertilization of the egg is part of that process. But if that fertilized egg does not get implanted, it does not grow. And so on throughout the course of pregnancy.

For those who do not believe that life begins upon fertilization, but believes, in fact, that that fertilized egg has to be implanted, the gentleman is imposing his judgment as to when life begins on that person and, in so doing, denying them what might be the safest means of contraception available to them.

Some women cannot take the pill. It is too disruptive to them. Some women depend on intrauterine devices and other such contracptives. When we get to the point where we have the courage to do more research in contraception, we will have many other options to offer women so that they can have safe contraception.

For us to make the decision that that woman must choose a means of contraception that reflects any one individual's determination as to when in that process of conception life actually begins is a level of intrusion into conscience, into independence, into freedom that, frankly, I have never witnessed. Even the issue of being for or against abortion is a different issue than we debate here tonight. We have never, ever intruded to this depth.

When I talk to my friends who are obstetricians, because all my colleagues know my husband is a retired obstetrician, how the pills work is not simple. In some women they have one effect, and they may have first effects and secondary effects. They prevent ovulation in general but not absolutely. And if there is a fertilization while on the pill, the pill prevents implantation.

So this is a complex process. And for us to imagine here tonight that it is either right or proper or possible for the gentleman to impose his determination on others at this level is extraordinary. As a Republican who believes that government should stay out of our lives, I oppose this amendment with everything in me. And I would ask my colleagues, those who are pro life—and I honor that position. And I would say that the pro-life members of our Nation have changed the issue of abortion over these years. People take it far more seriously. It is not as casual. They have made an enormous difference for the good in our Nation. But that does not make it right for them to step, then, into this level and try to make definitions that, frankly, are not nearly so simple as my friend and respected colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), implies.

The lines are not clear. They are not simple. I would ask my colleague to respect that we are a Nation founded on the belief that we should have freedom of conscience and freedom of religion, and this amendment deeply, deeply compromises those liberties.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). 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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. RIGGS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for Friday, July 17 and today, on account of family reasons.

Mr. THOMPSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and tomorrow until 12 noon, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. JEFFERSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for July 21 and 22, on account of a death in the family.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and tomorrow until 12 noon, on account of official business.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 7:30 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

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. MEEHAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CALVERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma 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. MEEHAN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIND.
Mr. MANTON.
Ms. KILPATRICK.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. GREEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CALVERT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.
Mr. HEFLEY.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. RILEY.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. BRYANT.
Mr. MICA.
Mr. TALENT.
Mr. MCHUGH.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. UPTON.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1418. An act to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition, to the Committee on Resources, 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.

S. 638. An act to provide for the expeditions completion of the acquisition of private mineral interests within the Mount St. Helens National volcanic Monument mandated by the 1982 Act that established the Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1069. An act entitled the "National Discovery Trails Act of 1997; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1132. An act to modify the boundaries of the Bandelier National Monument to include the lands within the headwaters of the Upper Alamo Watershed which drain into the Monument and which are not currently within the jurisdiction of a Federal land management agency, to authorize purchase or donation of those lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1403. An act to amend the National Historic Preservation Act for purposes of establishing a national historic lighthouse preservation program; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1510. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the county of Rio Arriba, New Mexico; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1695. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and

feasibility of designating the Sand Creek Massacre National historic Site in the State of Colorado as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1807. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain parcels of public domain land in Lake County, Oregon, to facilitate management of the land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the culpability of Slobodan Milosevic for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in the former Yogoslavia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 21, 1998, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10065. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle, Bison, and Captive Cervids; Indemnity for Suspects [Docket No. 98-033-1] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10066. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Validated Brucellosis—Free States; Oklahoma [Docket No. 98-061-1] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10067. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Turkmenistan, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

10068. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

10069. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Eligibility for Membership and Advances [No. 98-15] (RIN: 3069-AA69) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

10070. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of Model Year 1999 High-Theft Vehicle Lines [Docket No. NHTSA-98-3752] (RIN: 2127-AH06) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10071. A letter from the Associate Managing Director for Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 1998 [MD Docket No. 98-36] received July 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10072. A letter from the Acting, Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Financial Disclosure by Clinical Investigators; Correction [Docket No. 93N-0445] received July 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10073. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

10074. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transportation of Hazardous Materials; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. RSPA-97-2905 (HM-166Y)] (RIN: 2137-AC41) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10075. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29260; Amdt. No. 1875] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received June 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10076. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29262; Amdt. No. 1877] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10077. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29261; Amdt. No. 1876] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10078. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-10642; AD 98-14-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10079. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Daytona Beach, FL; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 98-ASO-6] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10080. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Head of the Ohio, Allegheny River mile 0.0-3.3 (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10081. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Amendments; Organizational Changes; Miscellaneous Editorial Changes and Conforming Amendments [USCG-1998-3799] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10082. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; City of Pittsburgh Independence Eve Celebration Allegheny River mile 0.0-0.5, Monongehela River mile 0.0-0.2 and Ohio River mile 0.0-0.9 [CGD08-98-035] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10083. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Oakmont Yacht Club Regatta Allegheny River mile 12.0-13.0 [CGD08-98-031] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10084. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lake Pontchartrain, LA [CGD08-98-036] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10085. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—SPECIAL LOCAL REGULATIONS; Around Alone Sailboat Race, Charleston, SC [CGD07-98-008] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10086. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Steubenville Regatta, Ohio River mile 65.0-67.0 [CGD08-98-032] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10087. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Pittsburgh Three Rivers Regatta Allegheny River mile 0.0-0.5, Monongehela River mile 0.0-0.2 and Ohio River mile 0.0-0.9 [GCD08-98-033] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10088. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Great Lakes Pilotage; Reorganization of Regulations [USCG-1998-3976] Recieved July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10089. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS-350B, BA, B1, B2, and D, and Model AS-355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters [Docket No. 97-SW-25-AD; Amendment 39-10635; AD 98-14-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10090. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Model 172R Airplanes [Docket No. 97-CE-96-AD; Amendment 39-10641; AD 98-14-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10091. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada PW100 Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 97-ANE-33-AD; Amendment 39-10636; AD 98-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10092. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspcace; Philadelphia, PA [Airspace Docket No. 98-AEA-02] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10093. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Farmville, VA [Airspace Docket No. 98-AEA-07] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10094. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Marion, OH Correction [Airspace Docket No. 98-AGL-20] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10095. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace BAe Model ATP Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-113-AD; Amendment 39-10640; AD 98-14-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10096. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Inc. KT 76A Air Traffic Control (ATC) Transponders [Docket No. 97-CE-30-AD; Amendment 39-10637; AD 98-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10097. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland Model DHC-8-100, -200, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-336-AD; Amendment 39-10638; AD 98-14-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10098. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-103-AD; Amendment 39-10639; AD 98-14-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10099. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rules and regulations [Revenue Procedure 98-42] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10100. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Social Security Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Supplemental Security Income for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled; Charging Administration Fees for Making State Supplementary Payments [Regulations No. 16] (RIN: 0960-AE84) received July 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10101. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Social Security Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Supplemental Security Income for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled; Valuation of the In-Kind Support and Maintenance With Cost-of-Living Adjustment (RIN: 0960-AD82) received July 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 references to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3249. A bill to provide for the rectification of certain retirement coverage errors affecting Federal employees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-625 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3874. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to make improvements to the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children and to extend the authority of that program through fiscal year 2003; with amendments (Rept. 105-633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 8. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to deny entry into the United States of certain foreign motor vehicles that do not comply with State laws governing motor vehicles emissions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4274. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4276. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 504. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-637). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 121. Resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; adversely (Rept. 105-638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4057. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. PORTER:

H.R. 4274. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KIM, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 4275. A bill to reauthorize and make reforms to programs authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, 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 Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 4276. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4277. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by making the antitrust laws apply to negotiations by groups of health care professionals and certain other associations that are engaged in negotiations with health maintenance organizations and other health insurance issuers in the same manner as such laws apply to collective bargaining by labor organizations under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 4278. A bill to require the provision of health care benefits under Federal contracts and subcontracts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, 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 Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the application of the alternative minimum tax to the transfer of stock pursuant to an incentive stock option; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHALE (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FORD, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr.

GALLEGLY, Mr. HORN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. ETHERIDGE):

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of children and families in the United States and expressing support for the goals of National KidsDay and National Family Month; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should declare Kneeling Nun Mountain in Grant County, New Mexico, to be a national monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 505. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the importance of diplomatic relations with the Pacific Island nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 506. A resolution providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the second session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 45: Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 71: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 296: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 677: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 687: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1032: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 1126: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1288: Mr. CANADY of Florida.
H.R. 1320: Mr. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1321: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 1338: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1404: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1636: Ms. LEE and Mr. FARR of California.
H.R. 1689: Mr. CHAMBLISS.
H.R. 2397: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2409: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2509: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2579: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 2869: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 2914: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. THOMPSON.
H.R. 2944: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2955: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2968: Mr. PITTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 2982: Mrs. MORELLA and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 3022: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 3234: Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 3248: Mr. GUTKNECHT and Mrs. WILSON.
H.R. 3251: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3262: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 3281: Mr. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3572: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3610: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 3710: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOYD, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3779: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BASS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COSTELLO, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3782: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.
H.R. 3790: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WHITE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. MCINTOSH.
H.R. 3792: Mr. METCALF.
H.R. 3815: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FROST, Mr. KLUG, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 3821: Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. WILSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 3862: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.
H.R. 3879: Mr. PITTS, Mr. HYDE, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 3905: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3985: Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 4006: Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4035: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4036: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4071: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 4084: Mr. MANTON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 4095: Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 4121: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 4125: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. CRAPO.
H.R. 4147: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 4151: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4155: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4188: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 4196: Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 4197: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ENSIGN.
H.R. 4206: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WALSH, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4217: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4220: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 4224: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 4232: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4236: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 4248: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BALDACCI.
H.R. 4250: Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 4257: Mr. REGULA.
H.J. Res 40: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H. Con. Res. 224: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 229: Mr. SAXTON.
H. Con. Res. 278: Mr. COOK and Mr. RILEY.
H. Con. Res. 290: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. POSHARD.
H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 98: Mrs. BONO.
H. Res. 421: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 459: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SHERMAN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2183

OFFERED BY: MR. DELAY

(To the Amendment Offered By: Mr. Shays or Mr. Meehan)

AMENDMENT NO. 172: Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. REQUIRING EXPRESS ADVOCACY TO BE DETERMINED WITHOUT REGARD TO BACKGROUND MUSIC.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), as amended by sections 101, 401, and 507, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"DETERMINATION OF EXPRESS ADVOCACY WITHOUT REGARD TO BACKGROUND MUSIC

"SEC. 326. In determining whether any communication by television or radio broadcast constitutes express advocacy for purposes of this Act, there shall not be taken into account any background music used in such broadcast.".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. GALLEGLY

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Add after the final section the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to collect entrance fees, or to pay the salaries of personnel of the Forest Service who collect entrance fees, pursuant to the recreation fee demonstration program authorized by section 315 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (section 101(c) of Public Law 104–134; 16 U.S.C. 4601–6a note), for a unit of the National Forest System from a person who resides within such unit or within 20 miles of any entrance to such unit.

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. GUTIERREZ

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 2, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by $1,000,000)".

Page 56, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $1,000,000)".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. GUTIERREZ

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Add after the final section the following new section:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES" under the heading "BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT" and increasing the amount for "STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY" under the heading "FOREST SERVICE" (for removal of trees in Chicago, Illinois, infected with the Asian Longhorn Beetle and for replacement of such trees), both by $1,000,000.

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 68, beginning at line 13, strike "for indirect" and all that follows through line 16 and insert the following: "may not be used for indirect support activities (as defined in the Forest Service Handbook).".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC.—. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to construct any road in the Tongass National Forest.

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. PAPPAS

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 19, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $50,000,000)".

Page 88, line 14, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by $25,000,000)".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. PARKER

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 81, line 8, strike "*Provided further*" and all that follows through "funding agreements:" on line 21.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SGT. DONALD WAYNE SLOVER'S SACRIFICE

HON. LINDA SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, recently, a friend forwarded a copy of this personal letter to us. The thoughts expressed in the letter hit close to home. We hope everyone can take a moment and reflect upon Sgt. Slover's sacrifice.

DEAR AMERICA: I am writing this letter to extend thanks to all the American people who still, despite the recent headlines undermining the ethics and morality of the military, understand that our jobs and way of life are necessary to preserve the "American" way of life. I once thought that "America" viewed us as most media portrays us; immoral, unethical, and uncivilized. My recent travels led me to conclude that the opposite is true. You, the American people, that honor and respect what we do, deserve a public "thank you."

Just a few weeks ago, a tragedy embedded itself in the tall evergreen forests at the Joint Readiness Training Center in Fort Polk, LA. As a tank slowly slalomed through the trees after sunset on January 14, 1998, the tank commander fell victim to the inherent danger of the military.

Sgt. Donald Wayne Slover passed away that night as he was guiding his tank through the thickest of trees, fog, and rain. The tank's edge clipped and uprooted a tree, which sent it crashing to the ground. The medics, arriving on site only minutes later, felt Sgt. Slover's last pulse.

As one of two military escorts, I was required to accompany the remains from the training area to the burial site, ensuring the proper and unimpaired delivery to the next of kin. The obligation required a two day journey from Fort Hood, TX, to Williamsburg, KY, via Fort Polk, LA. Loading unloading and transportation of the remains required our physical presence. This particular trip entailed a three hour van ride, a connecting flight in Atlanta en route to Knoxville, and a 1 hour drive to Williamsburg, KY.

Upon boarding initial flight out of Houston we informed the flight attendant of our duties. After explaining that it was necessary for us to depart the plane first upon landing (so as not to delay the cargo personnel unloading the casket), two gentlemen offered their seats in the first row of the plane for our last row seats.

This gesture left me speechless. I'm not so sure they even knew our purpose for having to be first off the plane, but with no questions immediately sacrificed their front row seats. After arriving in Atlanta, we were escorted by airport personnel off the plane and down to the tarmac. Standing in our dress green uniforms, we watched as the airline employees carefully unloaded the casket onto the cargo truck. The truck drove off to the departing gate and we made our way back inside the terminal. We met the cargo truck at the departure gate and again were escorted down to the tarmac to supervise the loading of our final flight. Following the loading, we turned and headed back to the terminal. As we made that walk, I noticed that we were being watched by the crowd awaiting the outbound flight. Not thinking much about it at the time, I scurried out of the cold and awaited the boarding call.

We boarded the plane and again informed the flight attendant of our duties and departure requirements. The flight was booked, every seat filled, and she told us that she would make an announcement upon landing that we were to exit the plane first.

Having been on full flights before, I was certain that this announcement would be ignored. Passengers are normally elbow deep in the overhead compartments as soon as the wheels touch the ground. I was 100% positive I would be the last person off that flight. But I took my seat in the back of the plane, my partner 10 rows in front, and with all of my military skills tried to devise a plan that could project me to the front of that plane upon landing. I concluded that even generals would have a rough time planning such an operation.

As the plane touched down in Knoxville, the flight attendant gave the standard "keep your seat-belts fastened until the captain turns off the seat-belt sign" announcement. She then led into the fact that two military escorts were on-board and that everyone must remain in their seats until we departed the plane. The plane parked and to my astonishment, not a soul moved. I'd never witnessed such absolute silence in my life.

Many of the passengers turned their heads to the rear of the plane but not a sound was made as myself and the other escort donned our jackets, grabbed our bags, and headed down the aisle. I realized then that all eyes were on us. As we neared the exit an older gentleman leaned toward us and broke the silence with something I will never forget, "God bless you both," he said. I am, sir, most truly blessed. I have been afforded the opportunity to work alongside some of the greatest sons and daughters of our nation.

We know and understand that each day presents the possibility of injury and/or death and we take all precautions to prevent them. But we sacrifice that possibility because you depend on us. We train through the roughest of conditions, with minimum sleep and limited resources, anywhere at anytime, to ensure we are always ready. We, sir, are most honored that you entrust us to defend your country.

So I'm writing this letter to say thanks. Thank you, Delta Airlines, thank you gentlemen for your seats, thank you sir for your blessings, and thank you America for your support. You see . . . we as soldiers don't expect you to understand the ways in which we live, train, and fight; we just ask for a thank you from time to time. A little appreciation from the people we're defending weighs more than a chestful of awards and medals.

Sgt. Donald Wayne Slover gave his life training to defend the very code of morality and ethics he exemplified and believed in. Sgt. Slover believed in the Army and his country. I worked alongside Sgt. Slover for over a year. He was good at his job and he loved it. He never complained and always did what was asked of him. Sgt. Slover always maintained the courage of his convictions. I hope he is laid to rest knowing he was appreciated. If not, we failed as a nation and we owe it to him.

Sgt. Slover . . . thank you! You will be missed!

DANIEL ASHLEY,
1–10 CAVALRY:
READY AND FORWARD.

TRIBUTE TO ELSIE BUCHENAU

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Elsie Buchenau for her dedicated service to the Madera County Central Committee and to the Republican Party.

Elsie Buchenau was born on October 5, 1907 in Firebaugh, California. Her family consisting of four girls and one boy, moved to a Madera vineyard in the La Vina area in 1912. She attended La Vina Grammar School, then Madera High School where she graduated in 1924. After working for a prominent attorney and a Realtor she moved to San Francisco for five years. She then married Herb Buchenau, a local cattleman and farmer, in 1937 and then moved to the Buchenau home ranch northeast of Madera, where she still lives.

Mrs. Elsie Buchenau has been active in the Republican Party for many years and served as chairperson for the Madera County Central Committee for eight years, and vice president of the California Republican Party. She has also been a member of the Madera Republican Women and a delegate and twice an alternate to the Republican National Convention.

Elsie Buchenau is also a member of the Madera County Cattleman's Association and was named Cattle woman of the Year in 1979. In 1994, Elsie Buchenau was named Farmer of the Year by the Madera District Chamber of Commerce. Mrs. Buchenau has also volunteered her time with the Madera Community Hospital League and the St. Vincent de Paul Store, which supports Catholic charities.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to Elsie Buchenau for her decades of service to the Republican Party, the Madera County Central Committee, and to her community. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Elsie Buchenau best wishes for the future.

WINFIELD SCOTT STRATTON: A GREAT HUMANITARIAN

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, July 22, 1998, will mark the 150 anniversary of the birth of Winfield Scott Stratton, a great Colorado humanitarian.

In Colorado, this date will be recognized by 25 different events celebrating his life and good deeds. It is appropriate that we commemorate the deeds of this distinguished humanitarian from Colorado Springs, Colorado.

He reached out to his fellow man in so many ways during his lifetime. His biggest contribution and blessing was his endowment of the Myron Stratton Home. Some of his benevolent good deeds include buying the old courthouse in Colorado Springs and furnishing the county with the money to build a new courthouse on a city block that he provided. He also purchased a corner lot downtown for $70,000 offering it to the federal government for half of its value in order to build a new post office. It was recently named the Winfield Scott Stratton Post Office by a new Congressional Act. In addition to these contributions, Stratton also built a convention hall and pavilion seating 35,000 people for the use of the city and gave five thousand dollars a year to keep it maintained. He donated supplies worth $50,000 when the fire of 1896 in Cripple Creek Colorado left 5,000 people without shelter or goods. He also gave $25,000 to the Colorado School of Mines to complete the "Hall of Metallurgy", recognized by Colorado's 13th General Assembly. He made gifts of $70,000 to Colorado College and $25,000 to the Colorado Deaf and Blind School. Stratton donated approximately $85,000 to feed and house the homeless; made substantial contributions to churches, supported miners, laborers, laundry women and others in need.

Stratton's most lasting gift was a bequest in his handwritten will directing that his wealth be delivered to the trustees of a charitable institution for acting and maintaining a free home, "for poor persons without means of support, and who are physically unable by reason of old age, youth, sickness or other infirmity to earn a livelihood." This home is called the Myron Stratton Home in honor of his father.

After Stratton "stuck it rich" he continued to live frugally and simply by helping the poor, saying "I count my money as a gift from the father of us all, and I am responsible for its administration as a good steward." Stratton backed his philosophy with action and no other individual gave so generously to so many individuals and organizations. Stratton's benevolent gifts in today's world would be astronomical. Before he died in 1902, he gave away over $3 million. In any time of prosperity there will be many children from broken homes who could be helped by homes like the Myron Stratton Home. Winfield Scott Stratton, was a man of vision and one of Colorado's greatest humanitarians. His good deeds continue to be a good example of our need to help one another.

ALLSTATE FOUNDATION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ongoing efforts of the Allstate Foundation, which works in partnership with national and local nonprofit organizations in the areas of community and economic development, automobile and highway safety, and personal safety and security. Through corporate investment, marketing initiatives, and employee volunteer projects, the Allstate Foundation delivers on its commitments to build and strengthen our communities. I am proud to have Allstate headquartered in my District.

Since 1991, Allstate Foundation has been working in conjunction with the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and the Department of Justice to help spread the message to families across the nation that identifying and practicing effective crime prevention methods is essential to their safety and welfare. In the eight-year history of this partnership, the Allstate Foundation has consistently supported the efforts of the National Crime Prevention Council by identifying and funding innovative and prevention and awareness tools. The Foundation first demonstrated its outstanding level of commitment to community safety by providing significant funding for the further enrichment and distribution of a 1993 Council auto theft prevention publication.

In 1996, Allstate helped to create the NCPC's growing presence on the world wide web, giving more people more crime prevention know-how than ever before. Today, five sites are on-line because of Allstate's contributions. These sites offer answers to basic questions about what one individual—or ten—can do to help stop crime and build better, stronger communities. The web sites engage teens, parents, teachers, law enforcement officials, grandparents, and business owners in fighting crime—giving them concrete examples of what they can do, outlining proven strategies, and informing them about training opportunities and events.

Since May 1, 1997, the National Crime Prevention Council's On-Line Resource Center has welcomed more than 100,000 visitors. Visits have skyrocketed to more than 16,000 a month, and this number is growing every day, a testament to the site's quality and effectiveness in spreading the Council's crime prevention message.

The partnership among the NCPC, the Department of Justice, and the Allstate Foundation deserves much credit for their successful on-line project. There are already plans to expand the website's content and exposure as part of a multi-million dollar public service campaign on radio and TV, and in print and on billboards across the country. The Allstate Foundation's safety team has also worked with NCPC to adapt the video, Are You Safe: A National Test on Crime Prevention for use by its agents as a public service to help educate individuals on personal and home security.

With further input from law enforcement, criminal justice, and private sector communities, and with Allstate's continued involvement, the web project and other National Crime Prevention Council initiatives will continue to serve as great tools for all Americans in the fight to prevent crime. I commend the Allstate Foundation for their contributions to this noble cause.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 17, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4194) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It accomplishes a goal that America's veterans believe is important and that Congress should strongly support.

My amendment has been endorsed by the American Legion, AMVETS, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the Vietnam Veterans of America.

Almost identical legislation that I introduced last year received strong bipartisan support.

As the ranking Democrat on the Veterans Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Health, I have become very familiar with the serious problem of sexual abuse and harassment in the military.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is responsible for treating the victims of these crimes and abuses. In my oversight role on the Health Subcommittee I have had the opportunity to speak with and learn from women veterans who suffered from this abuse.

The high rate of sexual abuse in the armed services requires continued action on this issue.

In 1996, approximately 190,000 women served in our armed services.

That year, the Pentagon conducted a survey of active duty women and found that five percent of women had been the victims of sexual assault during their period of military service.

National surveys conducted by the VA indicate that approximately 20 percent of women seeking services from VA medical facilities report having experienced a rape or other form of assault on active duty while 35 to 50 percent report suffering some form of sexual harassment.

Such findings—and high profile news reports of incidents of abuse—have made clear the existence of a very serious problem in our armed forces and the need to move more aggressively to end the tragedy of sexual violence and harassment.

Rick Schultz, the executive director of the Vietnam Veterans of America, which supports

this initiative, said, "in our nation's fervor to prosecute the offenders, we must not forget to attend to the needs of the victims."

This amendment puts those words into law.

This amendment also is smart policy.

The prevalence of substance abuse, homelessness, family breakdown, poverty and the receipt of public assistance is higher among women veterans who suffered from abuse during their military service than it is among the general women veterans population.

The women veterans that I have spoken with told me that the VA's program had helped them turn their lives around. Helped them get off public assistance, to treat their addictions and become active in their families and communities once again.

Sadly, the VA's sexual trauma treatment program is scheduled to expire at the end of this year.

The possible termination of this program would be tragic for the thousands of women who have benefited from the services provided by the VA.

More than 18,000 women veterans and 200 male veterans have sought and received therapeutic counseling at hundreds of VA medical facilities throughout America.

I believe we have an obligation to maintain these services.

Our failure to ensure a safe environment for women in the armed services compels us to reauthorize this vital program.

Unfortunately, current law also does not enable all the victims of sexual abuse in the military to receive counseling at the VA.

Current law excludes active and former reservists and national guard members from seeking this vital care.

This is a serious oversight that needs correction.

Female reservists have been the victims of sexual abuse while on active duty in the Gulf and in Bosnia. They have come back with the scars of these crimes and have not been afforded care at VA facilities.

Reservists have also been the victims of these serious crimes during their active training.

Unfortunately, these crimes often go unreported because the Defense Department refuses to investigate offenses that affect nonactive duty soldiers.

Because of this policy, no recourse exists for reservists and no care is provided.

This is wrong and my amendment will correct this loophole.

The Department of Veterans Affairs wants this program reauthorized until 2002 and Congress should comply with this request.

The veterans community wants this program reauthorized and wants all the victims of sexual abuse during their military service to be eligible for proper treatment.

As Josephus Vandengoobergh (VAN–DEN–GO–BER), the National Commander of AMVETS, states in a letter of support for my amendment, "AMVETS strongly supports Congressman Guiterrez's amendment to HR 4194, to reauthorize and improve the VA's sexual trauma program. If nothing is done, this program will expire in December. We would like to see it established as a permanent program, we believe it has proved its worth."

Today, our nation has more than 1.2 million women veterans.

This amendment would respond to their needs and help them gain the recognition they deserve and care they have earned.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and honor our obligations to women veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter in the RECORD the letter from Josephus Vandengoobergh, the National Commander of AMVETS, in support of my amendment.

AMVETS
Lanham, MD, July 14, 1998.

Hon. GERALD SOLOMON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: AMVETS strongly supports Congressman Luis Gutierrez's amendment to H.R. 4194 (the VA/HUD Appropriations Bill) to reauthorize and improve the "Veterans Sexual Trauma Treatment Act."

AMVETS, along with other veterans service organizations, the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Government Accounting Office, testified earlier this year to the House Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Health that this program needs to be reauthorized. We would like to see it established as a permanent program; we believe it has proved its worth.

Enclosed is our testimony, as well as the testimony of the VA and GAO. Mr. Gutierrez's amendment would reauthorize the program and expand its scope to cover Reservists and National Guard who experienced sexual trauma during military duty. Currently VA includes these groups in the program; therefore, no additional costs will be incurred by their addition.

If nothing is done, the program will expire in December of this year. According to VA, more than 18,000 women veterans and 200 male veterans have accessed sexual trauma counseling services. Please help save this viable program.

Sincerely,
JOSEPHUS C. VANDENGOOBERGH,
National Commander.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ANNE SPEAKE

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Anne Speake for being selected to receive the Central California Women in Business Advocate of the Year Award by the U.S. Small Business Administration. Ms. Speake is viewed as a role model for all women owning businesses. Not only is she a tremendous asset as a mentor, but she is also a leader in our business community.

Anne Speake is the owner and operator of the International English Institute. Anne started this business over 15 years ago, and is successful not only here in the Valley but globally through the International English Institute. Most recently she was selected as the Fresno Chamber of Commerce President. As Chamber President, Anne will be influential in shaping and molding the Valley's policy toward small businesses.

The Women in Business Advocate Award is presented annually to individuals who fulfill a commitment to the advancement of women's business ownership. Selection criteria for the award is based on the following areas: 1) Efforts to increase business and financial opportunities for women; 2) Legal, financial or managerial assistance; 3) Voluntary efforts to strengthen the role of women business owners within the community; 4) Advocacy of the women-owned business community as a whole.

Anne Speake was nominated for this award by Glendale Federal Bank. Anne Speake is viewed as a consensus builder and a leader. She commands respect from others, because she leads by example. Ms. Speake is deeply committed to our community, through her active involvement in the Fresno Business Council and the Fresno Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to Anne Speake of the International English Institute. Mrs. Speake exemplifies what it means to be an advocate for small business. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Anne Speake many more years of success.

NEEDED: GOOD HELICOPTERS, NOT ACADEMIC DEBATE IN COLOMBIA; EIGHT ANTI-DRUG POLICE DIE IN HUEY CRASH

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week in northern Colombia, eight Colombian National Police (CNP) officers from the eilte DANTI anti-drug unit died following a crash of one of the U.S.-provided, Vietnam-era Huey helicopters. These anti-drug police officers died flying a worn out 35-year-plus chopper after a take down operation against a rightwing paramilitary cocaine lab in the Uraba region, near the border with Panama.

Congress has argued that these good police officers fighting our fight against drugs before they reach our streets and kill our kids, deserve the best helicopter equipment we can provide. The House International Relations Committee has long argued for better and crash-survivable helicopters. Regrettably the State Department has resisted these efforts.

This aged helicopter fleet puts at risk the few good men and women of DANTI (only 3,000). CNP leader General Serrano doesn't have an unlimited number of good police officers. He no longer will have the courageous and dedicated service of Major Vodmar Galeano, the Chief of Operations for DANTI, and Captain Martin Sierra, Chief Helicopter Instructor Pilot, among the others killed in the most recent crash.

Their loss diminishes our national interests, as well as that of Colombia, where these illicit drugs finance all sides in a raging narcobased war, threatening South America's oldest democracy.

AMERICA'S LOOKING FOR ITS MISSING CHILDREN PROGRAM

HON. JOHN M. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a very important program. It's not a government program, but an example of our private sector partnering effectively with the public sector to tackle pressing social problems.

In 1985, ADVO, Inc., the nation's largest direct mail marketing company, partnered with The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The Adam Walsh Child Resource Center, the Juvenile Division of the Department of Justice, and the U.S. Postal Service to lend a hand in the recovery of missing and exploited children. One of the leaders of that partnership, ADVO Senior Vice President Vincent Giuliano, recently came to Capitol Hill to share with the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus this amazing success story. I encourage my colleagues and every citizen to take an interest in this important program, which is doing so much to help the nation's missing and exploited children.

As a direct result of this innovative program, ADVO has helped the authorities recover 88 children and to reunite them with their families. Approximately one out of every seven children featured in the program has been recovered.

How was this amazing success possible? First, a bit of background about ADVO's business. In delivering its advertising circulars, ADVO utilizes a little white card that functions as the address label and is detached from the advertising package itself. Most of us probably wouldn't have seen much in those cards. But Vince Giuliano saw in those cards an opportunity. Because he realized that those cards reach a huge portion of the American public—today they are seen by over 150 million Americans living in more than 60 million homes every week, and reach another 13 million homes through ADVO's direct mail partners—he saw possibility. He saw in that huge distribution network an opportunity to help find America's missing and exploited children.

Mr. Giuliano developed a public service program through which ADVO printed the pictures of missing children on those address cards. The U.S. Postal Service is a proud partner with ADVO, having changed its regulations in 1985 to allow pictures and data provided by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to appear on the cards.

In addition to the obvious benefit of finding missing children, the program makes other contributions. The pictures of the missing children on the cards help raise public awareness and sensitivity to the problem of missing and exploited children. In addition, the program serves as a powerful deterrent to would-be abductors, to whom this program states, "You can run, but you can't hide." And, this program makes sure that no child is forgotten no matter how long he or she has been missing.

Accompanying Mr. Giuliano as he spoke to the Caucus was Krystle Bondello of Warminister, Pennsylvania. She is the living embodiment of the success of this program. She was abducted by her non-custodial father in 1993 and has been the subject of a nationwide search by police and the FBI. After no leads turned up in the case, Krystle appeared on one of the ADVO fliers which at that time reached 57 million homes.

Within a couple of hours of the deliveries of those cards, the FBI tracked her father to California and Krystle was ultimately recovered and reunited with her mother.

Because of so many success stories like Krystle's, this program has been widely and deservedly praised. It won the award of excellence from the Adam Walsh Child Resource Center on January 28, 1986. On July 23, 1987, President Reagan presented ADVO the Steuben Glass Tetrahedron, the most prestigious Presidential Award for Private Sector Initiatives. On September 24, 1987 he honored ADVO with the President's Child Safety Partnership Award.

President Bush and Congressional leaders celebrated National Missing Children's Day and the fifth anniversary of the program by honoring three "Unsung Heroes" for their role in helping to reunite missing children with their families with a Capitol Hill ceremony on May 25, 1990.

ADVO recently added an innovative enhancement to the program in hopes of recovering more missing children. It now targets its photo distribution to leverage the NCMEC's and the FBI's intelligence, when possible, on the likely whereabouts of a missing child. A photo can now be pinpointed to one of six regions in the country, or distributed nationwide over a six-week period.

If imitation is, indeed, the most sincere form of flattery, the folks at ADVO deserve to feel flattered. Other organizations—including several Members of Congress—have recognized the effectiveness of ADVO's program and are starting spin-off programs of their own. For example, my office recently began working with NCMEC and the New York State Missing & Exploited Children Clearinghouse to identify three children from my congressional district who are currently missing. Soon, the envelopes sent from my office will bear the photos of those kids in an effort to raise awareness and perhaps locate and recover them.

I want to take this opportunity to praise ADVO for its spirit of innovation and for caring enough to work to tackle this heartbreaking and seemingly intractable problem. I also want to commend the United States Postal Service, for amending its regulations to allow that creative spirit to flourish. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, The Adam Walsh Child Resource Center, and The Juvenile Division of the Department of Justice are all cooperating organizations and are also deserving of our thanks. Finally, I wish to commend and to thank all of the noble Americans who took it upon themselves to look at these cards and contact the authorities with information. Without this final ingredient of citizen participation, these amazing results would not have been possible.

HONORING THE FILIPINO COMMUNITY OF DELANO, CA, ON THEIR 24TH ANNUAL PHILIPPINE WEEKEND FESTIVAL

HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an entire community in Kern County, California, at the Southern end of the 20th district. For twenty-four years, the unique Philippine Weekend Festival has been a way for the Filipino community of Delano to celebrate their culture and traditions over three full days.

The festival is the largest Filipino cultural event held in the state of California, attracting over 10,000 people each year. Founded in 1975 by members of the Filipino Athletic League in Delano, the concept sought to bring community unity to the local Filipino populations: the manongs, or island-born, the mestizos, or U.S.-born, and the younger new immigrants in addition to already established and emerging Filipino organizations.

Today, twenty-four years after its grassroots beginnings, a formal board of directors and two standing committees (the Philippine Weekend Committee and the Filipino Athletic League) oversee the more than twenty events which make up the celebration. A dynamic mix of young and old, male and female, rich and poor, gather together in an annual show of driving energy and creativity to celebrate Kern County's rich Filipino heritage.

I am proud to be able to attend this remarkable event this year, as I have in years past, to join in celebrating the Filipino culture and traditions, and to take part in helping to keep those traditions alive. The Filipino community of Delano, and all across the San Joaquin Valley, is to be commended for their hard work on continuing to sponsor this wonderful event, and their profound sense of community strength and cultural unity. Congratulations on the 24th Annual Philippine Weekend Festival, and may there be many more to come!

HONORING ADMIRAL THOMAS T. MATTESON

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor RADM Thomas T. Matteson, USMS, who, on July 21, 1998, will retire from the position of Superintendent of the Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) after a total of 41 years of federal service to our nation.

While others might have sought permanent retirement after 36 years of active duty in the Coast Guard, RADM Matteson chose to continue to serve America at the United States Merchant Marine Academy. RADM Matteson was on the bridge for five years navigating through perilous and uncharted waters. As he quickly became familiar with the dynamics of the vast maritime and intermodal transportation industry, he strove to ensure that the

USMMA's program produced graduates that would serve America's global economic and defense needs.

His time as Superintendent has not been easy. Early in his command he faced the possible closure of the Academy. Congressional action resolved this issue at the same time that RADM Matteson ensured the Academy received its ten-year accreditation. In addition, tight federal fiscal policy required good and sometimes creative stewardship to ensure the effects of level funding did not adversely impact the Academy's academic program.

During his tenure at the Merchant Marine Academy, Admiral Matterson strove to create a better learning and personal environment for the midshipmen. His guiding hand enhanced the curriculum by creating the new Shipyard and Engineering Management, and Intermodal Transportation majors, and by planning the evolution of a trimester system. Along with his wife Dottie, RADM Matteson strengthened the bond between the Academy's leadership and the regiment by personally cooking hundreds of meals in his home for the future leaders of America, the academy's midshipmen.

By traveling around the country to meet with the Academy's alumni body, RADM Matteson discussed the needs of the Academy and supported the need for the Alumni Associations Superintendents Campaign for Excellence, an endowment campaign to fund academic excellence, curriculum development, new technology and learning systems, and leadership training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

Today, thanks to the devotion of RADM Matteson, the United States Merchant Marine Academy continues to be the most cost-effective federal academy, whose graduates serve our nation for many years beyond their required commitment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to rise and join with me today in wishing RADM Matteson and his wife fair winds, following seas, a joyous retirement.

TRIBUTE TO BOBBIE BYRD

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bobbie Byrd on the occasion of her 100th Birthday. The event will be celebrated on August, 1, 1998.

Bobbie Byrd was born in Linden, Tennessee on August 1, 1898. She spent the first 35 years of her life performing the rugged chores of farm life with her family. After marriage to Hurshell M. Byrd, she moved to Fresno, California.

Bobbie Byrd's grandfather fought in the Civil War, and her brother J.E. Marvin served in the U.S. Navy during World War I. Her husband, H. M. Byrd, was in the Naval battle at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. After her husband was discharged from the United States Navy because of wounds he received in the battle in the South Pacific theatre, Mrs. Byrd and family moved to Richmond, California. There the entire family worked hard to support the war effort in the U.S. Navy ships yards. Bobbie Byrd played the role of babysitter for several children so that family members could work to build ships in support of the national defense.

At the end of World War II, the Byrd family returned to Fresno and Mrs. Byrd's time was completely occupied with caring for her family and installing in them a value system which formed a strong family and therefore a strong nation. She is still a vital part of her family which includes two granddaughters and four great grandsons.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to Bobbie Byrd on her 100th birthday. Mrs. Byrd's dedication to her family and her country serve as a great role model for all Americans. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mrs. Byrd best wishes for the future.

IN HONOR OF PIPEFITTERS LOCAL UNION #120

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Pipefitters Local Union, #120, in Cleveland, Ohio. After one hundred years in existence, the union still successfully protects the lives, health, and honor of its members and their families.

Since its beginning, Pipefitters Local Union #120 has worked to defend its members' rights by advocating reasonable working hours, higher pay, and increased job security. After WWII, the union was one of the first locals to champion the novel idea of incorporating more apprenticeships and training programs in their field. This promising idea resulted in literally tens of thousands of new talented Americans becoming apprentice pipefitters. Having witnessed the day-to-day hard work and dedication to their craft, it is clear to me that members of the Pipefitters Local Union #120 bring skills, training and integrity to every job.

As technology has changed, pipefitters have used new methods and materials, meeting demands for safer and more efficient systems. Pipefitters bring the technology to ensure safety, improve health, and protect lives to each new home or office in Cleveland. Pipefitters Local #120 is responsible for parts in the heating, air conditioning and fire safety systems in Cuyahoga County, and its four surrounding counties. Every day, every citizen of northeast Ohio is touched by the good work of this union local.

Currently, Pipefitters Local #120 is working on many new and exciting projects, such as Cleveland's new football stadium, NASA, and renovations at the Cleveland Clinic and Cleveland Hopkins Airport. Their mark is surely being left on the Greater Cleveland area, and I applaud them for the contributions they make to the local community.

After a century, Pipefitters Local still stands strong, prepared and willing to meet the challenges that await. One hundred years of hard work surely deserves recognition, and I wish the men and women of Pipefitters Local Union #120 the best in the years to come.

We owe them a debt of gratitude.

MAINTAIN INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION FUNDING

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to oppose the proposed amendment by Rep. Roemer, eliminating the funding for an International Space Station (ISS). The funding for this project has undergone a thorough investigation and found to be justifiable. Having developed much of the hardware that is needed for the ISS, it is senseless to eliminate the funding that would have allowed NASA to utilize this hardware. As we debate this amendment, the hardware for the first three flights are awaiting a launch in Florida.

Each NASA launch brings a tremendous amount of research benefits back to our country. Medical research done in space, and technology developed for astronauts by NASA, have substantially benefited medical care here on Earth. NASA's research has led to the development of a voice activated wheelchair for paralyzed patients who cannot control a chair manually. Symptoms that arise from diseases such as multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, and spina bifida, have been improved due to a custom-made cooling suit used in astronaut space suits. Modern methods of examining breast tissue, without a surgical biopsy, can be attributed to NASA, as well as Ultrasound scanners that play a key role in diagnosing the treatment of severe burns.

We often take for granted information that is available to us on a regular basis because of NASA and space exploration. Accurate weather reports of severe storms, down to the exact time a high or low pressure system will hit a certain locale, are derived from the Barorator, a tool developed for the Space Shuttle. Alternative farming methods such as hydroponics are worked on in space because of the potential uses on and off of the orbiters.

The desire for renewable energy methods has become more prevalent around the world. Solar energy, through a photo-voltaic power system, was developed for various spacecraft applications. This system has been used to supply power to isolated villages, communication systems, various military systems, and a variety of other services in areas where no conventional power source exists. This photovoltaic system is constantly being improved.

Aside from these practical medical and social benefits to the ISS, there is a clear political benefit. It serves as a force to unify all of the space-faring nations of the world. The International Space Station is the largest scientific cooperative program in history, bringing together 16 nations, thus providing international commercial opportunities for the United States. It would become a serious problem for the United States to withdraw from their commitment to the Space Station. It would cost a significant amount of money, almost a billion dollars, just to terminate the program contracts.

An independent cost evaluation team went through a detailed, exact investigation of the

ISS program. This Cost Assessment and Validation Task Force praised the ISS management team because of its resourceful methods of managing the challenges associated with an international partnership of this magnitude.

There is so much empirical evidence that the benefits from space exploration outweigh the costs. Cutting future funding would not just be a sheer waste of hardware already developed, but a huge waste of potential as well. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to celebrate our space work and applaud NASA's efforts by voting against the Roemer amendment.

CONGRATULATING THE JESUITS OF THE MISSOURI PROVINCE

HON. JAMES M. TALENT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Jesuits of the Missouri Province as they celebrate the 175th anniversary of the arrival of Jesuits to the St. Louis area. It is a true privilege for me to recognize the many important accomplishments and achievements which have marked the Jesuit presence in the St. Louis area and throughout the entire Midwest.

In May of 1823, a small group of Belgian Jesuits completed their journey from Maryland to St. Louis, to take possession of a farm given to them by the Bishop of the Territory, William Louis Valentine DuBourg. They had originally come here to assist Bishop DuBourg in the establishment of an Indian School, an effort which was endorsed by President Monroe and Indian Commissioner General William. Although the Indian School proved to be an unsuccessful venture, the school was converted into the St. Stanislaus Seminary and would train young Jesuits until 1968.

In 1840, the Jesuit brothers and priests began work on a permanent structure made of limestone. This structure, known as the "Rock Building," still stands today and is the current home of the Jesuit Museum. The Jesuit Museum houses memorabilia of numerous Jesuits who have lived there since 1823. One of the more famous residents of the site was Father Peter John DeSmet, who served as a missionary with many Indian tribes in the plains and northwest. Among his many accomplishments, was a detailed map he provided the U.S. Department of the Interior indicating the location of various Indian tribes. Other famous Jesuits include Fr. Peter Verhaegen who became president of St. Louis University, and Fr. John Elet, who also served as president of St. Louis University and was the founder of Xavier University in Cincinnati.

Countless other Jesuits of the Missouri Province have made a lasting impact in this region by serving as missionaries and founding a number of parishes in the lower Missouri River Valley. Little did that small group of Jesuits realize that their arrival in 1823, would lead to the expansion of the Jesuit presence throughout the Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in congratulating the Jesuits of the Missouri Province on their 175th anniversary in St. Louis. I also ask that you join me in thanking them for their countless contributions to this region. Their efforts are truly an inspiration and source of pride for all residents of Missouri.

MR. RONALD A. BELFIGLIO'S RETIREMENT FROM CITIBANK

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the vital contributions to New York City made by Mr. Ronald A. Belfiglio throughout his distinguished career with Citibank. Mr. Belfiglio is today celebrating his retirement from the position of Division Executive for Citibank's Corporate Realty Services.

As the head of the Corporate Realty Services Division, Mr. Belfiglio was responsible for 2,500 office and branch locations in 33 countries, in-house architectural, engineering and construction supervision, acquisition and divestiture of space, long range space planning, oversight of 900 employees, and an operations and capital budget totaling over $3.5 billion.

It is through Ronald Belfiglio's vision and leadership that Citibank continues to be a model corporate citizen. The budget of the Corporate Realty Services Division allowed for all the amenities and services provided to the community in the eight years since Citibank's Court Square headquarters has been in existence. These amenities include the construction of a Public Library in Citibank's Court Square building, art exhibition space, as well as providing a welcoming environment at Citibank for the Queens community,.

Further, because of Mr. Belfiglio's concern for Court Square's neighbors, Citibank has provided generous grants to various community and civic organizations. In fact, since 1989, over $500,000 in grants has been given to neighborhood organizations within my Congressional District's local Community Planning Board #2.

It is with gratitude that I rise today to recognize Mr. Belfiglio's distinguished career and indispensable contributions to the Queens' community. His leadership and awareness have ensured that Citibank's Court Square is not simply an impersonal corporate center, but a vital part of and generous contributor to the surrounding community.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Ronald Belfiglio on his outstanding achievements and wishing him well on his retirement.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE CHILD CARE AFFORDABILITY ACT

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation to allow agencies to use their salary and expense accounts to help federal employees pay for child care. Balancing work and family has become increasingly difficult for families, and federal employees are no exception.

My legislation will provide opportunities for federal agencies to help provide quality child care for their employees' children. The legislation I am introducing today will be marked up in the Civil Service Subcommittee, on which I serve, on Tuesday, July 21, and in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee on Thursday, July 23.

I have worked with the Office of Personnel Management to develop this legislation. Several agencies, including the Social Security Administration, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, and the Office of Personnel Management, have requested such authority from OPM. OPM cannot grant this authority; we must legislate this simple change.

This legislation does not require any additional appropriations. It would be up to individual agencies to determine whether or not to use funds from their salary and expense appropriations to help provide child care. Agencies—not employees—would make payments to child care providers to help lower-income federal employees pay for their child care.

Such child care benefits are already being provided to military employees—with a separate line item, which is more than my legislation would provide. The Department of Defense, one of the agencies seeking such authority to help its employees with child care costs, has pointed out that they can provide child care benefits to their military employees but not the civil servants working side by side.

Many federal employees are caught in a serious child care crunch. A recent study showed that one-quarter of all federal workers had children under the age of six needing care at some time during the work day. During a recent hearing in Congressman Steve Horn's subcommittee, testimony revealed that some federal child care facilities charge up to $10,000 or more per child per year. Many federal employees simply cannot afford quality child care. By allowing agencies the flexibility to help their workers meet their child care needs, we will be encouraging family-friendly workplaces and higher productivity. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to help federal employees and agencies meet their child care needs.

SONNY BONO MEMORIAL SALTON SEA RECLAMATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the restoration of the Salton Sea and have worked with my colleagues for some time in furtherance of that goal. I am a cosponsor of this bill, the Sonny Bono Salton Sea Reclamation Act, and when it was introduced I had hoped that we could proceed quickly in a bipartisan effort to produce a bill that all Members of the House could support. The introduced bill had provisions I was not

happy with, but in the spirit of compromise I went along, believing that it could be improved as it moved through the Resources Committee. Obviously, that has not happened. In fact, the bill has picked up more contention, leaving us with much work to do to resolve the differences of opinion about how we should proceed to restore this unique and valuable ecosystem.

I would like to highlight the fact that despite the differences that have been discussed, there is much we agree upon. At the start of this Congress, there were few Members who had ever heard of the Salton Sea. Now, thanks to the efforts of our departed colleague, Representative Sonny Bono, and the other Members of the Salton Sea Task Force, Congress is aware, not only of its location, but of its catastrophic problems.

I believe we have a unanimous bipartisan commitment to address the Salton Sea's problems. We all want to see the Salton Sea restored and maintained as a viable ecosystem which enhances the quality of life for the residents of southern California and which supports a diversity of economic activity in this region. Our challenge is to work together to achieve that goal.

The Salton Sea is a valuable national and international resource. It is an important resting and feeding area for birds migrating along the Pacific flyway. It once supported a vibrant recreational economy. It is, can be, and should be much more than a receptacle for agricultural runoff and for polluted New and Alamo River water.

While there are those who have been aware for some time that the Sea was in trouble, there has been a failure to act. The death of migratory birds and repeated fish-kills has brought national attention to this issue. If we continue our present policy of no action, I fear the bird and fish deaths will be but a few of the negative environmental consequences that will become apparent to all of us.

One of those negative consequences, in a slightly longer time frame, will result from the export of conserved agricultural water to urban users, and the treatment and re-use by Mexico of water now flowing across the U.S.-Mexico border which may cause the Salton Sea to shrink by as much as one quarter. This will expose a hundred square miles or more of highly polluted sea bottom to blowing winds, as has already happened in the very similar case of Owen's Lake. The cost of mitigating the environmental damage resulting from such decrease in area of the sea could easily reach 100 million dollars per year, far more than the cost of stabilizing the level of the sea at an elevation close to its present elevation.

Now with all of the agreement on the need for rapid environmental mitigation, I am deeply disappointed in the bill produced by the Resources Committee and the manager's amendment which was adopted last Wednesday. A number of provisions in the reported bill and the amendment cause problems: the inappropriate authorization of EPA funds; the Clean Water Act permit exemption; the broad liability exemption for local water district activities; the complex and probably unconstitutional provisions for triggering a construction authorization for a not yet defined, or designed, technological fix. These provisions are all inappropriate. They have drawn severe criticism from the environmental community and the Administration and that criticism is warranted.

Some of what my colleagues may view as my abandonment of this bill is due to my naïve faith that the problems which I have described would be corrected. It was not apparent to me until I reviewed a copy of the substitute amendment early last week that such was not the case. Some of the fault is mine and I regret that I was not clearer in emphasizing the failings of the reported bill to my fellow members of the Task Force. However, I would point out that these issues had been raised to us and in the Resources Committee by the Administration and the environmental community for some time prior to this bill's coming to the floor.

Last week I found myself in the unfortunate situation of seeking to fix a bill on the floor that should have been fixed by the manager's amendment. Although the substitute that Mr. Miller and I offered failed, I reluctantly supported the bill, fully aware that it has no real opportunity to be enacted into law and still having major concerns with its provisions. I realize that my fellow Task Force Members are disappointed that I cosponsored a substitute amendment, but I felt I had to take the last opportunity I had in the House to produce a bill that could proceed beyond House passage; a bill that would have a chance to gain broad, bipartisan support; a bill that would gain the endorsement, and not the wrath, of the environmental community; a bill that would be rapidly moved through the Senate and enthusiastically received by the Administration. In short, a bill that could become a law.

As an original co-sponsor of this legislation, I feel an obligation to move the process forward in this Congress. It is my hope that we can find a clear bipartisan solution in the Senate. I supported the bill last week on final passage with great reluctance, hoping that the Senate will perfect the bill. However, should the remaining legislative work on this bill in the Senate return a Conference Report that has not removed the provisions I have mentioned or return the existing bill, I will oppose enactment of the legislation.

I want my colleagues to know what a painful situation this puts me in. I grew up in the Salton Sea basin, in the Imperial Valley. I feel some sense of history and personal responsibility in cleaning up the Salton Sea and in finishing the work in which our former colleague, Sonny Bono, was so deeply involved. But I cannot stand by and let this effort be endangered by legislation that has failed to meet the standard that Sonny would have set, namely to be meritorious enough to gain easy bipartisan and bicameral support. It is my hope that we can accomplish that goal in the near future.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES B. ALLISON UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ED BRYANT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to recognize outstanding citizens out of my own 7th district of Tennessee. Today, it is indeed an honor and a privilege for me to recognize one such citizen.

Charles B. Allison was born on December 12, 1942, in Austinville, Virginia. He graduated with an accounting degree from Ben Franklin University in Washington, D.C. while being employed by the Bureau in a clerical capacity, having entered on duty June 19, 1961. Chuck's first duty assignment as a Special Agent was in 1968 in Louisville, Kentucky, where he also served several months in the Richmond Resident Agency.

He thereafter was transferred to Newark, New Jersey, in 1969 and served in the Newark Division until June of 1977. He was then transferred to the Memphis, TN, FBI Office where he is currently serving as a Supervisory Special Agent of the Organized Crime and Drug Squad. Mr. Allison is retiring on July 31, 1998 after 37 years of dedicated service to the FBI.

Mr. Allison and his wife, Janet, have two children, Jill and Greg. Jill, a registered nurse, is married to Dr. Camp Newton and they are both employed at Baxter County Regional Hospital in Mountain Home, Arkansas. Greg is a graduate of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and is currently employed by the C.H. Robinson Company in Nashville, TN.

I would like to thank the Chair for this time to recognize this exceptional American citizen.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 this House voted to approve H. Res. 452, expressing the sense of the House that the Postal Service should not raise its rates. My vote was mistakenly recorded as "No." I would like to express my support for the H. Res. 452 and emphasize that I do not believe the Postal Service should raise its rates at this time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, due to an illness I was absent on Friday, July 17, 1998. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall vote No. 295 and "Aye" on rollcall vote No. 296.

TRIBUTE TO THE BETANCES CADETS FOR ITS FIRST GRADUATION CEREMONY

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Betances Cadets, an invaluable

Bronx institution, which celebrated its First Graduation Ceremony on Saturday, July 18, 1998.

Six months ago, under the leadership of "General" Carlos Quintana and his staff, the Betances Cadets was established. The program takes kids off the street and prepares them for real-life experience through a military-style program. It gives them the opportunity to apply academic lessons as they experience real-life situations, bring real-life lessons back to the classroom, become problem solvers, understand the need for responsibility, and develop leadership ability. Today, the program has 64 students and 9 staff members.

Three cadets, Amanda Perez, Jose Barreto and Tanairis Noriega were recognized for academic achievement during the graduation.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the 16th district of New York where the Betances Cadets is located and I am delighted by its early success. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the Betances Cadets, to the staff and parents, and to the students, whose ambition and hard work will make this great institution a tremendous source of pride and success for years to come.

CELEBRATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF DOWAGIAC, MI

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to rise today to mark the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the City of Dowagiac, Michigan. On February 16, 1848, the city's founding fathers received official recognition, giving birth to a dynamic community that has been thriving ever since.

Over the past century and a half, Dowagiac has served as a focal point for southwest Michigan's progress and development. Many industries have found Dowagiac a great place to do business. They know that if you want the job done right, you get it done in Dowagiac. Home to the campus of Southwest Michigan College and a great school district, Dowagiac is helping the next generation chart a course to the future.

Dowagiac has seen a lot of change during the years. But in times of war and peace, prosperity and tough times, there is one thing that remains constant. The people of Dowagiac have always cared for each other as neighbors and as a community. We realize that we cannot move forward until we move together. The city was founded in this spirit—it has allowed our town to thrive and will ensure its continued success for many years to come.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing this great American town and wishing the entire community another one hundred and fifty years of success.

U.S.-TAIWAN RELATIONS

HON. LINDA SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled to hear on June 30, 1998 President Clinton affirm China's "three noes" concerning Taiwan. Specifically, he said: "We don't support independence for Taiwan, or two Chinas; or one Taiwan, one China; and we don't believe that Taiwan should be a member in any organization for which statehood is a requirement."

Sadly, the President turned his back on 22 million people who live in a democracy. What kind of message are we sending to the emerging democracies of the world? Are we going to turn our backs on these nations for political expediency?

Today, by a vote of 390 to 1 the House of Representatives voted to affirm U.S. commitment to Taiwan in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act. The Taiwan Relations Act, passed by Congress and signed into law in the immediate aftermath of the 1979 recognition of mainland China, says that the United States will view any attempt to determine Taiwan's future by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, as a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States.

Furthermore, H. Con. Res. 301 expresses the sense of Congress that the future status of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means and that Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Strait should determine their own future. Importantly, it states that we should make available to Taiwan "defense articles and defense service," including appropriate ballistic missile defenses. Taiwan should also be able to have appropriate membership in international financial institutions.

The people of Taiwan have worked hard and sacrificed for their democracy. Taiwan transformed itself into a democracy with a multiparty parliament and a popularly elected head of state, the first in all the millenniums of Chinese political experience. In the end, Taiwan's future is not a matter for President Clinton, the American government or Beijing. It is a matter soley for the government and people of Taiwan to decide.

JUDGE SILBERMAN'S ATTACK ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL COMES UNDER CRITICISM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD the following editorial that appeared today in the Washington Post. This article quite rightly criticizes D.C. Court of Appeals Judge Laurence Silberman's opinion issued last week in response to the Justice Department's request for a stay of the lower court order requiring several Secret Service agents to testify before the grand jury.

As this editorial makes clear, Judge Silberman's broad view of the powers of the independent counsel is completely insupportable. The editorial also helpfully reminds us that Judge Silberman once struck down the Independent Counsel Act as unconstitutional, but was later reversed by the Supreme Court. Judge Silberman's insistence on construing the Independent Counsel Act as broadly as possible, therefore, appears to be another chapter in an old argument that has long since been lost. This editorial provides some important context to Judge Silberman's intemperate attacks on the Justice Department's good-faith representation of the Secret Service.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1998]

A POWER NOT VESTED IN THE CONSTITUTION

(By Benjamin Wittes)

Judge Laurence Silberman's extraordinary concurrence in last week's Court of Appeals decision concerning grand jury testimony by Secret Service agents grabbed headlines for its vituperative rhetoric. The judge cast aspersions on Attorney General Janet Reno, saying she was "acting as the President's counsel under the false guise of representing the United States." And Silberman also accused "the President's agents [of] literally and figuratively 'declar[ing] war' on the Independent Counsel."

Silberman's overheated rhetoric, however, was not the most remarkable aspect of his opinion—which, as a mere concurrence, fortunately does not have the force of law. As a prominent conservative jurist, Silberman is an advocate of judicial restraint, yet his opinion Thursday was almost a prototype of activist judging. Indeed, the judge opined on a matter the parties had not squarely presented him. And, having reached its merits unnecessarily, he issued an opinion with constitutional implications for the independent counsel statute, a law that was upheld unequivocally by the Supreme Court in the 1988 case known as Morrison v. Olson. Silberman's opinion is more dramatic still, because the high court's holding in Morrison reversed an appeals court decision written by none other than Laurence Silberman himself.

Silberman's opinion does not directly attack the constitutionality of the independent counsel statute. Though he gripes about it, the judge is, after all, bound by the Morrison precedent. But by asserting that the attorney general legally cannot litigate against Kenneth Starr on behalf of the Secret Service, he attacks the statute through a back door. Silberman's opinion, were it actually law, would grant Starr such immense power that his role could no longer be constitutional under the vision of the independent cunsel the Supreme Court upheld in Morrison.

Silberman's decision 10 years ago held that the independent law unconstitutionally breached the separation of powers. The theory of his lengthy and elegant decision was that the Constitution vests the power of the executive branch in the president and that an executive branch officer independent of the president is a derogation of the president's exclusive sphere. The independent counsel, as a prosceutor named by a panel of judges, he reasoned, cannot constitutionally wield the prosecutorial powers of the executive branch.

The Supreme Court, however, disagreed. In Morrison, Chief Justice William Rehnquist

held that an independent counsel is a constitutional beast known as an "inferior officer" of the executive branch. Inferior officers, under the Constitution, can be appointed by courts. And the high court deemed Independent Counsel Alexia Morrison to have this subordinate status because of her limited jurisdiction, her being subject to removal by the attorney general under certain circumstances, and her obligation to follow the policies of the Department of Justice. Starr, in other words, can exist constitutionally only as long as he remains such an "inferior officer." The moment he becomes anything grander, his independence from the president would render him constitutionally defective.

Silberman understands the requirements of Morrison as well as anyone. Yet his latest opinion would inflate the balloon of Starr's authority well past the point where his constitutionality would burst. The law gives the independent counsel "full power and independent authority to exercise all investigative and prosecutorial functions and powers of the Department of Justice [and] the Attorney General." And Silberman reasons that if Starr is acting as the attorney general in the areas within his mandate, Reno cannot also be the attorney general for those areas. She must, therefore, bow out: "It seems clear to me then that no one in the United States Government, speaking for the government, has standing to oppose the Independent Counsel in [the Secret Service] proceeding. . . . That, as should be apparent, means that it is up to the Independent Counsel—the surrogate Attorney General in this matter—to decide whether the 'privilege' asserted by the Secret Service as a government entity should be recognized."

This description of Starr's power hardly sounds like an inferior officer. Quite the contrary. In Silberman's vision, Starr is an officer of titanic executive power, who can operate not only entirely as he pleases with respect to Justice Department policies (for no one can oppose him) but can also decide the behavior of other parts of the executive branch. If Starr really can arbitrate his own dispute with the Secret Service—and, by extension, with any other federal agency—he would usurp enormous executive authority. But were this the true scope of his power, the constitutionality under Morrison of his office would evaporate.

Silberman's history on this issue makes his recent opinion all the more astonishing. By describing Starr's power in such a way as to make it inconsistent with the limited independence on which the Supreme Court predicated the constitutionality of the law, Silberman subtly would rehabilitate his own earlier opinion striking down the law. So even while Silberman bashes the integrity of the administration, his logic would make its greatest adversary impossible.

The writer is a member of the editorial page staff.

HONORING DON A. HORN

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to a community leader, a friend, and a legend in Houston's labor movement. Don Horn became a union member in 1945 when he joined the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Houston. Don's leadership positions in Local 716 included President, member of the Executive Board, and Business Representative.

In recognition of his hard work and dedication to the members of Local 716, the Harris County AFL–CIO Executive Board elected him as Secretary-Treasurer in 1965, a position he held until his retirement in 1995. During his 30 years as Secretary-Treasurer, he also served the Texas AFL–CIO, both as a member of the Executive Board and as a Trustee.

Don has not only been a leader in the labor movement, he has been a leader in the community. He served for many years on the United Way Board of Trustees and as a Boy Scout Leader. In addition, Don served 10 years on the Harris County Hospital Board and was instrumental in the creation of the Neighborhood Health Centers, which have brought quality medical care to all parts of Harris County.

Don continued his work for quality health care as Consumer Representative of the Texas State Health Board. In fact, he once took former Texas Lieutenant Governor Bill Hobby with him on an unannounced inspection of a nursing home, a trip which led to a statewide reexamination of nursing home practices.

Don is a graduate of the University of Houston. Currently, he serves on the City of Houston's Ethics Committee. Three years after his retirement, he is still active in the labor movement and still organizes union retirees for the Harris County AFL–CIO.

Mr. Speaker, Don's work as a labor leader and as a community leader has earned him a special place in the hearts of all Texans. The Nation could use more people like Don Horn.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 21, 1998, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 22

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine how the Year 2000 computer conversion will affect agricultural businesses.

SR–332

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD–406

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine China's missile transfer issues.

SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of Bill Richardson, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of Energy.

SH–216

Finance

To hold hearings to examine new directions in retirement security policy, focusing on social security, pensions, personal savings and work.

SD–215

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1380, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding charter schools, S. 2112, to make the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 applicable to the United States Postal Service in the same manner as any other employer, and S. 2213, to allow all States to participate in activities under the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Act.

SD–430

Indian Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Resources Committee on S. 1770, to elevate the position of Director of the Indian Health Service to Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and to provide for the organizational independence of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services, and H.R. 3782, to compensate certain Indian tribes for known errors in their tribal trust fund accounts, and to establish a process for settling other disputes regarding tribal trust fund accounts.

SD–106

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

Business meeting, to consider the nomination of Daryl L. Jones, to be the Secretary of the Air Force.

SR–222

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the 1946 Swiss Holocaust Assets Agreement.

SD–538

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2136, to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Washington, S. 2226, to amend the Idaho Admission Act regarding the sale or lease of school land, H.R. 2886, to provide for a demonstration project in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, under which a private contractor will perform multiple resource management activities for that unit of the National Forest System, and H.R. 3796, to convey the administrative site

for the Rogue River National Forest and use the proceeds for the construction or improvement of offices and support buildings for the Rogue River National Forest and the Bureau of Land Management.

SD–366

4:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of David G. Carpenter, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security, and to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, Bert T. Edwards, of Maryland, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of State, and Jonathan H. Spalter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Director (Bureau of Information) of the United States Information Agency.

SD–419

JULY 23

9:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposals to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

SD–406

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 2238, to reform unfair and anticompetitive practices in the professional boxing industry.

SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings to examine the results of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, 1002 Area, Petroleum Assessment, 1998, conducted by the United States Geological Survey.

SD–366

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine the problem of telephone cramming—the billing of unauthorized charges on a consumer's telephone bill.

SD–342

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the current status of, and prospects for, competition and innovation in certain segments of the software industry.

SH–216

Special on Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem

To hold hearings to examine the Year 2000 computer conversion as related to the health care industry.

SD–192

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings to examine long-term economic and budgetary effects of social security.

SD–608

Foreign Relations

International Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine whether the United Nations international criminal court is in the United States national interest.

SD–419

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of Ida L. Castro, of New York, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Paul M. Igasaki, of California, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

SD–430

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to examine the financial structure of the International Monetary Fund.

2220 Rayburn Building

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2109, to provide for an exchange of lands located near Gustavus, Alaska, S. 2257, to reauthorize the National Historic Preservation Act, S. 2276, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail, S. 2272, to amend the boundaries of Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site in the State of Montana, S. 2284, to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and H.R. 1522, to extend the authorization for the National Historic Preservation Fund.

SD–366

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

S–116, Capitol

3:00 p.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings on the nominations of Patrick T. Henry, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Carolyn H. Becraft, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, and Ruby Butler DeMesme, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations and Environment.

SR–222

4:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Robert C. Felder, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Benin, James Vela Ledesma, of California, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Joseph H. Melrose Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, George Mu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire, Robert Cephas Perry, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Central African Republic, Joseph Gerard Sullian, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, and William Lacy Swing, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

SD–419

JULY 27

1:00 p.m.

Special on Aging

To hold hearings to examine allegations of neglect in certain California nursing homes and the overall infrastructure that regulates these homes.

SH–216

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine why cable rates continue to increase.

SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the March 31, 1998 Government Accounting Office report on the Forest Service, focusing on Alaska region operating costs.

SD–366

10:00 a.m.

Special on Aging

To continue hearings to examine allegations of neglect in certain California nursing homes and the overall infrastructure that regulates these homes.

SH–216

JULY 29

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold oversight hearings on the Department of Agriculture's progress in consolidating and downsizing its operations.

SR–332

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD–366

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1405, to provide for improved monetary policy and regulatory reform in financial institution management and activities, to streamline financial regulatory agency actions, and to provide for improved consumer credit disclosure.

SD–538

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2161, to provide Government-wide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and S. 1675, to establish a Congressional Office of Regulatory Analysis.

SD–342

JULY 30

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to review a recent concept release by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission on over-the-counter derivatives, and on related proposals by the Treasury Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SD–106

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine international satellite reform.

SR–253

SEPTEMBER 10

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Communications Subcommittee

To resume hearings to examine international satellite reform.

SR–253

OCTOBER 6

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.

345 Cannon Building

POSTPONEMENTS

JULY 21

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1964, to provide for the sale of certain public land in the Ivanpah Valley, Nevada, to the Clark County Department of Aviation, and S. 1509, to authorize the Bureau of Land Management to use vegetation sales contracts in managing land at Fort Stanton and certain nearby acquired land along the Rio Bonita in Lincoln County, New Mexico.

SD–366

JULY 22

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold oversight hearings to examine the Department of Justice's implementation of the Violence Against Women Act.

SD–226

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 21, 1998*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DEAL of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 21, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable NATHAN DEAL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

URGING THE PRESIDENT TO WORK WITH CONGRESS TO SAVE THE CENSUS

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the increasing partisanship of the White House over their embattled Census plan. Last week the White House made two comments that demonstrated how far they will go to get their way.

First, they announced their intention to shut down a huge part of government over the Census, and later in the week the Vice President made some racially divisive and inaccurate comments.

Let me begin by making the majority position on the Census very clear. We want to save the Census from failure. The General Accounting Office and the Commerce Department's own Inspector General have warned that the Clinton administration is risking a failed Census plan. Their plan is too complicated and relies on unrealistic assumptions and timelines. We cannot allow the Census to fail. The 2000 Census will cost about $4 billion, and we cannot risk that kind of money on a plan that probably will not work.

What Republicans want to do is work with the administration to save the Census. We have some very specific problems with the administration's plan. Experience has shown that sampling used on a large scale just is not accurate enough for a Census.

In 1990 the Census Bureau tested sampling and compared it to the actual enumeration. For cities and towns with populations under 100,000, the actual enumeration, that is, counting everyone, proved to be more accurate and reliable. So we do not believe we should spend $4 billion on a plan that has failed its only test. That does not seem to make much sense.

Another major problem is the deletion of Americans from the official Census count. Again, when they tried this in 1990, 1.46 million Americans were removed from the sampled Census. Under the Clinton Census plan, it will happen again. It is wrong to use statistics to remove individuals from the Census count. Because statistics is an imprecise science, real Americans who exist will be removed from the count, and cities and towns all across America will lose representation.

If Members are concerned about the undercount, as I am, then they have to be equally concerned about a Census that removes real people from the official count. They, too, would be undercounted under sampling.

We are concerned that the administration is moving forward without the consent of Congress. They simply ignore the fact that the Constitution gives Congress the responsibility to direct how the Census is conducted. Much of the Census is about trust. The American people have to trust the outcome of the Census or else it is worthless.

If the administration ignores Congress, they will guarantee a failed Census. They need to work with us so all Americans have faith that the process was inclusive and open.

That is why I was disappointed to hear last week that President Clinton wants to shut down the government over the Census. He wants to sign a bill that provides 6 months of funding for the whole Commerce Department, the whole State Department, and Justice Department, so he can have leverage over the Census.

Can Members believe the President wants to take cops off the street to get his way over the Census? Can Members believe the President wants to hold U.S. foreign policy hostage to the Census? Why would he want to shut down the Border Patrol over the Census? It is irresponsible, and goes against his 1995 statement when he said, "It is wrong, deeply wrong, to shut down the government while we negotiate." Work with Congress, Mr. Speaker, and we will have a better Census.

I was, along with many of my colleagues, saddened by comments made by Vice President GORE at the annual NAACP convention. He told the participants that the Republicans "don't even want to count you in the Census." These outrageous comments do nothing to unite America, and do nothing to help save the 2000 Census from failure.

Congressional Republicans are prepared to make an unprecedented effort to count all Americans. We have provided more money than the President requested so we can do a much better job of counting minorities. I hope the administration stops trying to divide America over the Census, because that will not lead to a more accurate Census, and it certainly will not increase trust in the Census.

Mr. President, work with Congress. I ask the President to stop holding the rest of government hostage to getting his way on the Census. Stop trying to divide America against one another. Work with Congress, and together we can save the 2000 Census.

THE WELL-BEING OF AMERICA'S FAMILIES DEPENDS UPON THE HEALTH OF OUR SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the goal of those of us here in Congress should be to be a full partner for the American people, who really care about the essentials. They want their children to be safe when they go out the door to school in the morning, they are concerned about the family's economic security, and they want them to be healthy, physically and environmentally.

This well-being of our families depends upon the health of our schools. There are some in Congress who would turn their back upon the historic responsibility that the Federal Government has had with education, claiming

that this is exclusively a State or a local responsibility. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Federal Government has always played a major role in education, starting from the Land Ordinance Act of 1785 through the GI bill to school lunches today.

There are three critical areas that we must address here in this Congress: assistance for the children who are the most difficult and expensive to educate; the reduction of gun violence, so that families can have peace of mind when the children go to school; and the promotion of computer skills and access that are so essential for success in today's world.

Congress mandated, appropriately so, in the 94th Congress that there would be special education access for children with severe learning disabilities, but along with that mandate came a promise of 40 percent funding from the Federal Government, appropriately, for these children are the most difficult and expensive to educate. Yet, we are contemplating only 9 percent Federal funding in place of that 40 percent commitment.

In the area of gun safety, we have seen example after example across this country where carnage has erupted on our schoolyards. Yet, at the same time, this Congress has a number of bills before it that are designed to reduce the incidence of gun violence. So far, not one has been scheduled to come to this floor.

Finally, in the area of Internet connection, that promise was to be made through the mechanism of the E-Rate, a heavily discounted fee that would be available particularly to inner city schools, rural schools, but all American schools and libraries would benefit, to some degree. This was the promise of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and yet this promise has yet to be fully implemented. Indeed, today there are some in Congress who are threatening to repeal that provision, leaving behind the most needy children from the information superhighway.

There is no reason for us to shrug our shoulders, no excuse for inaction. We know the problems. We in Congress have made the commitments. We currently have the strongest economy of a generation. Indeed, some of my friends in the Republican leadership feel we have so much money that they feel comfortable contemplating a $1 trillion tax cut over the next 10 years.

I would suggest that, first and foremost, we tend to knitting by first fully funding our commitment to special education; by passing commonsense legislation to reduce gun access, the cap laws that would mandate safe storage and responsible gun ownership; and finally, keep our commitments to our schools and libraries by fully funding the E-Rate. Americans and their children deserve no less from this Congress.

FOLLOWING THROUGH ON THE COMMITMENT OF THE HOUSE TO ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer this House made a commitment to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I thought this morning that I would talk about why it is so important that we follow through on that commitment, and follow through on that commitment with a series of simple questions that I hear in the South suburbs and the South Side of Chicago, the area that I have the privilege of representing.

That is, do Americans feel that it is fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax on married working couples? Do Americans feel it is fair that 21 million married working couples pay, on average, $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married? Do Americans feel that is fair that this couple pays higher taxes than an identical couple that lives together outside of marriage? Do Americans feel it is fair that our tax code actually provides an incentive to get divorced, because the only way today to avoid the marriage tax penalty is to get divorced and to file that paperwork?

That is wrong. It is unfair. Frankly, really, it is immoral that our tax code punishes society's most basic institution for 21 million married working couples; that is, $1,400 in higher taxes.

Let me give an example of a south suburban couple from Illinois that suffers the marriage tax penalty. The gentleman in the couple is a machinist at Caterpillar. That is where they make the big heavy earth-moving equipment in Joliet. This machinist makes $35,500. If he is single, under our tax code he files and, of course, with the standard exemption and deduction, he is in the 15 percent tax bracket.

He meets a schoolteacher, a schoolteacher in the public schools. She has an identical income of $35,500. If she stayed single, just like her machinist fiance, she would be in the 15 percent tax bracket. Under our tax code, if they choose to get married, they will file jointly. When they file jointly, because they combine their income, and their combined income is $61,000, that pushes them into a higher tax bracket. They are now taxed in the 28 percent tax bracket just because they are married, producing an almost $1,400 marriage tax penalty just because they are married.

That is wrong that this couple, just because they choose to get married, pay higher taxes. If we think about it, what is the bottom line, here? We propose the Marriage Tax Elimination Act which puts a working married couple like our machinist and schoolteacher on parity with an identical married couple that lives outside marriage.

In 1996 this House of Representatives led the way by working to provide an adoption tax credit to help families provide a loving home for a child in need of adoption. In 1997 this House led the way in convincing the President and the Senate that we should provide a $500 per child tax credit which will benefit 3 million Illinois children. That helped families. Of course, this year we can help families again by strengthening marriage and no longer punishing marriage.

Let me share how we propose eliminating the marriage tax penalty. The Marriage Tax Elimination Act, H.R. 3734, is very simple. It is legislation which essentially doubles relief for working married couples by doubling the standard deduction from its current level of $4,150 to $8,300, and also doubling the income tax threshold, which of course you file in the 15 percent if you are single, and just over 24,000, doubling that to a little over 49,000.

So when you are single and you choose to get married, your tax essentially doubles. Your rates are double the income. That brings fairness to the tax code. That is a very simple way of eliminating the marriage tax penalty under the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, doubling the standard deduction, doubling rates, so married taxpayers are not punished just because they are married. That is a simple solution.

This House, of course, made a commitment about 2 months ago to address and eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Our friend, the President, he has a proposal of his own which he says is a better idea. He says we should just expand the child care tax credit for families that are lower-income and, of course, happen to have children. So I thought I would compare, for this machinist and this schoolteacher in Joliet, Illinois, which is really better.

Under the President's proposal, under the President's proposal for a child tax credit, those couples or families that have qualified for the President's expanded tax credit, and they already have one, he just wants to make it a little bigger, they would see about a $350 net increase on take-home pay, money to spend on child care.

I looked into this and asked some local day care providers in Joliet, what does that mean? They said that the average weekly day care cost is about $127 in Joliet, so under the President's proposal, for a working married couple with a child who goes to day care, they would see just less than 3 weeks of day care financed by the President's proposal. If we compare this with this machinist and schoolteacher, eliminating the marriage tax penalty, $1,400, with the same weekly day care costs for this machinist and schoolteacher, if they

have a child in day care, it is almost 3 months' worth of day care. So which is better, 3 months or 3 weeks?

Mr. Speaker I ask Members to make a bipartisan commitment to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. This House of Representatives made a commitment earlier this summer to address the marriage tax penalty, and make elimination the centerpiece of this year's budget.

Let us follow through on that commitment. Let us help working families. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. For 21 million couples, $1,400, that is real money for real people. Let us help married couples, and eliminate the marriage tax penalty now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight what is arguably the most unfair provision in the U.S. tax code: the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank you for your long term interest in bringing parity to the tax burden imposed on working married couples compared to a couple living together outside of marriage.

In January, President Clinton gave his State of the Union Address outlining many of the things he wants to do with the budget surplus, a surplus provided by the bipartisan budget agreement which: cut waste, put America's fiscal house in order, and held Washington's feet to the fire to balance the budget.

While President Clinton paraded a long list of new spending totaling at least $46–$48 billion in new programs—we believe that a top priority should be returning the budget surplus to America's families as additional middle-class tax relief.

This Congress has given more tax relief to the middle class and working poor than any Congress of the last half century.

I think the issue of the marriage penalty can best be framed by asking these questions: Do Americans feel it's fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel it's fair that the average married working couple pays almost $1,400 more in taxes than a couple with almost identical income living together outside of marriage? Is it right that our tax code provides an incentive to get divorced?

In fact, today the only form one can file to avoid the marriage tax penalty is paperwork for divorce. And that is just wrong!

Since 1969, our tax laws have punished married couples when both spouses work. For no other reason than the decision to be joined in holy martrimony, more than 21 million couples a year are penalized. They pay more in taxes than they would if they were single. Not only is the marriage penalty unfair, it's wrong that our tax code punishes society's most basic institution. The marriage tax penalty exacts a disproportionate toll on working women and lower income couples with children. In many cases it is a working woman's issue.

Let me give you an example of how the marriage tax penalty unfairly affects middle class married working couples.

For example, a machinist at a Caterpillar manufacturing plant in my home district of Joliet, makes $30,500 a year in salary. His wife is a tenured elementary school teacher, also bringing home $30,500 a year in salary. If they would both file their taxes as singles, as individuals, they would pay 15%.

MARRIAGE PENALTY EXAMPLE IN THE SOUTH SUBURBS

	Machinist	School Teacher	Couple	Weller/McIntosh II
Adjusted Gross Income	$30,500	$30,500	$61,000	$61,000
Less Personal Exemption and Standard Deduction	6,500	6,500	11,800	13,100 (Single2)
Taxable Income	23,950	23,950	49,200	47,900
	(.15)	(.15)	(Partial .28)	(.15)
Tax Liability	3,592.5	3,592,5	8,563	7,185
		Marriage Penalty: $1,378		Relief: $1,378

Weller-McIntosh II Eliminates the Marriage Tax Penalty

But if they chose to live their lives in holy matrimony, and now file jointly, their combined income of $61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28 percent, producing a tax penalty of $1,400 in higher taxes.

On average, America's married working couples pay $1,400 more a year in taxes than individuals with the same incomes. That's serious money. Millions of married couples are still stinging from April 15th's tax bite and more married couples are realizing that they are suffering the marriage tax penalty, particularly if you think of it in terms of: a down payment on a house or a car, one year's tuition at a local community college, or several months' worth of quality child care at a local day care center.

To that end, Congressman DAVID MCINTOSH and I have authored the Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act.

The Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act will increase the tax brackets (currently at 15% for the first $24,650 for singles, whereas married couples filing jointly pay 15% on the first $41,200 of their taxable income) to twice that enjoyed by singles; the Weller-McIntosh proposal would extend a married couple's 15% tax bracket to $49,300. Thus, married couples would enjoy an additional $8,100 in taxable income subject to the low 15% tax rate as opposed to the current 28% tax rate and would result in up to $1,053 in tax relief.

Additionally the bill will increase the standard deduction for married couples (currently $6,900 to twice that of singles (currently at $4,150). Under the Weller-McIntosh legislation the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly would be increased to $8,300.

Our new legislation builds on the momentum of their popular H.R. 2456 which enjoyed the support of 238 cosponsors and numerous family, women and tax advocacy organizations. Current law punishes many married couples who file jointly by pushing them into higher tax brackets. It taxes the income of the families' second wage earner—often the woman's salary—at a much higher rate than if that salary was taxed only as an individual. Our bill already has broad bipartisan cosponsorship by Members of the House and a similar bill in the Senate also enjoys widespread support.

It isn't enough for President Clinton to suggest tax breaks for child care. The President's child care proposal would help a working couple afford, on average, three weeks of day care. Elimination of the marriage tax penalty would give the same couple the choice of paying for three months of child care—or addressing other family priorities. After all, parents know better than Washington what their family needs.

We fondly remember the 1996 State of the Union address when the President declared emphatically that, quote "the era of big government is over."

We must stick to our guns, and stay the course. There never was an American appetite for big government, but there certainly is for reforming the existing way government does business. And what better way to show the American people that our government will continue along the path to reform and prosperity than by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Ladies and Gentleman, we are on the verge of running a surplus. It's basic math. It means Americans are already paying more than is needed for government to do the job we expect of it.

What better way to give back than to begin with mom and dad and the American family—the backbone of our society. We ask that President Clinton join with Congress and make elimination of the marriage tax penalty, a bipartisan priority. Of all the challenges married couples face in providing home and hearth to America's children, the U.S. tax code should not be one of them.

Let's eliminate The Marriage Tax Penalty and do it now!

THE PATIENTS' PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, perhaps the ultimate test of the marriage tax is that it truly shows that couples love each other if they are still willing to get married, knowing they are going to pay more for the privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the Patients' Protection Act. It is essential that it be debated on this floor, and I mean a full Patient Protection Act that protects patients who are in managed care plans. That is why I was number 29 out of 159 that have so far signed the discharge petition, an extraordinary remedy, to bring this bill

to the floor, to force it to the floor so this entire House can vote on it, because it is very likely that the House will not get to vote on this bill unless we get this discharge petition signed by 218 Members. One hundred fifty-nine of us signed it yesterday. I was pleased to be the 29th in line to sign it.

We support a bipartisan Patients' Protection Act, a Patients' Protection Act that works and protects people in managed care plans. Managed care plans can be health maintenance organizations, HMOs. They can be PPOs, preferred provider options. They can be other plans in which you pay less, but you also give up some of your choice in terms of choosing providers and where you go to get your care.

The Patients' Protection Act that I support, and that so far we have 159 Members who have signed the discharge petition on, would say, for instance, that a person going to the emergency room cannot be denied reimbursement for that if they use a prudent layperson's standard, if they had reasonable grounds to go to that emergency room. No insurance company can come behind them and say, no, those pains really were not justified. You do not get paid.

This would also grant a patient a fast appeal, so if an insurance company turns down the doctor and said, no, you cannot give that test, or you cannot perform that procedure, that patient has a right to a fast appeal on that.

It eliminates gag rules. In other words, physicians cannot be told by insurance companies and managed care plans that they cannot tell patients about certain procedures that might assist them, even though those procedures are not covered by the plan. It also guarantees access to specialists. If you do not like the specialist they send you to, it provides you access to other specialists. That is not the case in all managed care plans.

It has prohibitions on financial incentives given to physicians not to provide care. The physician should not be rated on the basis of whether or not they were able to divert people from the care they need. They should be paid on the basis of the excellent care they are capable of giving.

The Patients' Protection Act also has accountability. It has enforceability, for the patient to enforce the provisions on insurance plans. It is not fair that that a physician, in the best exercise of his or her judgment, would try to prescribe a treatment, say a CAT scan, and the insurance company refuses to pay for it, therefore making it not available to that physician to prescribe and to that patient.

Should something happen, who is it that gets sued? The physician gets sued, but the people who actually put it into motion do not. What this would say is that everybody is going to be held accountable in the same way.

The Congressional Budget Office, no friend of the Democratic Party but run by the Republican Party, has estimated the increased cost would be, at the most, about $2 per month to consumers, $4 per month overall. That is not very much to pay for an adequate Bill of Rights.

The plan that we support would apply to 161 million Americans. Regrettably, the one the Republican leadership wants to put forward would apply to only 48 million Americans. In West Virginia, this is a fast-growing area of concern. We have seven HMOs alone that now take up about 11 percent of all patients covered by insurance, around 202,000 people. Those are just the HMOs. They do not deal with the other managed care plans.

While 73 percent of Americans are now covered by some kind of managed care plan, we have not seen that kind of deep penetration yet in our State, but we will, so I want to head problems off in managed care plans before they get to the mountain State. That is why I support a Patients' Protection Act, and why I think it is essential that this Congress vote on it this week.

Mr. Speaker, we urge all Americans to rally around a Patients' Protection Act. It is vitally important that we get a Patients' Protection Act that has true accountability in it, that makes insurance companies responsible, the same way our doctors and providers and nurses and hospitals are responsible.

We want to make sure that we have access to specialists under these insurance plans, these managed care plans. We want to make sure that there are no gag rules. We want to make sure that doctors are not discouraged from providing the treatment that they know they want to be providing.

That is why it is important that this Congress vote, Mr. Speaker, on a Patients' Protection Act that really does something for America.

URGING MEMBERS' SUPPORT FOR THE BASE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL, THE BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of our important work on appropriation bills in this body we are engaged in another struggle, in a historic debate on campaign finance reform. I say it is historic because of the depth of the problem we are addressing, but also because of the length of the debate. It has been a long debate. We have engaged in over 20 hours of debate on this floor on the reform legislation.

I rise today in support of the base bill, which is the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. It is Hutchinson-Allen, the freshman bill that has been offered to this body on which all of the 11 substitute amendments hinge.

Presently we have debated three of the substitute amendments. We are presently on the Shays-Meehan substitute. We are going to have a vote on that in the near future, and then, before the August recess, we will have final action on the campaign finance reform legislation. We will have a vote on the Hutchinson-Allen freshman bill.

I ask my colleagues to join me in continuing to keep our eye and our focus on the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, because I believe it is the best hope for reform that this body will consider. After months of debate, I am more optimistic than ever that this House will pass real reform. The best opportunity for that reform will be the Hutchinson-Allen freshman bill.

I wanted to point out this morning an article that was published in the National Journal by Stewart Taylor, Junior, an excellent examination of the campaign finance reform issue. It outlines four different reasons why the freshman bill is unique among all the proposals, offers something different, is a new direction, and merits our close examination and support.

This article in the National Journal by Stewart Taylor, Junior, was published on July 18, 1998. It says, "The good news is that after a long winnowing process, the two principal campaign finance proposals now before the House of Representatives looked pretty promising."

Of course, he is referring to the Shays-Meehan bill that is presently being debated, but also the freshman bill. But he says that his personal favorite is the freshman bill, the Hutchinson-Allen bill. He goes through four different points that I think merit our consideration.

The first one is that the freshman bill would provide for campaign finance reform without seriously risking judicial invalidation. In other words, the author is saying that the freshman bill is constitutional, does not push that extra limit, infringe upon our constitutional liberties.

If we want something that will pass this House and the Senate, be signed by the President, and be upheld by the United States Supreme Court, then it is the freshman bill. That is the first point that he makes.

The second point that he makes that is unique about the freshman bill is that it significantly bans soft money, as the Shays-Meehan bill also does. But the freshman bill bans the soft money to the Federal parties. He points out that the soft money loophole, whereas perhaps well-intentioned at the beginning, over the years has been abused. It has been. That is the greatest abuse in our system, the soft money loophole

that allows the money that flows outside the regulated system from corporations, from labor unions, from wealthy individuals. That is what is addressed in the freshman bill very significantly.

A third point that he makes is the political realities. The freshman bill passes the political realism test. We are going to have to avoid the extremes. We do that, whether we are talking about free TV or whether you are talking about public financing. The freshman bill is realistic reform that can pass this body in a bipartisan fashion.

The fourth point that he makes that is significant is that the freshman bill breaks the relationship between the Federal officeholder and the chase for soft money. I believe that is unique about the freshman bill, because we prohibit a Federal candidate from soliciting soft money for the Federal parties, but as well as any State party other than his own, I think for any soft money at all; breaks the link between the Federal candidate and the chase for soft money.

These are four important, unique aspects about the freshman bill. It is good legislation that I urge my colleagues to support. First of all, it strengthens the individual role in our campaign system. It does that by preventing the individual role from being drowned in a sea of soft money, so it strengthens the individual; also by providing more information, increasing disclosure, information as to the timeliness of where the money is coming from. Then it stops the erosion of the value of the individual contribution by indexing benefits to the rate of inflation, indexing the contribution limits. That is what is good.

I urge my colleagues to support the freshman bill when it comes up for a vote on the floor.

AMERICANS NEED A PATIENT BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning to discuss one of the most important issues facing this Congress, the need to adopt a meaningful, comprehensive Patient Bill of Rights. For too long patients have been forced to wage lonely battles against sometimes callous managed care companies. We have heard too many cases where insurance actuaries, not doctors, make the final decision about a patient's medical care. This is wrong, and we must change it.

For years we have tried to help in the health care debate, and we have tried to adjust here or there to try to help people, working families, throughout Maine and America. Constantly the boxes have changed, and as soon as we try to work on something, the managed care companies figure out a way around it.

The best thing that we can do is to give every single American a bill of rights as it pertains to their health care policies, so regardless of whether the company is putting forward a PPO, an HMO, or whatever they wanted to call it, every single American will have a bill of rights as it pertains to their health care, so they will have their rights, regardless of the policies that a company or individual government entities would like to put forward; every American would have these basic rights.

It is a very important issue for all Americans. As they are being denied care in emergency rooms, as they are being denied the proper drug treatment that has been prescribed by a physician, and as they have been having insurance company bureaucrats making medical decisions and determining where and when and what type of health care individuals should receive, then those insurance companies, those insurance company bureaucrats, ought to be held medically liable. If physicians have to get medical malpractice insurance to protect themselves in their duties, and if insurance company executives are going to make those same decisions, they should also be held medically liable for that decision.

In my State, where there are many seniors that require many prescription drugs, between Parkinson's and other types of drugs that must be taken, they are expensive, and physicians are saying that the right treatment, the right mix has to be given. If it is upset or they cannot use the right medications, it is going to upset that person's health care.

In many cases, insurance companies give lists of drugs that can be given, and no other drugs. In order to appeal those decisions, to have the right treatment, we need to make sure that we have an enforcement mechanism, holding people medically responsible if they are not going to give seniors the types of prescription medication they need to have.

As far as information, it is so vitally important that a patient have the information as to their health care, as to their needs, and not to have that information kept from the patient because of the agreements and contracts that have been worked out behind the scenes between insurance companies and between some physicians. We as patients, as health care consumers, need to have that information.

I think this is a very important piece of legislation. I have signed the discharge petition that Members have signed to force this issue, in an unprecedented move to have over 218 Members forcing this issue to be debated before this House this week, because it is the most important issue in America today, to make sure that people have an individual Patient Bill of Rights, regardless of the health care they are being offered.

We must have this. It is a bipartisan effort. It knows no party. It is supported throughout America by Republicans, Democrats, Independents, people of all political stripes. It is something we need to do.

In my own State of Maine, where we have approximately 1.2 million people, over 200,000 are enrolled in HMO plans, and more is yet to come. Medicare is being formed into managed care. Other types of insurance companies and business are grouping together.

It is so important and imperative that we get this passed by this Congress this week. If they are going to make the decisions which harm individuals, then insurance companies are going to have to be held medically responsible and medically liable if they are going to be making these decisions. This will make sure that insurers are accountable for their actions.

As we become increasingly dependent upon computers and computerized records, this legislation makes important steps towards insuring confidentiality of medical records. We cannot allow the misuse of private medical information.

Finally, I am pleased that this bill takes steps to insure that plans which cover the drugs are going to cover all drugs which are medically indicated.

Later this week we are going to have an opportunity to vote on this plan offered by our Republican colleagues. While I am pleased that they have offered a plan, their plan leaves many millions uninsured and uncovered. I believe their plan comes up short because not only does it leave them uncovered, but it also does not have an enforcement mechanism to hold the insurance company and team making the decision to a responsible treatment and liability.

This is a bipartisan, comprehensive bill that will give Americans meaningful rights.

URGING MEMBERS TO STUDY THE ARTICLE "STATESMANSHIP AND ITS BETRAYAL"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, very infrequently I come across an article written by a person that rises so far above and beyond the normal, mundane literature we read daily in newspapers and see and hear visually and verbally on television that it bears special attention.

I rise today to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 2 by Mark Helprin entitled "Statesmanship and Its Betrayal."

Mr. Speaker, I will read just a few eloquent passages of Mr. Helprin's exposition on statesmanship, and then urge all of my colleagues, indeed, all who peruse the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to do likewise.

He speaks, in part, as follows:

We had men of integrity and genius: Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. These were men who were in love with principle as if it were an art, which, in their practice, they made it. They studied empires that had fallen, for the sake of doing what was right in a small country that had barely risen, and were able to see things so clearly that they surpassed in greatness each and every one of the classical models that they had approached in awe.

Now. . . when we desperately need their high qualities of thought, their patience for deliberation, and their unerring sense of balance, we have only what we have.

Which is a political class that in the main has abandoned the essential qualities of statesmanship, with the excuse that these are inappropriate to our age. They are wrong. Not only do they fail to honor the principles of statesmanship, they fail to recognize them, having failed to learn them, having failed to have wanted to learn them.

In the main, they are in it for themselves. This constitutes not merely a failure, but a betrayal, and not only of statesmanship and principle, but of country and kin.

And why is that? It is because things matter. Even though it be played like a game, by men who excel at making it a game, our life in this country, our history in this country, the sacrifices that have been made for this country, the lives that have been given to this country, are not a game. My life is not a game. My children's lives are not a game. My parents' lives were not a game. Your life is not a game.

Yes, it is true, we do have great accumulated stores of power and wealth and decency—against which those who pretend to lead us can draw when as a result of their vanity and ineptitude they waste and expend the gifts of previous generations. The margin of error bequeathed to them allows them to present their failures as successes.

They say, "As we are still standing, and a chicken is in the pot, what does it matter if I break the links between action and consequence, work and reward, crime and punishment, merit and advancement?" I myself cannot imagine a military threat (and never could), so what does it matter if I weld shut the silo hatches on our ballistic missile submarines? What does it matter if I weld shut my eyes to weapons of mass destruction in the hands of lunatics who are building long-range missiles? Our jurisprudence is the envy of the world, so what does it matter if now and then I perjure myself, a little? What is an oath? What is a pledge? What is a sacred trust? Are not these things the province of the kinds of people who were foolish enough to do without all their lives, to wear the ruts into the Oregon Trail, to brave the seas, to die on the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima and on the battlefields of Shiloh and Antietam, for me, so that I can draw from America's great accounts, and look good, and be presidential, and have fun, in all kinds of ways?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Helprin goes on at some length to use words that conjure up, as few in American history, perhaps only most recently President Reagan could, to reach down into the soul of America, to remind us once again, we are and were and should and must be a Nation of principle, personified by statesmen, not crass political leaders looking only for themselves, only for today, and forgetting not only the great history of an America past, but looking forward to a great history of America future.

I commend Mark Helprin's article, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 2 of this year, entitled "Statesmanship and Its Betrayal," to be read and reread by my colleagues and by every American who cares about this great country, its history, and its future.

The article referred to is as follows:

STATESMANSHIP AND ITS BETRAYAL

(By Mark Helprin)

When Marco Polo entered Xanadu, the capital of the Great Khan, he crossed ring after ring of outer city, each more splendid and interesting than the one that had come before. He was used to greatness of scale, having traveled to the limits of the ordered world and then twice as far into the unknown, where no European had ever set foot, over the Hindu Kush and beyond the Pamir, and through the immense empty deserts of Central Asia. And yet after passing through the world's most ethereal regions he was impressed above all by Xanadu, a city of seemingly infinite expanse, the end of which he could not see no matter in which direction he looked.

For almost 1,000 years, this city floated at the peak of Western imagination. Unlike Jerusalem, it had vanished. Unlike Atlantis, someone had actually seen it. Even during the glory of the British Empire, Coleridge held it out for envy. But no more. Now it has been eclipsed, with ease, by this, our country, founded not as a Xanadu but with the greatest humility, and on the scale of yeomen and their small farms, and as the cradle of simple gifts.

This country was not expected to be what it became. It was expected to be infinite—seeming in its rivers, prairies and stars, not in cities with hundreds of millions of rooms, passages, halls, and buildings a quarter-mile high. It was expected to be rich in natural silence and the quality of light rather than in uncountable dollars. It was expected to be a place of unfathomable numbers, but of blades of grass and grains of wheat and the crags of mountains, rather than millions upon millions of motors spinning and humming at any one time, and wheels turning, fires burning, voices talking and lights shining.

But this great inventory of machines, buildings, bridges, vehicles and an incomprehensible number of smaller things, is what we have. A nation founded according to a vision of simplicity has become complex. A nation founded with disdain for power has become the most powerful nation.

THE ESSENTIAL QUALITIES

When letters took a month by sea and the records of the U.S. government could be moved in a single wagon pulled by two horses, we had great statesmanship. We had men of integrity and genius: Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, Jefferson, Adams, Madison and Monroe. These were men who were in love with principle as if it were an art, which, in their practice, they made it. They studied empires that had fallen, for the sake of doing what was right in a small country that had barely risen, and were able to see things so clearly that they surpassed in greatness each and every one of the classical models that they had approached in awe.

Now, lost in the sins and complexity of a Xanadu, when we desperately need their high qualities of thought, their patience for deliberation, and their unerring sense of balance, we have only what we have.

Which is a political class that in the main has abandoned the essential qualities of statesmanship, with the excuse that these are inappropriate to our age. They are wrong. Not only do they fail to honor the principles of statesmanship, they fail to recognize them, having failed to learn them, having failed to have wanted to learn them.

In the main, they are in it for themselves. Were they not, they would have a higher rate of attrition, falling with the colors of what they believe rather than landing always on their feet—adroitly, but in dishonor. In light of their vows and responsibilities, this constitutes not merely a failure but a betrayal, and not only of statesmanship and principle but of country and kin.

And why is that? It is because things matter. Even though it be played like a game, by men who excel at making it a game, our life in this country, our history in this country, the sacrifices that have been made for this country, the lives that have been given to this country, are not a game. My life is not a game. My children's lives are not a game. My parents' lives were not a game. Your life is not a game.

Yes, it is true, we do have great accumulated stores—of power, and wealth, and decency—against which those who pretend to lead us can draw when as a result of their vanity and ineptitude they waste and expend the gifts of previous generations. The margin of error bequeathed to them allows them to present their failures as successes.

They say, "As we are still standing, and a chicken is in the pot, what does it matter if I break the links between action and consequence, work and reward, crime and punishment, merit and advancement? I myself cannot imagine a military threat (and never could), so what does it matter if I weld shut the silo hatches on our ballistic missile submarines? What does it matter if I weld shut my eyes to weapons of mass destruction in the hands of lunatics who are building long-range missiles? Our jurisprudence is the envy of the world, so what does it matter if, now and then, I perjure myself, a little? What is an oath? What is a pledge? What is a sacred trust? Are not these things the province of the kinds of people who were foolish enough to do without all their lives, to wear the ruts into the Oregon Trail, to brave the seas, to die on the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima and on the battlefields of Shiloh and Antietam, for me, so that I can draw from America's great accounts, and look good, and be presidential, and have fun, in all kinds of ways?

BLOOD ONTO SAND

That is what they say, if not in words then, indelibly, in actions. They who, in robbing Peter to pay Paul, present themselves as payers and forget that they are also robbers. They who, with studied compassion, minister to some of us at the expense of others. They who make goodness and charity a public profession, depending for their election upon a well-mannered embrace of these things and the power to move them not from within themselves or by their own sacrifices but, by

compulsion, from others. They who, knowing very little or next to nothing, take pride in eagerly telling everyone else what to do. They who believe absolutely in their recitation of pieties not because they believe in the pieties but because they believe in themselves.

Nearly 400 years of America's hard-earned accounts—the principles we established, the battles we fought, the morals we upheld for century after century, our very humility before God—now flow promiscuously through our hands, like blood onto sand, squandered and laid waste by a generation that imagines history to have been but a prelude for what it itself will accomplish. More than a pity, more than a shame, such a thing is despicable. And yet, this parlous condition, this agony of weak men, this betrayal and this disgusting show, are not the end of things.

Principles are eternal. They stem not from our resolution or lack of it but from elsewhere, where in patient and infinite ranks they simply wait to be called. They can be read in history. They arise as if of their own accord when in the face of danger natural courage comes into play and honor and defiance are born. Things such as courage and honor are the mortal equivalent of certain laws written throughout the universe. The rules of symmetry and proportion, the laws of physics, the perfection of mathematics, even the principle of uncertainty, are encouragement, entirely independent of the vagaries of human will, that not only natural law but our own best aspirations have a life of their own. They have lasted through far greater abuse than abuses them now. They can be neglected, but they cannot be lost. They can be thrown down, but they cannot be broken.

Each of them is a different expression of a single quality, from which each arises in its hour of need. Some come to the fore as others stay back, and then, with changing circumstance, those that have gone unnoticed rise to the occasion. Rise to the occasion. The principle suggests itself from a phrase, and such principles suggest easily and flow generously. You can grab them out of the air, from phrases, from memories, from images.

A statesman must rise to the occasion. Even Democrats can do this. Harry Truman had the discipline of plowing a straight row 10, 12 and 14 hours a day, of rising and retiring with the sun, of struggling with temperamental machinery, of suffering heat and cold and one injury after another. After a short time on a farm, presumptions about ruling others tend to vanish. It is as if you are pulled to earth and held there.

The man who works the land is hard put to think that he would direct armies and nations. Truman understood the grave responsibility of being the president of the United States, and that it was a task too great for him or for anyone else to accomplish without doing a great deal of injury—if not to some, then to others. He understood that, therefore, he had to transcend himself. There would be little enjoyment of the job, because he had to be always aware of the enormous consequences of everything he did. Contrast this with the unspeakably vulgar pleasure in office of President Clinton.

Truman, absolutely certain that the mantle he assumed was far greater than he could ever be, was continually and deliberately aware of the weight of history, the accomplishments of his predecessors, and, by humble and imaginative projection, his own inadequacy. The sobriety and care that derived from this allowed him a rare privilege for modern presidents, to give to the presidency more than he took from it. It is not possible to occupy the Oval Office without arrogantly looting its assets or nobly adding to them. May God bless the president who adds to them, and may God damn the president who loots them.

America would not have come out of the Civil War as it did had it not been led by men like Lincoln and Lee. The battles raged for five years, but for 100 years the country, both North and South, modeled itself on their characters. They exemplified almost perfectly Churchill's statement that "public men charged with the conduct of the war should live in a continual stress of soul."

This continual stress of soul is necessary as well in peacetime, because for every good deed in public life there is a counterbalance. Benefits are given only after taxes are taken. That is part of governance. The statesman, who represents the whole nation, sees in the equilibrium for which he strives a continual tension between victory and defeat. If he did not understand this, he would have no stress of soul, he would be merely happy—about money showered upon the orphan, taken from the widow. About children sent to day care, so that they may be long absent from their parents. About merciful parole, of criminals who kill again. Whereas a statesman knows continual stress of soul, a politician is happy, for he knows not what he does.

It is difficult for individuals or nations to recognize that war and peace alternate. But they do. No matter how long peace may last, it will end in war. Though most people cannot believe at this moment that the United States of America will ever again fight for its survival, history guarantees that it will. And, when it does, most people will not know what to do. They will believe of war, as they did of peace, that it is everlasting. The statesman, who is different from everyone else, will, in the midst of common despair, see the end of war, just as during the peace he was alive to the inevitability of war, and saw it coming in the far distance, as if it were a gray wave moving quietly across a dark sea.

The politician will revel with his people and enjoy their enjoyments. The statesman, in continual stress of soul, will think of destruction. As others move in the light, he will move in darkness, so that as others move in darkness, he may move in the light. This tenacity, that is given to those of long and insistent vision, is what saves nations.

A statesman must have a temperament that is suited for the Medal of Honor, in a soul that is unafraid to die. Electorates rightly favor those who have endured combat, not as a matter of reward for service, as is commonly believed, but because the willingness of a soldier to give his life is a strong sign of his correct priorities, and that in the future he will truly understand that statesmen are not rulers but servants. It seems clear even in these years of squalid degradation that having risked death for the sake of honor is better than having risked dishonor for the sake of life.

HUNGER FOR A STATESMAN

No matter what you are told by the sophisticated classes that see virtue in every form of corruption and corruption in every form of virtue, I think you know, as I do, that the American people hunger for acts of integrity and courage. The American people hunger for a statesman magnetized by the truth, unwilling to give up his good name, uninterested in calculation only for the sake of victory, unable to put his interests before those of the nation. What this means in practical terms is no focus groups, no polls, no triangulation, no evasion, no broken promises and no lies. These are the tools of the chameleon. They are employed to cheat the American people of honest answers to direct questions. If the average politician, for fear that he may lose something, is incapable of even a genuine yes or no, how is he supposed to rise to the great occasions of state? How is he supposed to face a destructive and implacable enemy? How is he supposed to understand the rightful destiny of his country, and lead it there?

At the coronation of an English monarch, he is given a sword. Elizabeth II took it last, and as she held it before the altar, she heard these words: "Receive this kingly Sword, brought now from the altar of God and delivered to you by us, the Bishops and servants of God, though unworthy. With this Sword do justice, stop the growth of iniquity, protect the holy Church of God, help and defend widows and orphans, restore the things that are gone to decay, maintain the things that are restored, punish and reform what is amiss, and confirm what is in good order; that doing these things you may be glorious in all virtue; and so faithfully serve our Lord."

Would that we in America come once again to understand that statesmanship is not the appetite for power but—because things matter—a holy calling of self-abnegation and self-sacrifice. We have made it something else. Nonetheless, after and despite its betrayal, statesmanship remains the manifestation, in political terms, of beauty, and balance, and truth. It is the courage to tell the truth, and thus discern what is ahead. It is a mastery of the symmetry of forces, illuminated by the genius of speaking to the heart of things.

Statesmanship is a quality that, though it may be betrayed, is always ready to be taken up again merely by honest subscription to its great themes. Have confidence that even in idleness its strengths are growing, for it is a providential gift given to us in times of need. Evidently we do not need it now, but as the world is forever interesting the time will surely come when we do. And then, so help me God, I believe that, solely by the grace of God, the corrupt will be thrown down and the virtuous will rise up.

THE IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN HEALTH CARE REFORM BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, for months now the movie "As Good as It Gets" has become symbolic here in Washington with the debate over managed care reform.

Everyone knows by now that in the movie, actress Helen Hunt unleashes an epithet-laden attack on her HMO after her HMO gives her trouble when she is trying to get treatment for her asthmatic son.

In an effort to stop getting beat over the head with this example and what it symbolizes, last Friday the Republican leadership unveiled the language of its

long-awaited managed care reform bill. To state it simply, Mr. Speaker, this Republican bill is as bad as it gets.

The Republican leadership has really outdone itself with this bill. It is easily one of the worst speaks pieces of legislation they have put forward since they took control of the House in 1994. It is an unabashed sell-out to the insurance industry. In fact, it looks as if it were written by the insurance industry itself.

Although it is called the Patient Protection Act, in an attempt to confuse it with the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights, a more appropriate title for the Republican bill would be the Profit Protection Act.

The worst aspect of this bill is that it allows the insurance companies, and not doctors and patients, to make medical choices. Remarkably, the Republican bill actually reaffirms the status quo and allows insurance company bureaucrats to decide what is medically necessary, so under the Republican plan, HMOs can define "medically necessary" any way they wanted. If you get sick and your insurance company decides the treatment you need is not medically necessary, you are simply out of luck.

This is, in my opinion, truly a sell-out of the highest proportions. It ignores the central catalyst of the whole managed care debate, the strongly held belief among Americans that medical decisions should be made by doctors and their patients.

The Democrats' Patient Bill of Rights, by contrast, insures that medical decisions would be made by doctors and patients. The Democratic bill defines "medically necessary care" based on the generally accepted principles of professional medical practice. What that means is that under the Democratic plan, patients and doctors determine what is the best course of treatment, not HMOs and insurance company bureaucrats.

The Republican bill also fails to ensure access to specialists. If your child gets an illness and you want to bring your son or child to a specialist, you cannot, under the Republican bill. You may not be able to go to that specialist, depending on what the insurance company decides. But the Patient Bill of Rights, the Democratic bill, guarantees patients access to specialists when such access is needed.

Another thing, the Republican plan does not even guarantee you full access to the nearest emergency room if you need emergency care, which has been a big issue during the course of this debate. The Republican bill includes a reasonable person's standard for access to emergency care, but it does not list severe pain as a reason why a person might determine that he or she needs to go to the emergency room.

I want to repeat that, because it is really kind of mind-boggling. Under the Republican plan, severe pain is not considered a symptom of a possible emergency. So that means if you are suffering from severe pain and you rush to the emergency room to receive treatment for a legitimate problem, your HMO can still refuse to pay for it.

The Democrats' Patient Bill of Rights also guarantees patients coverage if they go to an emergency room because they are suffering from severe pain. So regardless of the reason you go to the emergency room that is closest, if you get the emergency room care, the HMO has to pay for it.

The Republican bill is also a failure when it comes to gag clauses. This is particularly interesting, because we passed prohibitions on gag rules here in the House of Representatives. But under the Republican bill, it would still allow a health plan to restrict communications between doctors and patients.

The Democrats, on the other hand, prohibit plans from gagging doctors to inform patients about treatment options that are not covered by their health plan, and protects providers from retribution by the HMO for telling their patients the truth.

When it comes to accountability, the GOP plan also is riddled with loopholes and omissions. The bill includes an external appeals process, but limits access to that process to individuals in plans under ERISA; in other words, only if your employer is self-insured. If you are covered by ERISA, you get the external review. Otherwise, you are out of luck.

Then finally, and I want to stress this, the GOP plan also denies patients the right to sue their HMOs if they are denied needed care. Again, the right to sue is an enforcement mechanism that is necessary if these patient protections really are going to be enforced.

The Democratic bill enforces all of the patient protections it provides by giving the patients the right to sue their HMO, and holding the HMOs accountable for the decisions they make. Again, this is an extremely important difference between the Democratic and the Republican plans.

CALLING FOR BIPARTISAN HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION, AND FOR SUPPORT OF THE MEEHAN-SHAYS CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM MEASURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, there is a Democrat health care bill and there is a Republican health care bill, but ultimately, if we are to have a bill, there will have to be a Republican and Democrat bill. I urge both sides on this issue, once the posturing of our various positions is known, to work in a bipartisan agreement to pass meaningful health care reform.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before the Members to thank this Chamber for its support for campaign finance reform legislation that is moving before the House; the Meehan-Shays bill as it is sometimes referred to, or McCain-Feingold.

We have had an extraordinary process that has allowed Members to debate this issue fairly extensively, and before last night we had 55 amendments. We have dealt with 20 of them. We dealt with the one that would have been a killer amendment, and I appreciate the House defeating it.

The bottom line to campaign finance reform is that we need to ban soft money, not just on the Federal level but on the State level, for Federal elections. Soft money are the unlimited sums that individuals, corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups give to the political parties, unlimited sums. They ultimately get rerouted right back to the candidates to help them in their election, making a mockery of our campaign finance laws.

The second major element, and the Meehan-Shays bill deals with soft money both on the Federal and State level, for Federal elections, it also deals with the sham issue ads and calls them what they are, campaign ads.

It does not mean that if it is a campaign ad, people do not have their voice. They just come under the campaign law. They have to disclose contributions. Contributions are limited but expenditures are not, because the Supreme Court has found that you cannot limit expenditures.

What we do is recognize that a sham issue ad that clearly is a campaign ad, 60 days prior to an election is a campaign ad if it mentions the name of the person or shows a picture or the name of the individual, and is intended to affect the election.

We also codify the court decision on Beck. That was the decision where an individual who was not a member of a union argued that he should not have to make political contributions in his agency fee to the union to be used for candidates that a person opposed. The court heard this case and determined that if you are not a member of a union, your money does not have to go for political purposes, and therefore, your agency fee is less than what the union fee would be.

We also significantly improve FEC disclosure and enforcement, particularly as it relates to disclosure. Any expenditure over $1,000, 20 days to an election, has to be noted within 24 hours, and then is put on the Internet.

We require, and in terms of enforcement, we give the FEC the ability to dismiss cases that do not have any merit, and to take up cases more quickly that do, before an election, and

we also provide for audits of campaign expenditures.

In addition, we make sure it is clear in the law that foreign money cannot be raised, and that we cannot raise money on government property. Members may think that is the law today, but soft money is not deemed campaign money, and therefore, does not come under the Pendleton Act.

So many have argued that they can accept soft money from foreigners, and on government property they can raise money. They do not want people to know they are doing this, because they know morally it is wrong, but legally and technically it is not. That is why we need to amend the law.

Mr. Speaker, we have, as I said earlier, 55 bills or amendments coming before this Chamber. We dealt with 20 last night. I would like to say that we have dealt with a few before. One of the things we are trying hard to do is, as both Republicans and Democrats, to find where we have common ground.

We found common ground with those who supported the commission bill, and urged them to vote against their own substitute commission bill, but then support the commission bill, attach it to our bill. Also the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH) took her 6 amendments last night and put them into one, and helped us write a better bill to guarantee, without question, and to satisfy those groups that are concerned, that voter guides are in fact legal and do not come under the campaign law.

There is no ambiguity on this issue. She wrote the law in a tough way. We accepted her six amendments into one, and thank her for her work in this area. She really has been a leader on campaign finance reform, and has played a tremendous role in helping us move this bill forward.

CALLING UPON HOUSE LEADERSHIP TO BRING FORWARD FOR DEBATE THE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized during morning hour debates for until 9:50 a.m.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, this morning a hearing is being held by the Democratic Health Care Task Force on the critical issue of managed health care. We are going to hear this morning from families across the country who have been denied care, who have had very difficult situations occur because they have not had the opportunity to receive the care their doctor recommended because they are in a managed care system. We are going to hear from small businesspeople. We are going to hear from other Americans speaking out.

I only wish that we were doing this within the regular committee structure. I would call upon the House leadership this morning to bring forward the Patients' Bill of Rights, the comprehensive bill to protect American families, to bring it to a full hearing, to bring it to this House for a vote, because it is absolutely critical that in this day and age, when we have the best health care in the world, that we make sure our families can truly receive that care when in fact it is recommended by their physician or other health care provider.

What we are talking about today is a basic set of principles that will allow us as Americans to be sure that the quality of care that is available in this country is truly available to each of us. I would urge strongly that the leadership take this bill up immediately.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Kevin Shrum, Pastor, Inglewood Baptist Church, Nashville, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, I humbly approach You today in the name of the one and only true God, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. In His name and with the aid of the Holy Spirit, I ask for Your bountiful blessings and godly wisdom to anoint this law-making body in their daily tasks. For, Lord, great is their task in leading this Nation to honor its noble heritage and secure the possibilities of a future as one Nation under God. May we understand, as did President George Washington, that of all dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports.

Assist this esteemed assembly and our beloved Nation as a whole to honor Your justice, mercy and righteousness in all that we say and do. If godly righteousness exalts a Nation, then let us be that Nation that leads the nations in seeking Your righteous standards.

When we err, forgive us. If we succeed, let our successes honor You and humbly lead us to further successes. And may every action of this law-making body reflect the absolute character and gracious benevolence of Your biblical law and love. Ultimately may all that we do and say as a unified people bring glory and honor to You who is able to keep us from falling and not failing and to present us before His glorious presence without fault and great joy, to the only God our Saviour be glory, majesty, power and authority, through Jesus Christ our Lord, I pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAPPAS 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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize 15 one-minutes on each side.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND DR. KEVIN SHRUM

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I stand to welcome Dr. Kevin Shrum to the Chamber of the U.S. House of Representatives and to thank him for opening our session today with a heartfelt prayer.

Dr. Shrum is a devout Christian and an inspiring pastor. His church is in Nashville, Tennessee. Inglewood Baptist Church is one of the fastest growing Southern Baptist churches in the Fifth Congressional District.

Dr. Shrum graduated with a bachelor of arts from Missouri Baptist College in 1984, received his master's of divinity in 1987 and earned his doctor of ministry in 1991 from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Dr. Shrum comes from a rich heritage of spiritual leaders. My administrative assistant Dottie Moore has been an active member of his church for many years. It is a great honor to have him with us today. God bless you.

TWINKLE, TWINKLE KENNETH STARR

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker,

Twinkle, twinkle Kenneth Starr,
Now we see how brave you are.
Up above the Pentagon sting,
Like a fair judge in the ring.
Twinkle, twinkle Kenneth Starr,
Now we see how brave you are.
When subpoenas and lies are gone,
When obstruction shines upon,
Then you throw your trump cards down,
Twinkle, twinkle all brought down.
Twinkle, twinkle Kenneth Starr,
Now we see how brave you are.
Then the Congress in the dark
Thanks you for your courage and spark;
We could not see which way to go,
If you did not lead us so.
Twinkle, twinkle Kenneth Starr,
Now we see how brave you are.

DEMOCRATIC PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of those last comments, I would point out that although we have investigations in this House galore, we have not had one hearing on the subject of managed care reform.

Health care financing is in transition and the shift to managed care has raised concerns about implications for health care quality. Managed care must be more than managed cost. Every American deserves quality health care. Managed care reforms are necessary at the Federal level to ensure that managed care is quality care. Even in my home State of Maine where strong patient protections have been enacted at the State level, my constituents know that we need a national solution to a national problem.

The Republican legislation only applies to Americans in self-insured plans. They ignore two-thirds of Americans with private health insurance. One hundred thirteen million Americans are left out in the cold by the Republican bill.

The Republicans have a patchwork approach to dealing with the real problems such as access to specialty care and the choice of physicians. Furthermore, the Republican bill is laced with poison pills such as health marts and malpractice limits.

My constituents want real protections. They do not want a watered down bill. They want the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights Act.

WITHER THE BUDGET SURPLUS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Federal budget will be in surplus for the foreseeable future. Leaving aside the fact that this is not entirely accurate given that the Social Security surplus is masking the true size of the budget deficit, the question before us is what to do with the surplus.

The Democrats, naturally, want to spend it. The Republicans, not surprisingly, want to see it used to begin paying down the national debt or they want to use it for a tax cut. I will leave it to the other side to explain to the American people why they want to spend more money on failed, wasteful social programs and I will only consider the real choice for Congress, paying down the debt or tax relief.

My instinct is to go 50–50, half towards tax cuts and half towards a down payment on our $5.4 trillion national debt. But then I think about the likelihood that liberal spending politicians in Washington will keep their hands off the budget surplus and I start to lean more strongly towards tax relief.

The bottom line is this: Do not spend the surplus.

PASS THE DEMOCRATIC PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, Democrats want to make sure that good health care is the right of every American. You pay for it. You deserve it. And you should have the right to demand the medical treatment you need.

The Republican leadership and insurance companies believe that they and not you will determine your medical coverage. So the insurance companies and the Republican leadership continue to allow gag orders on doctors and nurses in managed care plans. HMOs tell doctors and nurses and you what medical treatment you will receive, not what medical treatment you need. They gag your doctor.

Democrats believe you and your doctor should decide what medical treatment you need. No more gag orders. The Republican leadership continue to place a gag order on the American people and refuse to hold hearings on the Patients' Bill of Rights. So Democrats want to lift the GOP gag order. We are holding hearings on the Patients' Bill of Rights in Room 2237 of the Rayburn Building.

Democrats want to make sure that health care is the right of every American. You pay for it, you deserve it. You have the right to demand the medical treatment you need. Lift the gag order, Mr. Speaker. Pass the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights.

SCHOOL CHOICE

(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, we Republicans find ourselves in a strange position. On the one hand, we benefit politically when the defenders of the status quo oppose choice in public schools. We benefit politically because school choice is something their own constituents favor. But on the other hand we Republicans despair at finding leftist opposition to school choice because many kids are denied the opportunity of attending a good school and thereby are forced into failing schools. And so we have this bizarre situation where left-wing opposition to school choice means that Republicans win politically but we win at a terrible social cost.

□ 1015

The remarkable thing about this bizarre situation is that the defenders of the bureaucracy accept this national disgrace, because it benefits their union monopolies. No wonder so many Americans are fed up with many posturing politicians and the special interests they protect. We need to give parents control over their kid's education, and that will only come from school choice. That is what we Republicans are fighting for.

E-RATE WEEK

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce E-Rate week. Today I join many Members of Congress in kicking off a week of discussion, information, and emphasis about the importance of the E-Rate program to our schools, our children, and our country. The E-Rate is designed to bring discounted Internet services to children in schools and libraries across America.

In the world of tomorrow, technology and the Internet will be the tools essential to our Nation's workforce. Technical literacy will determine whether a person has a high-paying job or whether that person is frozen into a low-wage, low-opportunity profession.

Currently, only a few wealthy school districts can afford this technology. The E-Rate ensures that needy schools receive discounted services so that every American child has an equal chance to succeed.

Those who attack the E-Rate undercut the future of our children and of our country. Americans want to provide their children the skills and tools of the 21st Century. Through the E-Rate, this is one way we can accomplish this goal.

JUDGE STARR ONCE PRAISED BY DEMOCRATS

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, let us listen to what some people have said about Judge Ken Starr's character and integrity. I quote, "Starr has the confidence of most of those of us who know him and, I suspect, the confidence of most of us in the Senate." A Republican? No. That was Senator JAMES EXON, Democrat of Nebraska.

Here is another, and I quote, "Judge Starr is certainly a neutral party. No one, I think, has accused him of being on a fishing expedition." A Republican? No. That was Senator JOHN KERRY, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, these two comments represent many, many comments made by Democrats about Judge Ken Starr's character back in 1993 when Judge Starr was asked to investigate sexual misconduct charges against former Senator Bob Packwood on behalf of the Ethics Committee.

Democrats once praised Judge Starr, but now they either criticize him or stand silent in the face of White House attacks on his character. What has changed? Well, it could be that Democrats praised Judge Starr because he was investigating a Republican. We can only wonder.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address the very important issue of school violence. I was recently pleased to learn that this administration will finally hold a national conference on school safety sometime in October of this year.

Because no community in America is immune to the plague of school violence, and because we, as a Nation can no longer sit idly by while violence in our schools continue to rise, I sent a letter to the President on June 24th encouraging him to listen to the solutions of the American people from coast to coast and border to border.

For America to achieve success in combating school violence in our local communities, we must first address three important issues. First, the Federal Government must redirect its resources to States to focus on this problem at the local level. Secondly, our communities must continue to improve cooperative relations among local agencies whose job it is to address this problem associated with school violence.

Finally, it is important that any conference bring together, in a round table discussion, several representatives from local and Federal law enforcement agencies, courts, city councils, and school boards to develop local solutions to a national problem. Mr. Speaker, our children deserve no less.

AGRICULTURE EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1998

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, with 40 percent of American agricultural commodities and products being exported, the American farmer is more reliant on international markets than any other sector of the U.S. economy. That is why it is so important that the U.S. lay out specific agricultural trade negotiation objectives.

Today, I am pleased to introduce the Agricultural Export Enhancement Act of 1998. Until recently, farm exports had soared over the past several years. However, too many trade barriers prevent billions of people from buying our products. Our trade negotiators need to focus their attention on eliminating tariffs, subsidies, and other foreign regulations that limit what we sell overseas.

This legislation would establish those negotiating objectives. I would suggest that it is a good bill for many Members of this House to support.

MANAGED CARE

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the way that Americans choose and obtain and pay their physician has changed drastically over the last 10 years.

Ten years ago, less than 30 percent of the people with health care insurance coverage were in managed care programs. Today, approximately 75 percent of insured employees are covered by managed care plans. A large amount of that 75 percent is questioning whether they are served well by that system.

The result is a health care system which is dominated by economic tools, limited budgets, limited hospital budgets, waiting hospital lines, waiting lines also with the managed care program. Many managed care constraints now limit what we can do.

Our goal must be to provide health care with increased health care coverage for this country. This is a national challenge. In Congress, we need to meet that challenge.

Supporting H.R. 3605, the Patients' Bill of Rights Act, is a first step in achieving health care reform. This bill will allow patients and doctors, not the insurance company, to control the length of stay, the quality of care. Mr. Speaker, I encourage you and my colleagues to join me in supporting of this bill.

FALSELY ACCUSED BEHAVIOR VERSUS GUILTY BEHAVIOR

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, imagine you are falsely accused of crimes. You know that you are innocent, but the people who know the truth simply are not talking. People who could prove you are innocent, it turns out, are the Secret Service personnel who are constantly by your side and that could testify that all of the scurrilous accusations are, in fact, untrue. So your task is to convince everyone you know to come forward, to prove your innocence, and to clear your name.

Let us think about this for a minute. If a person is falsely accused of wrongdoing, clearly what must be done is to demand the people who know the truth to come forward and tell the whole world what they know. On the other hand, someone who is guilty of wrongdoing acts in a strikingly different manner. In such a case, all manner of excuse is given to prevent people from coming forward to tell what they know.

You do not have to be a Perry Mason fan to know the difference between a behavior of a falsely accused person and one that is guilty.

PROTECT MEDICAL PRIVACY: REJECT BIG BROTHER

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, Big Brother is back, this time in the form of a previously unpublicized provision in the law that would require every single American to have a special identification number. That number would allow every notation in his or her medical record to be tracked. Tracked by who knows who.

We have seen it before. We have seen it in the 1-800-Big Brother scheme that would require the Federal Government to sign off on each and every job hiring in this Nation. We have seen it in proposals for some sort of national ID card. Now we are witnessing an unprecedented attempt to invade the privacy of one's medical records.

When most of us voted for legislation that would allow individuals to take their health care insurance with them when they changed jobs, we were not voting for a hidden provision to allow medical ID numbers.

Let us face it, medical records are extremely sensitive. This Member is going to work vigorously to protect the medical privacy of every American. Let us reject this latest example of Big Brother.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, all across New York and across America,

many people are being denied access to the health care that they need. They are also being denied access to the doctor of their choice and the health care professional that they would like to consult and be advised by in order to get the health care they need.

Access to prescription drugs also is being denied to Americans. These drugs are needed to alleviate the health care conditions that they have. The problem is that our health care delivery system is out of control because it is increasingly controlled by bureaucrats and insurance companies.

We need a Patients' Bill of Rights which will allow Americans to get the health care they need, access to health care professionals and the professional medical advice they need, not from insurance company bureaucrats, but from health care professionals, the doctors that they want to consult.

That is why the Democratic proposal for a Patients' Bill of Rights is so important. The hearing is going on now. We need to get that bill to the floor and get it passed.

BABY PHOENIX

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Baby Phoenix, first known survivor of a partial-birth abortion. Last week, in the A-Z Women's Center in Phoenix, Arizona, a 17-year-old was scheduled to abort her baby.

The abortionist began a partial-birth abortion on what he thought was a 23-week-old baby. However, as he continued the procedure, he realized that he was actually committing a partial-birth abortion on a 6-pound, 2-ounce baby girl.

Instead of continuing this procedure in which the doctor would stick scissors into the back of the girl's head and then vacuum her brains out, the abortionist decided to stop the abortion and deliver the 6-pound, 2-ounce little girl.

What if this abortionist had continued the partial-birth abortion? Would he have been convicted of killing Baby Phoenix? Absolutely not. Under our Nation's abortion law, the doctor could have continued the partial-birth abortion and delivered Baby Phoenix dead.

Our Nation's law protects this infanticide, the right of the doctor to kill a baby just because she is not fully outside her mother's body. Like Baby Phoenix, my son Dan was only 6 pounds when he was born. I remember cradling him in my hands. He was so tiny, but so perfect.

Those that oppose the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act support the right to kill babies like these. We should vote to override the President's veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act and pass it into law this year.

IRS REFORM BILL

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the third district of North Carolina have expressed their appreciation for this Congress for passing the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform bill, which awaits the President's signature.

This is an opportunity for President Clinton to sign into law legislation that protects American taxpayers from IRS abuse and prove to the American people that he is willing to work with this Congress to provide substantial tax reform for all Americans.

The IRS Reform bill is long overdue legislation that would shift the burden of proof from the hard-working American taxpayer back to the IRS where it belongs. In addition, taxpayers will receive 74 new rights and protections that will help reduce the power of the Internal Revenue Service and bring fairness to a corrupt system.

I urge the President to sign the IRS Reform bill and to work with the 105th Congress to continue providing hard-working Americans with a tax relief they need and rightly deserve.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 504

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 306 or 401 the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 88, line 10, through page 89, line 6. If an unprotected provision is stricken on a point of order, the Committee of the Whole shall immediately consider the amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Johnson of Connecticut or her designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The amendment printed in part 3 of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only by Representative Young of Alaska or his designee, may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 504 is an open rule which waives all points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 306 or section 401 of the Budget Act of 1974. The rule provides one hour of general debate, equally divided between the

chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule further provides that the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted.

The rule also waives clause 2, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions, and clause 6, prohibiting reappropriations in an appropriations bill, of rule XXI against the bill, except as follows: Page 88, line 10, through page 89, line 6.

The rule makes in order those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report, which shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided between a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. The rule also waives all points of order against amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report.

Mr. Speaker, the rule permits the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It allows the Chair to postpone recorded votes and reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed votes, provided that voting on the first of any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

The rule waives points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI, prohibiting non-emergency amendments to be offered to a bill containing an emergency designation under the Budget Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4193, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1999 was reported by the Committee on Appropriations by voice vote. The bill appropriates a total of $13.4 billion for fiscal year 1999, which is roughly $800 million less than the President's request and roughly $700 million less than what was appropriated last year.

The bill's spending level is equal to the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation for discretionary budget authority. Approximately one-half of the bill's funding finances Interior Department programs to manage and study the Nation's animal, plant and mineral resources. The balance of the measure's funds support other non-interior agencies that perform related functions. These include the Forest Service, conservation and fossil energy programs run by the Department of Energy, and the Indian Health Services, as well as the Smithsonian and other cultural organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), for requesting an open rule on this important legislation. Recognizing that certain members have particular concerns about the bill, the Committee on Rules has reported a rule which permits those wishing to offer amendments to do so.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 4193.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present and move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6, rule XV of the House, the Chair cannot entertain a point of no quorum at this stage.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, at what stage then can the point of no quorum be made?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At such time as the Chair is putting the question to a vote.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, we have a very important debate coming up on the rule itself, and I would think that this is the proper time for the Chair to consider that Members of the House ought to hear the debate. I respectfully ask the Chair to have that in mind when it makes the ruling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Clause 6 of rule XV restrains the Chair from entertaining the point of order at this point in time.

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, this rule has many good features. It is an open rule that will allow Members to work their will. It self-executes important amendments that deal with vital issues, such as the wildland fire suppression, forest health and Indian health care. In fact, I would have been pleased to vigorously support this rule if it had protected all portions of the committee-reported bill from points of order and if it had allowed the precedents of the House to determine the order in which Members would be recognized to offer amendments.

However, the rule reported by the Committee on Rules leaves unprotected a single provision of the bill, allowing that provision of the bill to be struck, but then the rule allows a specified majority member to offer an amendment to put the same provision back in the bill.

Now, why do we go through this charade? Because apparently they wanted to mollify a segment of the conference while simultaneously allowing a majority Member, who is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations or the authorizing committee, to appear to take a leadership role on the arts.

As the Chair of the Congressional Member Organization for the Arts, I encourage all Members to support the arts and welcome their active participation and leadership in the ongoing efforts to fund the National Endowment for the Arts at a reasonable level.

However, this year in particular, the decision to award this important amendment to a majority Member is extremely unfortunate. This is the last year in which debate on Federal support of the arts will be led by the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). Known as the champion of the National Endowment for the Arts and credited for keeping it alive by the shear force of his will, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) is retiring at the end of the year. Under the normal procedures of the House, the gentleman would have had the honor of offering amendments to strengthen the arts, but this rule deliberately snatches that honor from him, for purely partisan reasons.

Of course, this disappointment can never obscure the debt that artists, arts, educators and arts institutions across the Nation owe to their long time champion.

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

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) yield for that purpose?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES of Illinois moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 7, nays 382, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—7

Conyers
DeFazio
Filner
Gephardt
McDermott
Miller (CA)
Nadler

NAYS—382

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sánchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—45

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

□ 1102

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

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Most importantly, we must not forget the impact of the arts on our Nation's most precious resource, our children. Providing students access to art has a significant impact on their overall development, including academic achievement and behavior. In fact, a study conducted by the College Entrance Examination Board showed that students with 4 or more years of arts classes raised their SAT scores by 53 points on the verbal and 35 points on the math portions of the test. For 36 cents per capita, how can we not even consider making this investment?

The NEA is also instrumental in making sure all Americans have access to the arts. Through its innovative new

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If we did that we, of course, would not have a debate on an issue that is terribly important to many Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and especially to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) who is without a question the personification of the word "gentleman" in this body.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, instead of that, in trying to be fair to Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats both divided on this issue, we issued a rule and we lived up to the protocol, our obligation to the authorizing committees and we left the NEA funding exposed.

Now, we also wrote into the rule, and I have the language right here, that if

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Thirty seconds is all I need.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not think the gentleman can explain that to the 21 fire fighters from my district that went out to fight fires and were gone for 3 months in this country.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the Arts, but only after we have taken care of all the necessary services.

I am not sure that this should ever be a function of the Federal Government. The ultimate irony is that funding for the National Endowment for the Arts came from the fire fighting account. Now, that is a misprioritization of our funds. It would be especially odd considering that the NEA is an organization this body has elected to terminate. But to fund the NEA at the cost of the wild land fire fighting capabilities is unacceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then the rule turns around, having taken the money away from NEA, and tries to put it back by giving the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) the opportunity to offer an amendment to restore it.

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

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

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

□ 1130

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is an excellent example of a public-private partnership. I again want to

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The rule has only one purpose. It knocks out funding put in the bill on a Democratic motion for the purpose of giving a Republican Member a chance to claim credit for putting it back, and it also has the parliamentary effect of raising the number of votes required to preserve the arts because we have to have a majority to put the money back in rather than a majority to take it out. That is all it does.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

arts groups who travel across the country bringing the arts to the American people.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But let me just talk for a moment about this rule. I have heard words like "Byzantine" and "extreme partisanship" used to describe this rule, and I think it is important for us to note that there is a great deal of controversy about the National Endowment for the Arts.

□ 1145

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

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

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

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

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

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

This record of sound management now depends on the outcome of a House-Senate conference reconciling fiscal year 1999 energy and water appropriations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the House could have an up or down vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope Members will read the report. We have a section on the recreation on all of our land agencies plus the cultural agencies, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Holocaust Memorial Council, the Kennedy Center, and others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So what are we really witnessing here? We are witnessing an assault on free expression, a war on culture, a rule that denies the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) his earned right. This is a battle as old as the stockades in puritan times and just as wrongheaded.

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

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

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

□ 1200

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

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

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

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

A few weeks ago, we had a debate which I supported on giving support for marketing our agricultural crops abroad. We are appropriating more

money to sell oranges than we appropriate for the National Endowment for the Arts. I think that is a pity in a country that is probably the most creative country in the world.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I propose to have a vote on the previous question as I indicated when I addressed the House formerly. I would hope that, with the favorable vote on the previous question, I will then offer an amendment to provide the waiver for NEA that it deserves.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interior Appropriations subcommittee, I have learned a great deal about the NEA in the last few years. I know that the NEA would admit it has made mistakes in the past, but it has instituted a series of management reforms to ensure that those types of problems will not recur. Even given those problems, opponents of the NEA can point to only a handful of questionable grants out of hundreds of thousands that have been awarded during the 32-year history

of the NEA. After hearing real people and real artists discuss what the NEA has brought to them and to their communities, I know that the NEA is an incredible catalyst for bringing people together and expressing, in a creative fashion, the full range of the human experience. The National Endowment for the Arts is successfully working to bring arts to underserved communities, through after school youth programs that are introducing our young people to the power of creative expression as an alternative to violence, and through folk and traditional arts they remind us of our common bond and what it means to be an American.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule so that we can have a fair debate on the NEA and honor the views of the full committee, which voted to report a bill to this House that included $98 million in funding for the NEA. A vote against this rule is a vote for the arts.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

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

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Baker
Bilirakis
Canady
Dixon
Ford
Gekas
Gonzalez
Hinojosa
John
Kennelly
McDade
McNulty
Norwood
Ortiz
Peterson (PA)

□ 1227

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—224

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug

Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hefner
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—19

Baker
Bilirakis
Dixon
Ford
Gekas
Gonzalez
Graham
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
John
Kennelly
Livingston
McDade
McNulty
Norwood
Ortiz
Rodriguez

□ 1234

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1891

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1891.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which we are about to consider, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4193.

□ 1236

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to introduce my statement with a quote from the Indian lore, from the Native Americans, and I think it sums up what this bill is all about. I quote: "We do not inherit this land from our ancestors; we borrow it from our children." That is a profound truth, and that is what we have tried to keep in mind as we have dealt with this legislation. I like to call this bill the "Take Pride in America" bill, because we can take pride in what has happened in this great land of ours, in the preservation of our great natural resources.

Several members of our committee had an opportunity to tour some of the parks in the system this last month, and I think we agreed that we found great pride on the part of the people that staff these facilities. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would agree. He was part of our delegation, and saw that people in the land agencies are proud of their work and they put in a lot of extra time. We saw this in Yosemite where the storm damage has been repaired, a lot of it on time donated by members of the Park Service staff.

I also think that the record of volunteers in the land agencies is enormously impressive, and something we can all take pride in. Mr. Chairman, 94,000 people volunteered to work in our national parks without any compensation, but because they care about the land, they care about the parks. Mr. Chairman, there are 112,000 volunteers in the Forest Service; 28,000 volunteers in Fish and Wildlife; 17,000 volunteers in the Bureau of Land Management; and we of course are talking about a total of 617 million acres of the United States, about 30 percent of the land area.

We get a lot of foreign visitors. In our meeting with park officials, we learned that people come here from all over the world to view the national treasures, to view the unique ecological characteristics of our national parks, forests and other facilities.

We have extended the recreation fee program for two. We will talk more about that in general debate. It is anticipated to generate $500 million over

a 5-year period. This is additional money, in fact, and the public has accepted it. One of the superintendents told me on our trip that people often want to give more. They say, "That is not enough," $2 to visit a park or $20 for a car load of people. They say, "We would like to contribute more." The same park people said that vandalism has been reduced because people become stakeholders. We can take pride in that.

We can take pride in the fact that as a Nation we commit almost $8 billion to programs for the Native Americans, not all in our bill, but across the board in many different bills.

Now, this has been a remarkable success story. I do not mention this in terms of just today, but I want to say it is there because of the leadership over the years of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE). They are both going to leave the committee, and I think that is something we should note.

I could say a lot about the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and his leadership. I have served 24 years with him. We have been partners, and as partners often will, we may have disagreed on policies, but never in a disagreeable way. He served on this committee for 48 years, 20 years as chairman.

Just to illustrate his leadership, I will give my colleagues a couple of instances. I remember the hearing on the National Endowment for the Arts when the gentleman brought in a group from Jessup, Iowa. Now, that is not exactly New York City; Jessup, Iowa is a pretty rural community. These young people came to our subcommittee and testified on how a string quartet had been sent there for a 6-month period, funded one-half by the National Endowment for the Arts, the other half by the local community. Obviously, this would not be a wealthy community, and yet they were willing to put up half the money to bring this cultural experience to their students. We had one of the students testify from Jessup about what an impact this grant, along with what his own community had spent, had made on the students in Jessup, Iowa.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) brought many examples such as this one during our period on the committee. Likewise, in terms of our natural resources, the redoing of the minerals management system was leadership that the gentleman provided. He really has truly lived and personified in his role on this subcommittee of the Indian saying, that we borrow this land from our children, and I know that he has always had a concern for it.

Likewise, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE), who has been a member of this committee for 20 years. He always brought to the committee a desire to enhance the natural heritage that is a legacy for all of us and has given us wonderful service. We will miss these two individuals a great deal in terms of the subcommittee and the leadership they have provided over the years.

Also, we have had the thoughtful work of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), our friend who always brings to this committee intellectual curiosity. He always says, "is this the right thing to do?" and always I felt challenged as a chairman. Many times, after reflecting on what he had to say, I might disagree, but always he made a very good point in bringing a concern that he might have for some of the activities of our subcommittee.

Well, we could spend a lot of time on the three Members who have done so much to contribute to the strength of our committee and to the good work that it has done. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) will be missed from the committee's thoughtful deliberations.

Finally, I have some of charts, which will illustrate what we have done on the Native Americans. I think it outlines it very well. We do not have a lot of time to spend on the various activities of the bill.

□ 1245

I would say at the outset, we were given $14 billion-plus in budget authority and $13 billion-plus in outlays. We have tried to manage our resources carefully. In fact, we are spending $2 million less this year than last. And that in the face of enormous backlog maintenance problems, in the face of great needs to expand the programs within the parks.

One item I would like to mention is that we have included the money to complete the Appalachian Trail, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has been a leader for many years. Here we have a trail that is over 2,000 miles long and, thanks to the gentleman's leadership and follow-up as my partner, our team effort, this will be the last payment in the Appalachian Trail which is one of the great resources of the trails program in this Nation, and it will be totally public in terms of its land access.

I want to mention the recreation fee program in more detail. We extend it for 2 years, because we have had great support from the public, from the park leadership. Over a 5-year period, it will provide $500 million which will be used to enhance the visitor experience and will be used to deal with some of the backlog maintenance problems.

In terms of management, we are changing the structure somewhat. We do not want any more Delaware Water Gap outhouse projects. I say that because it is debilitating to the public support for the parks. And, therefore, we need to manage the construction programs in a way that people have confidence in the continued leadership.

Thanks to Members on both sides of the aisle on the Forest Service issue, we have eliminated the Purchaser Road Credit. This was always a problem in the past. This year we will not have any amendments on Purchaser Road Credit, because we took it out.

I must say these things were something that, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) always called me "a partner," and I likewise call him a partner, and it is just that we have agreed on that for good management.

With regard to SPR oil, we are no longer going to create money. We are not going to go in and invade the SPR oil account and sell oil just to provide us some additional funding. And, of course, because of that, in part, we are funding this bill with a reduced amount of money.

The "crown jewels," the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone and Yosemite, are being protected. We are recognizing their needs. But also, I think in the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, we recognize the potential there for recreation. I would urge all Members to see the section in the report dealing with recreation. This is a new section, and it is a recognition that there has been an explosion of recreation usage by the public.

We often think of the Forest Service in terms of America's lumber needs. But in reality, the Forest Service has the largest number of visitor days, and the reason being that they offer a wide variety of opportunities to hunt, fish, snowmobile, camp, bird watch, whatever the desire might be in the use of public lands. And they have 192 million acres in federal land.

I think we have tried to have a responsible harvesting of fiber in the national forests. About 20 percent of the lumber used in the Nation comes from the national forests. And so I think it is important that we manage this resource carefully. We have vastly reduced the cut. About 7 years ago, the allowable cut was 11 billion board feet. We have reduced it to 3.6 billion, because we recognize the public is concerned about the environmental impact of heavy cutting.

But I would point out that we are growing 20 billion board feet every year. So even though we might harvest 3 billion-plus board feet, we are getting an additional 17 billion added to the stock of our national forests.

So this is important as we talk about reducing CO_2. There is no better way to reduce CO_2 than to have a tree, because it takes in the CO_2, and gives off oxygen. And that is part of what the Kyoto Agreement is all about, to reduce CO_2. I think we need to continue the expansion of our national forests.

The BLM lands get very little attention, but they had 65 million visitor days last year. One-third of the Nation's coal supply comes from BLM

lands. That is from the public lands. Also, they preserve a lot of our recreation, natural historical and cultural resources, and they do have a very broad scope of land opportunities.

Something that I am very pleased to see happen is that our agencies are working together. The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service are consolidating their activities at the field level. They realize we all serve the same taxpayers, we all have the same mission, which is to preserve our public lands, and the public does not know whether this has a tag on it that says BLM or Forest Service. They just want this land to be taken care of.

In terms of saving money, this is terrific, I think, that they work together. And, likewise, the Department of Agriculture and Interior are coordinating their efforts on the Joint Fire Science Plan. This is good management, and it is good for the way in which we use our public lands.

Revenues, this is one of the few bills that produces revenues. Sale of the resources from our public lands totals about $8 billion. And that goes into the Treasury, helping defer the cost of providing the services that are part of our land usage.

I have mentioned the recreation fee program and we are getting a growing land usage. One of the things that we observed when we were visiting the parks this summer as a committee is the pressures that are growing for parking space, for traffic management, for the use of the facilities.

One of the things that we hope to address prospectively is ways in which we can better enhance the visitors' experience and avoid some of these problems of too many people loving their parks too much. We want to manage the parking problem. We want to manage the traffic problem so that the visitors can get the maximum amount of enjoyment out of their asset, the national public lands.

We looked at some of the construction needs of our parks. Housing is one that requires attention so that we can give the employees of the Park Service, the Forest Service, and the other land management agencies, an opportunity to live in a comfortable way.

We are changing the way in which we manage construction. Historically for the parks, the Denver Service Center has done this and their fees have come from overhead on the project. That does not provide a desirable accountability. So we are going to reduce the numbers of employees there.

We found that there are 500 people at Denver, whereas the other land management agencies have about 25 people each. We are putting them on-line, so that their budget will be part of the line-item budget and will have accountability for what they do.

These changes are the result of recommendations from the National Academy of Public Administration, who did an extensive oversight of the way in which we manage construction project. Again, this is an effort to stretch our dollars. Prospectively, we will require the Park Service to contract out 90 percent of construction projects to local architectural and engineering firms. Hopefully, we will get more efficient use of these construction dollars.

I mentioned the Purchaser Road Credit, we have eliminated it. But I want to point out also that we have include $91 million for road maintenance and decommissioning. That is to eliminate these roads which are of concern to people.

We put an increase of $6 million for road reconstruction and $93 million also as part of the road reconstruction program. This is an increase over last year, a statement that we recognize that these roads are important to the recreation user and we want them to be able to get in and out of the forest in a safe way. We only have $1 million for new roads and we provided $5 million for road obliteration. I think that is a positive direction in terms of those who are concerned about the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned about the amount of board feet that come out of the national forests, part of our resources, which allows us to reduce housing costs. In terms of fire, we heard discussion on the fire issue in the debate on the rule, but we had put in additional money for fire suppression and fire science so that we can deal with fire in the best possible way. There is a substantial amount of money left over from previous years, and I think we have very adequately taken care of our fire needs.

$2 million from the Department of Agriculture bill has been added to this bill to help with volunteer fire companies, recognizing that in communities where they have volunteer firefighting units, they need a little help, and they, in turn, can help the forestry people in dealing with fires. And we had $21.5 million in fire assistance to the States, places like Florida.

I think it should be pointed out that the Florida fires are pretty much on State lands, but nevertheless the Federal Government is helping as much as possible.

On Native Americans, I was disappointed in the administration's request. They reduced the amount on Indian Health Services and had we funded at the administration's level, only 25 percent of the Indian population would have dental services. This is from testimony from the American Dental Society.

We have tried to correct this gross inequity, and we have increased Indian Health Services by $147 million. And we have increased $50 million for facilities, clinics and so on and recognized our responsibility.

Some of you will remember some years ago we transferred the Biologic Resources Program to U.S. Geological Survey and I think they are doing a remarkably efficient job of providing science to all the land agencies. We tried to meet their budget needs, as well.

In Ecological Services of the Fish and Wildlife Service, we have included funding for the Endangered Species Act, to administer it. I hope the administration will come up with a bill to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act. It is not authorized. It needs reauthorization, and I would hope that we can get a bill from the administration, along with others that have offered bills, to deal with this problem because we have to just appropriate in light of the absence of an authorization program.

Energy programs. Obviously to meet the needs of the parks and the forests and the other agencies, we did cut back on the amount of funding in energy. And I might mention at this point that one of the things that we have emphasized in our programs is matching funds. We have said to those who want to have experimental programs in energy, for those who want to have other programs, "Okay, we will put up a dollar, but you have to put up a matching dollar from the private sector, or from a State, or whatever it might be." Therefore we have maximized considerably the amount money that we have had available to do energy programs.

Obviously, everyone who goes to the gas pump know that energy prices are relatively low. Part of this is the result of efficiency in the production of gasoline. I think the fact that we have low energy costs contributes very substantially to our strong economy.

We have to keep this success going. It is not a given. We are importing over half our petroleum. And, therefore, it is important that we maintain the SPR oil. And I think it is important that we maintain the programs that will give a more efficient use. I was struck by the fact that for every barrel that is extracted from wells, two barrels are left there. And if we can develop technology to get at least part of that extra two barrels, we will tremendously expand our domestic resources of petroleum.

Again, we have emphasized partnerships in these programs in terms of energy efficiency. We have increased energy efficiency funding 14 percent since 1996, and we recognize that energy efficiency is important in terms of using the resources to the best possible advantage.

In terms of weatherization, we have flat-funded it. The Federal Energy Management Program has got an increase because, again, this is a partnership that has been very effective in working with Federal agencies.

□ 1300

National Endowment for the Arts. We will have plenty of opportunity to debate the NEA later on, so I will not take time on it now, other than to say to all the Members that they will have an opportunity to vote up or down on whether they think it is a proper function of the United States Government to provide funding for the cultural heritage of this Nation, for the enhancement of it, for the expansion, for the education of young people in terms of what they have as a cultural heritage.

We will have that vote, and I will mention at that time the fact that we have changed the NEA. We have six Members of the Congress that serve on the Council. We put a cap on funds that can go to any one State. Forty percent of the funding goes for set-aside programs for State grants. We have reduced the administrative funds. We have established priorities for grants for education, particularly in music.

And I would point out also that the obscenity restrictions adopted in 1990 are still part of the law. The Supreme Court, most recently in the Finley decision, upheld these obscenity restrictions. And we have eliminated grants to individuals for seasonal support and subgranting.

I think I can say categorically that there will be no more Maplethorps; that there will not be a "Corpus Christi," as has been alleged. That cannot happen under the restrictions that we have put on the National Endowment for the Arts. And I think one of the Members on our side who has been appointed as one of the three appointees will have something to say on the functioning of this.

Very briefly I would like to highlight the cultural agencies. We have funded the Smithsonian. We have tried to address backlog maintenance as much as possible. But what I really find pleasing, and this is the result of our subcommittee members working together, is that our cultural agencies are expanding their outreach. Secretary Heyman, from the Smithsonian, testified that their web site gets over 12 million hits per month from all over the world. People are benefiting from the scientific research that is done there, and benefiting from the cultural dimensions of this institution.

In tribute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) have all been strong proponents of these programs. This wonderful asset is more than an asset for the District of Columbia. It is a world asset because of the outreach that they are doing. Twelve million hits per month. Imagine how many lives and how many individuals are being touched by that. Twenty percent of these internet hits are from overseas.

Likewise, the Kennedy Center has developed an outreach program called the Millennium Stage. They provide a free performance each day in the Kennedy Center. I think it is at 6 o'clock in the evening. Because we forget that the Kennedy Center is more than just the opera house and the film institute. The Kennedy Center is a monument, in addition to other things. When people go there, most of them do not go to any performance, they go to just see the Kennedy Center. In fact, they wear out the carpeting with so many visitors, and we have to provide for that.

And, again, these are things that were brought about under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) much more than myself or others on this subcommittee.

Last year 130,000 visitors to this city, as well as people who live here locally, went to the free performances at the Millennium Stage, and at the anniversary in March, they had 10,000 people. I do not know how they got 10,000 people in that hallway for this Millennium program, but I think it is wonderful that these agencies are reaching out to the people all across the Nation. And I know they too have a web site where people can plug in.

The National Gallery of Art and the Holocaust Museum both offer extensive outreach programs, and, of course, the Holocaust Museum was directly there as a result of the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois. I guess when it is all said and done, we know he will be sorely missed because he has been such an important part of providing a legacy for future generations.

Over 23 million people receive services of the National Gallery's extension programs. They loaned over 150 different programs on the Gallery's permanent art collection. The Holocaust Museum has a traveling exhibition. They were in Canton, Ohio, recently, attracting an enormous crowd.

Canton, I might mention, is in the 16th District, and many of my colleagues already know about the Pro Football Hall of Fame, but we do have other things. We have a great art institute. We have a great symphony. We have a lot of strong cultural enrichment programs.

The Holocaust Museum brought "The Nazi Olympics: Berlin 1936," to Canton. People came from all over Ohio and even from other States to view this exhibit. The Holocaust Museum has four traveling exhibits going around the Nation telling the story to remind people of how important the message is.

This is a good bill. It is fair. We had input from every member of the subcommittee. We had the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois and other Members on the minority side. We had the challenges of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), did yeoman's service in solving the problem of the timber and the purchaser road credit so we do not have that issue this year. On balance, I would urge the Members to support this bill.

And let me just close again with a quote from our Native American friends. This is repetitious but it bears repeating: "We do not inherit this land from our ancestors. We borrow it from our children." And I want to say that the members of our subcommittee live that every day as we deal with the challenges of this committee. This truly is a bill in which we can take pride in America.

At this point I would like to submit a table detailing the various accounts in the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources	582,082,000	660,310,000	596,425,000	+14,343,000	-63,885,000
Wildland fire management	280,103,000	298,353,000	286,895,000	+6,792,000	-11,458,000
Central hazardous materials fund	12,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
Construction	5,091,000	4,175,000	6,975,000	+1,884,000	+2,800,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	.....	.....
Land acquisition	11,200,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	-1,200,000	-5,000,000
Oregon and California grant lands	98,906,000	98,966,000	98,407,000	-499,000	-559,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	9,113,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+887,000	.....
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite)	8,706,000	8,055,000	8,055,000	-651,000	.....
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000	.....	.....
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,136,001,000	1,233,659,000	1,155,557,000	+19,556,000	-78,102,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management	594,592,000	675,828,000	607,106,000	+12,514,000	-68,722,000
Construction	76,636,000	37,000,000	66,100,000	-10,536,000	+29,100,000
Land acquisition	62,632,000	60,500,000	30,000,000	-32,632,000	-30,500,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	14,000,000	17,000,000	15,000,000	+1,000,000	-2,000,000
National wildlife refuge fund	10,779,000	10,000,000	10,779,000	.....	+779,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	11,700,000	14,700,000	12,700,000	+1,000,000	-2,000,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	800,000	800,000	800,000	.....	.....
Multinational species conservation fund	1,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	+1,000,000	.....
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	772,539,000	818,228,000	744,885,000	-27,654,000	-73,343,000
National Park Service					
Operation of the national park system	1,234,004,000	1,320,828,000	1,333,328,000	+99,324,000	+12,500,000
National recreation and preservation	44,259,000	46,575,000	41,939,000	-2,320,000	-4,636,000
Historic preservation fund	40,812,000	100,612,000	40,812,000	.....	-59,800,000
Construction	222,769,000	175,000,000	149,000,000	-73,769,000	-26,000,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	.....	.....
Land acquisition and state assistance	143,290,000	138,087,000	69,000,000	-74,290,000	-69,087,000
Urban park and recreation fund	.....	2,000,000	.....	.....	-2,000,000
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,655,134,000	1,753,102,000	1,604,079,000	-51,055,000	-149,023,000
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	760,358,000	806,883,000	774,838,000	+14,480,000	-32,045,000
Minerals Management Service					
Royalty and offshore minerals management	144,196,000	222,402,000	216,402,000	+72,206,000	-6,000,000
Additions to receipts	.....	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	.....
Oil spill research	6,118,000	6,118,000	6,118,000	.....	.....
Total, Minerals Management Service	150,314,000	128,520,000	122,520,000	-27,794,000	-6,000,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement					
Regulation and technology	94,937,000	93,265,000	93,074,000	-1,863,000	-191,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	500,000	275,000	275,000	-225,000	.....
Subtotal	95,437,000	93,540,000	93,349,000	-2,088,000	-191,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	177,624,000	183,416,000	185,416,000	+7,792,000	+2,000,000
(By transfer)	(3,163,000)	.....	.....	(-3,163,000)	.....
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	273,061,000	276,956,000	278,765,000	+5,704,000	+1,809,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs	1,529,638,000	1,638,681,000	1,558,425,000	+28,787,000	-80,256,000
Construction	125,279,000	152,054,000	121,695,000	-3,584,000	-30,359,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	43,352,000	38,396,000	28,396,000	-14,956,000	-10,000,000
Indian guaranteed loan program account	5,000,000	5,005,000	5,001,000	+1,000	-4,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(34,615,000)	(59,682,000)	(59,682,000)	(+25,067,000)	.....
Indian land consolidation pilot	.....	10,000,000	.....	.....	-10,000,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,703,269,000	1,844,136,000	1,713,517,000	+10,248,000	-130,619,000
Departmental Offices					
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories	39,794,000	38,555,000	38,455,000	-1,339,000	-100,000
Northern Marianas Islands Covenant	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Assistance to Territories	67,514,000	66,275,000	66,175,000	-1,339,000	-100,000
Compact of Free Association	8,545,000	8,445,000	8,545,000	.....	+100,000
Mandatory payments	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Compact of Free Association	20,545,000	20,445,000	20,545,000	.....	+100,000
Total, Insular Affairs	88,059,000	86,720,000	86,720,000	-1,339,000	.....
Departmental management	58,286,000	60,871,000	58,286,000	.....	-2,585,000
Office of the Solicitor	35,443,000	37,304,000	37,304,000	+1,861,000	.....

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Office of Inspector General	24,500,000	25,684,000	24,499,000	-1,000	-1,185,000
National Indian Gaming Commission	1,000,000			-1,000,000	
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	38,557,000	42,000,000	39,499,000	+942,000	-2,501,000
Natural resource damage assessment fund	4,228,000	8,100,000	4,492,000	+264,000	-3,608,000
Total, Departmental Offices	250,073,000	260,679,000	250,800,000	+727,000	-9,879,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,700,749,000	7,122,163,000	6,844,961,000	-55,788,000	-477,202,000
Appropriations	(6,730,749,000)	(7,152,163,000)	(6,674,961,000)	(-55,788,000)	(-477,202,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(34,615,000)	(59,682,000)	(59,682,000)	(+25,067,000)	
(By transfer)	(3,163,000)			(-3,163,000)	
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest and rangeland research	187,796,000	198,122,000	197,444,000	+9,648,000	-678,000
State and private forestry	209,178,000	162,900,000	156,167,000	-53,011,000	-6,733,000
National forest system	1,357,744,000	1,417,708,000	1,298,421,000	-59,323,000	-119,287,000
Wildland fire management	566,559,000	554,437,000	564,737,000	-21,822,000	+10,300,000
Emergency appropriations		102,000,000			-102,000,000
Reconstruction and construction	166,015,000	160,914,000	271,444,000	+105,429,000	+110,530,000
Land acquisition	52,976,000	56,057,000	30,000,000	-22,976,000	-26,057,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000		
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	210,000	210,000	210,000		
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	3,811,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	-511,000	
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	92,000	92,000	92,000		
Midewin national tallgrass prairie restoration fund	100,000			-100,000	
Total, Forest Service	2,565,550,000	2,656,809,000	2,522,884,000	-42,666,000	-133,925,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Clean coal technology:					
Rescission	-101,000,000			+101,000,000	
Deferral		-40,000,000			+40,000,000
Subtotal	-101,000,000	-40,000,000		+101,000,000	+40,000,000
Fossil energy research and development	362,403,000	383,408,000	320,558,000	-41,845,000	-62,850,000
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-1,500,000	-1,300,000	-1,300,000	+200,000	
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	107,000,000	22,500,000	14,000,000	-93,000,000	-8,500,000
Energy conservation	611,723,000	808,500,000	630,250,000	+18,527,000	-178,250,000
Economic regulation	2,725,000	1,801,000	1,801,000	-924,000	
Strategic petroleum reserve	207,500,000	160,120,000	160,120,000	-47,380,000	
(By transfer)	(207,500,000)			(-207,500,000)	
Energy Information Administration	66,800,000	70,500,000	68,000,000	+1,200,000	-2,500,000
Elk Hills school lands fund		36,000,000			-36,000,000
Total, Department of Energy:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	1,255,651,000	1,441,529,000	1,193,429,000	-62,222,000	-248,100,000
Appropriations	(1,356,651,000)	(1,481,529,000)	(1,193,429,000)	(-163,222,000)	(-288,100,000)
Rescission	(-101,000,000)			(+101,000,000)	
Deferral		(-40,000,000)			(+40,000,000)
(By transfer)	(207,500,000)			(-207,500,000)	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services	1,841,174,000	1,843,873,000	1,932,953,000	+91,779,000	+89,080,000
Indian health facilities	257,538,000	274,476,000	313,175,000	+55,637,000	+38,699,000
Total, Indian Health Service	2,098,712,000	2,118,349,000	2,246,128,000	+147,416,000	+127,779,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses	15,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute	4,250,000	3,188,000		-4,250,000	-3,188,000
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses	333,408,000	357,300,000	346,449,000	+13,041,000	-10,851,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	3,850,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	+650,000	
Repair and restoration of buildings	32,000,000	40,000,000	44,500,000	+12,500,000	+4,500,000
Construction	33,000,000	18,000,000	2,000,000	-31,000,000	-16,000,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	402,258,000	419,800,000	397,449,000	-4,809,000	-22,351,000
National Gallery of Art					
Salaries and expenses	55,837,000	57,938,000	57,938,000	+2,101,000	
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	6,192,000	6,311,000	6,311,000	+119,000	
Total, National Gallery of Art	62,029,000	64,249,000	64,249,000	+2,220,000	

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts					
Operations and maintenance	11,375,000	13,000,000	12,187,000	+812,000	-813,000
Construction	9,000,000	20,000,000	9,000,000		-11,000,000
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	20,375,000	33,000,000	21,187,000	+812,000	-11,813,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars					
Salaries and expenses	5,840,000	6,040,000	5,840,000		-200,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration	81,240,000	120,500,000	81,240,000		-39,260,000
Matching grants	16,760,000	15,500,000	16,760,000		+1,260,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	98,000,000	136,000,000	98,000,000		-38,000,000
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and administration	96,800,000	122,000,000	96,800,000		-25,200,000
Matching grants	13,900,000	14,000,000	13,900,000		-100,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	110,700,000	136,000,000	110,700,000		-25,300,000
Institute of Museum and Library Services/ Office of Museum Services					
Grants and administration	23,280,000	26,000,000	23,405,000	+125,000	-2,595,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	231,980,000	298,000,000	232,105,000	+125,000	-65,895,000
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses	907,000	898,000	898,000	-9,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs					
Grants	7,000,000	7,500,000	7,000,000		-500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation					
Salaries and expenses	2,745,000	3,000,000	2,800,000	+55,000	-200,000
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses	5,740,000	6,212,000	5,954,000	+214,000	-258,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council					
Holocaust Memorial Council	31,707,000	32,607,000	31,707,000		-900,000
Presidio Trust					
Presidio trust fund		39,913,000	39,913,000	+39,913,000	
Total, title II, related agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,709,744,000	7,146,094,000	6,784,543,000	+74,799,000	-361,551,000
Appropriations	(6,810,744,000)	(7,084,094,000)	(6,784,543,000)	(-26,201,000)	(-299,551,000)
Emergency appropriations		(102,000,000)			(-102,000,000)
Rescission	(-101,000,000)			(+101,000,000)	
Deferral		(-40,000,000)			(+40,000,000)
(By transfer)	(207,500,000)			(-207,500,000)	
TITLE V - PRIORITY FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES					
Priority land acquisitions and exchanges	699,000,000			-699,000,000	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	14,109,493,000	14,268,257,000	13,429,504,000	-679,989,000	-838,753,000
Appropriations	(14,240,493,000)	(14,236,257,000)	(13,459,504,000)	(-780,989,000)	(-776,753,000)
Emergency appropriations		(102,000,000)			(-102,000,000)
Rescissions	(-131,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(+101,000,000)	
Deferral		(-40,000,000)			(+40,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(34,615,000)	(59,682,000)	(59,682,000)	(+25,067,000)	
(By transfer)	(210,663,000)			(-210,663,000)	
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management	1,136,001,000	1,233,659,000	1,155,557,000	+19,556,000	-78,102,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	772,539,000	818,228,000	744,885,000	-27,654,000	-73,343,000
National Park Service	1,655,134,000	1,753,102,000	1,604,079,000	-51,055,000	-149,023,000
United States Geological Survey	760,358,000	806,883,000	774,838,000	+14,480,000	-32,045,000
Minerals Management Service	150,314,000	128,520,000	122,520,000	-27,794,000	-6,000,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	273,061,000	276,956,000	278,765,000	+5,704,000	+1,809,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,703,269,000	1,844,136,000	1,713,517,000	+10,248,000	-130,619,000
Departmental Offices	250,073,000	260,679,000	250,800,000	+727,000	-9,879,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,700,749,000	7,122,163,000	6,644,961,000	-55,788,000	-477,202,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
Forest Service	2,565,550,000	2,656,809,000	2,522,884,000	-42,666,000	-133,925,000
Department of Energy	1,255,651,000	1,441,529,000	1,193,429,000	-62,222,000	-248,100,000
Indian Health Service	2,098,712,000	2,118,349,000	2,246,128,000	+147,416,000	+127,779,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	15,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	4,250,000	3,188,000		-4,250,000	-3,188,000
Smithsonian Institution	402,258,000	419,800,000	397,449,000	-4,809,000	-22,351,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
National Gallery of Art	62,029,000	64,249,000	64,249,000	+2,220,000	.....
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	20,375,000	33,000,000	21,187,000	+812,000	-11,813,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	5,840,000	6,040,000	5,840,000	.....	-200,000
National Endowment for the Arts	98,000,000	136,000,000	98,000,000	.....	-38,000,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	110,700,000	136,000,000	110,700,000	.....	-25,300,000
Institute of Museum and Library Services	23,280,000	26,000,000	23,405,000	+125,000	-2,595,000
Commission of Fine Arts	907,000	898,000	898,000	-9,000	.....
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,000,000	7,500,000	7,000,000	.....	-500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,745,000	3,000,000	2,800,000	+55,000	-200,000
National Capital Planning Commission	5,740,000	6,212,000	5,954,000	+214,000	-258,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	31,707,000	32,607,000	31,707,000	.....	-900,000
Presidio Trust	.....	39,913,000	39,913,000	+39,913,000	.....
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	6,709,744,000	7,146,094,000	6,784,543,000	+74,799,000	-361,551,000
TITLE V - PRIORITY FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES					
Priority land acquisitions and exchanges	699,000,000	.....	.....	-699,000,000	.....
Grand total	14,109,493,000	14,268,257,000	13,429,504,000	-679,989,000	-838,753,000

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

Mr. Chairman, once again we are here to consider the Interior appropriations bill, for fiscal year 1999. I have come before this House many times to present the Interior bill, for a number of years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, and for the past several years as the ranking member. However, this time it is a little different, because it is the last time that I will take the floor on behalf of the Interior bill.

I want to say that I have been on the subcommittee, I would guess, for about 30 or 32 years, and I was chairman for about 20 years during that time. So much for term limits, Mr. Chairman.

I was asked by a reporter whether I favored term limits, and I told him I did not favor a constitutional amendment for term limits, except perhaps if I could designate the number of terms that a Member might be limited to 24 terms. And that, Mr. Chairman, is about what I will have at the conclusion of this session of the Congress.

And it has been a happy time, Mr. Chairman, over all the years. It has been happy because of the character and quality of the Members of the House of Representatives. I think when I first came down here there were three women who were Members of the House, one Democrat and two Republican Members. One was from Ohio, from Cleveland. I forget her name. Perhaps the chairman would remember it. And there was another lady from New York.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think the woman the gentleman was thinking of was Frances Bolton.

Mr. YATES. Yes. Her son Oliver subsequently became a Member of the House when she retired. I thank the gentleman for reminding me of that.

I do not know how many women Members there are of the House at the present time, but I think there must be about 50. And I believe that the House has made and the country has made progress in that respect, because I consider that the women Members are among the ablest Members of the House and they make a real contribution.

I think the speech that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) made last week on female contraceptives was one of the great speeches I have heard during my career in the House of Representatives. And I am pleased that if the Republicans want to follow the rule that the Committee on Rules voted out, that they had the good sense to select the gentlewoman from Connecticut to offer the funding for the NEA amendment, because I think she is so eminently qualified in so many respects.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RALPH REGULA), what can I say about the current chairman? His eloquence, of course, was just made visible when he presented the bill. He and I have been thinking alike since he became a member of this subcommittee. When I was chairman, I considered the gentleman, and I have told him so, as cochairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, and we brought the bill to the floor in that spirit.

We had our differences, and those are represented, of course, in the bills that have come up since he became chairman. He and I differ on omitting the funds for NEA. And over the years when I was chairman, I would talk to the gentleman about his interest in the arts.

I think basically he is a lover of the arts. I do not think there is any doubt about it. He takes such pride in the Canton Symphony, and I think that extends even to the point that he goes to see the Cleveland Symphony on occasion. I remember that even on one occasion he went to New York and was a guest at the Metropolitan Opera, he and my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JACK MURTHA), who is also a member of the subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman is a very persuasive teacher.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman very much.

I remember the line from Gilbert and Sullivan. Does the gentleman remember it? I think it was from "Patience." "If you are looking for to shine in a transcendental line, as a man of culture rare." And the rest of the song goes on. I think the gentleman is almost qualified for that right now.

Certainly he is qualified to handle this bill, not only for the cultural aspects of it, which I think are, indeed, a most important part of the bill, but as well for the natural resources part of the bill, because he has really developed all these programs and made his presence felt. And it has been a good presence, it has been a fine presence, because the gentleman has the great qualifications of mind and of instinct that are so necessary in a good chairman.

I want to commend also the other members of the Subcommittee on Interior, who are really outstanding members of this House. It was a pleasure to serve with them and to work with them, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOE MCDADE), who joins me in retirement this year. The House will surely miss him because he has been an outstanding chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations.

I will vote for the Johnson amendment as it takes shape later in the bill, after one of the opponents of NEA funding will have taken the floor to make a point of order against the bill. I think we can bet that is going to happen.

□ 1315

I am sorry that the Committee on Rules did not support the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

I call the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) who loves the arts, who is a great lover of music, a legislative maestro. I think he is a legislative maestro because he has such a keen interest in the legislation. And I cannot think of what the Committee on Appropriations would be like without the great strengths that he possessed as chairman of the committee and now possess as ranking member. His service to the House and to the country has been outstanding.

I can understand his great interest in the milk price legislation, coming from Wisconsin as he does, but I am not sure I always understood the purport of that legislation as it came to the floor and traveled through the House.

I leave the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) with a great sense of loss, because he and I have been such great friends through the years, both on and off the committee. And I will say that about every member of the committee.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) I think is an outstanding constitutional expert. His touch was always present in connection with the legislation as we came forward. He was always a gentleman and he took onto himself, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the indomitable task, the practically impossible task of trying to bring the Members of the House together as brothers and sisters. I think perhaps he has succeeded to a far greater extent than seems apparent, because I think the sense of camaraderie in the House has in some measure overcome what I have felt was a cloud of partisanship that has seized the House on occasion.

At any rate, I have been ruminating, Mr. Chairman, and I am sorry that I have taken the time to try to express a few feelings on this occasion. I have not given the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) all the credit that he deserves. I think he is one of the great Members of the House in being able to bring people together. And I surely have not said the nice things I should be saying about the Republican members of our committee, who are very, very able members and good people. It was a pleasure to work with them.

I want to return for a few seconds to NEA. We have received letters from opponents of NEA. And I notice, Mr.

Chairman, that contrary to what I thought was the agreement that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and I had, there will be an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), I am told. And I have a copy of it, which reads as follows:

The amounts otherwise provided by this act are revised by increasing the amount for land acquisition and state assistance under the heading National Park Service to provide the funds for State assistance programs and reducing the amounts for grants administration under the National Endowment for the Arts by $50 million.

Of course, that is not nickel-and-diming, as some of the amendments would have, but this is a major program cut, and I would hope that the chairman would stand by his agreement and oppose the Pappas amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the names go first. We always make a mistake when we try to specify people. I momentarily forgot the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

I do want to laud my colleague for his service to the committee, as I should. But as Justice Leonard Hand said, the names go first. Then he said the knees go. Then he said the nouns go. And then we go.

At any rate, I want to close by acknowledging the great friendship that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and I have had over the years and his many, many contributions not only in the field of national defense but in the Interior bill.

Because of time limitations, I have not covered a number of the items I wanted to cover. But with that, Mr. Chairman, I say thank you, thank you to the Members of the House for the privilege of having associated with them over the years, and those who have come and those who have gone.

It was a very, very wonderful experience. Public service is a great vocation. I do not understand why anybody would impose term limits, as they try to do in various parts of the country. Public service is a great tradition and a great opportunity to serve the public, and I am very grateful for having had that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to especially congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for the fine work that he has done here on behalf of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Service and the Denver Service Center and the reforms that are written into this bill. It is a major accomplishment.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate your willingness to work with me to secure funds for projects on the New Jersey side of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and the Wallkill River National Wildlife Refuge. These will bring greater use and expand the opportunities for all people who use these park facilities.

As you know, Congressman JOSEPH MCDADE and I share in the benefits of one of the most beautiful recreation areas in the country, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (DWGNRA). Unfortunately, recent media reports have highlighted the National Park Service's expenditure of $800,000, waste if not fraud, for a single restroom facility at the Ramondskill Falls site on the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware Water Gap.

I know we agree that there was simply no justification for this scandalous squandering of taxpayer dollars. I am proud to have worked with Chairman REGULA to include provisions in this bill that are designed to put an end to the scandalous waste in the National Park Service.

This bill includes major reforms for the National Park Service's Denver Service Center. The Denver Service Center is an arm of the National Park Service which assists all regions with planning and support. A recent report commissioned by Chairman REGULA proved that the Denver Service Center is inefficient and wasteful of taxpayer dollars. There is little accountability for the costs of the projects it designs and little, if any, oversight of the design and construction process. Rather than creating standardized designs that would be expected of a central design office, the DSC needlessly reinvents the wheel over and over again.

The reforms included in this bill make sense. First the DSC will be required to adopt standard practices common to the private sector and other government agencies. Second, they will be required to consult outside experts and give more control to local park superintendents. Finally, the DSC must cut its staff in half and contract out 90 percent of construction projects to local architectural and engineering firms.

Despite the problems with the Denver Service Center and the $800,000 toilet, there are many worthwhile projects in the DWGNRA that should be funded. In the past, New Jersey has not gotten its fair share of the money for projects in the Delaware Water Gap. I had hoped that the Committee would agree to divide the money for Delaware Water Gap on a more equitable basis between New Jersey and Pennsylvania. However, I do appreciate the $300,000 included in this bill for much needed maintenance work on the New Jersey side of the Delaware Water Gap.

I was disappointed that we were unable to include funding for the rehabilitation of the Depew Recreation Site and money for the long-awaited Weygadt Visitors Center. Unfortunately, we still do not have a formal boat ramp on the New Jersey side, and many of the New Jersey recreation sites do not have modern restroom facilities. Chairman REGULA has agreed to work with me as this bill moves through the legislative process to see if we can secure additional funds to address these fundamental needs on the New Jersey side of the Delaware Water Gap. Delaware Water Gap is a national treasure, not just a Pennsylvania treasure.

Finally, I want to thank you for, once again, recognizing the significance of our wildlife refuges and specifically the Wallkill River National Wildlife Refuge by including $1 million to ensure the future preservation of the valuable resource.

Since its establishment, the refuge has received appropriations through your subcommittee to begin protecting the most critical habitat within its borders, especially along the Wallkill River itself. Funding has allowed for the acquisition of undeveloped frontage along the Wallkill River, as well as riparian wetlands, meadows and upland areas, all of which support large populations of numerous wildlife. In addition to enhancing habitat protection, acquisition of additional property enhances the refuge's effort to open up to the public. The natural resources found at the refuge lend themselves to environmental education programs that would benefit local school districts as well as other visitors to the refuge. By ensuring that a large manageable block of critical habitat is created at the refuge, acquisition of willing-seller lands will significantly enhance the refuge's programmatic goals and help bring the refuge closer to the public.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the very distinguished legislative maestro.

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

At a later point, I will make the appropriate comments concerning my own views of the shortcomings of this bill and the administration's views of the shortcomings of this bill. For a moment, I would simply like to say something about our good friend the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (SID YATES).

As everyone understands, he came to this House in 1948. And were it not for the fact that he ran for the Senate and lost by 1 percent and so had 2 years of interrupted service before he returned to this body, were it not for that fact, he would be recognized as the Dean of the House today.

He has served this House with extraordinary skills on at least two subcommittees. Since the beginning of the Marshall Plan, he has been involved in foreign policy. SID was one of the Members here who helped shape the Marshall Plan in its early years. And also, on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, he gave a lifetime of effort to assure the national security of the State of Israel. He recognized that the United States, having been a party to the creation of that country, that we had undertaken a long-term obligation to defend the security of that country, and he has done so with fervor and grace in all the years that he has been a Member of this Congress.

At home he has been a champion of civil liberties. He has understood that the Constitution's most important provision is that it guarantees citizens the right to be wrong; it even guarantees Members of Congress the right to be wrong. And I can think of few Members whose passion for individual liberty and whose passion for constitutional rights have been more fervent.

I would also say that more than any Member I have known, SID has been a champion of what he felt to be sensible budget priorities, almost without exception putting the needs of regular working people, putting the needs of education, putting the needs of health care, putting the needs of the environment before the needs of wasteful weapons systems or aid to foreign dictators or other provisions of money that did not as well reflect our national values.

He has served this subcommittee as Chair for 20 years, and in the last two Congresses as ranking Democratic member; and in that time there has been no greater defender of the public interest in terms of protecting the environment, in terms of protecting public lands, in terms of recognizing our obligations to Native American tribes.

And he also has, in my view, been the single best debater I have ever seen in the years I have been in this House. He has stood for a decent and just society. And in connection with this bill, most of all, he has been the quintessential champion of Federal support for and funding for the arts and humanities, recognizing that even with their occasional faults those programs make a great contribution to giving society the grace notes that make this society a little better and a little more human society in which individuals can function.

So I am grateful for the years of service he has provided here, as we all are, and we wish him Godspeed in his retirement.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) who will join me in retirement at the conclusion of this Congress and whose loss will be felt very deeply by the House and by the country.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) both for the yielding of time and his kind thoughts.

I want to begin by expressing my respect and affection for our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and my appreciation for all the consideration he has given to me and all the members of the subcommittee in putting the bill together, and thanks and appreciation to staff on both sides as well. It has been a great pleasure and privilege to have worked with everybody associated with this subcommittee.

But I, too, wish primarily to say a word or two about SID YATES. I was 5 years old when SID came to Congress, and I wish I knew then how much I should have appreciated what he was already doing for this country. There are many issues that come before us in which I think each Member yearns for a special eloquence to be able to express how they feel. But, we love you, SID.

□ 1330

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I join him in the expression of friendship that he has exhibited. I will not go beyond that because I will probably react the same way the gentleman did.

Mr. SKAGGS. Trying to regain my composure, and I thank the gentleman for interrupting me, perhaps just a couple of quantitative observations will capture how we are blessed and graced with the gentleman from Illinois being really an example of living history among us.

While commenting on the fact that he has graced the planet for 40 percent of the existence of the Republic may make him feel old, he is indomitably young at heart. He has served this country in Congress for nearly 25 percent of the Congresses of the United States. And so we applaud and cherish the gentleman from Illinois and his service to this place.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time. I want to start by thanking the gentleman from Ohio again for his great cooperation and support on a whole host of issues that are beneficial to the Pacific Northwest, the region of the country that I have the honor of representing. I also want to congratulate the staff. This staff is one of the very best. I appreciate the fact that they work with all the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. That is a good standard.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to say a few words about the gentleman from Illinois. We have had a few differences of opinion over the years. The gentleman from Wisconsin talks about his great debating skills going back to the days of Eddie Boland. I had the misfortune at that time to be the assistant for Senator Magnuson of the other body at the time who was the great author of the SST. So the gentleman from Illinois' great eloquence cost us dearly because ultimately he won. But I will say this. The day after that great victory for the gentleman from Illinois and Senator Proxmire from the gentleman from Wisconsin's home State, a senior member of the Boeing Company came in and said, "Those two guys saved the company because if we had built the SST, we would have been in deep trouble."

So the gentleman's judgment was good. It was correct, and I have learned a great deal from him. Our styles are probably, some people would say, completely different. But I would say to a young political science student, if you want to have a history of somebody who has been what I consider the best subcommittee chairman I have ever seen in this House, it was the gentleman from Illinois. He was fair to every witness that came before our committee and respected the individuals that came before the committee and treated them with dignity.

Also he had tremendous passion and concern for the issues, such as the National Endowment for the Arts. He and I have been on this floor defending the Endowment over the last 20 years. What has happened is we would have the greatest hearings in our committee on the Endowment, and one day I got a call from the gentleman from Illinois. He said, "I need you to cover me this afternoon on the hearing for the Endowment for the Arts." He forgot to tell me it was the opposition to the Endowment for the Arts. So I had to come in and be the acting subcommittee chairman. There were quite a list of very interesting individuals. The gentleman was good at handing things off when he did not particularly want to have to listen to all these people who were in opposition.

But the main thing is that I think he has left behind on our committee a whole series of members who have had the ability to see him and how he handles situations, and I think it has built a camaraderie on the Interior subcommittee. I agree with our chairman, this is a committee where we care about the culture of our country, we care about the natural resources, we care about the tribes, and the gentleman from Illinois has been the real glue on our committee. We are going to miss him. He has done a great job for the country and a great job for the Interior subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will allow me to pay my tribute to him by speaking in support of something that he has fought for his whole career and, that is, full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. We must allow the Endowment to continue its exercise of national leadership towards our goal of making the Nation's artistic resources available to all.

A civilized society as the gentleman from Illinois has taught us for many years must include art and cultural enrichment, and I believe it is one of the responsibilities of government to support that aspect of our civilization. We simply cannot rely exclusively on the good will of a few private individuals to fund the arts. It is impractical and unreasonable to expect a single city or an individual State to support the national availability of important cultural resources. It is the duty of all of us.

The NEA can act to sustain and increase funding for the arts by providing incentive funding to other government levels. I see it in my own city of San Diego. I see it around the country. NEA

helps to build alliances between the arts and related interests such as community revitalization, downtown development and historical preservation. That is what is occurring in San Diego. It is occurring all over this Nation.

The collaboration of NEA with other agencies to contribute to national goals is paramount. Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois has taught us again, we are judged by the heritage we leave our children. I hope we leave them more than soap operas and talk shows, attack submarines and assault rifles, gangs and drugs. By supporting the NEA, we ensure that the arts will continue to be here helping to build our economy and trade opportunities, helping to keep our youth from misbehavior, helping to increase public awareness and understanding of culture, not just for those with money, not just for the elite but for all of us. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for keeping this inspiration alive for so many years for all of us to keep it going.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time. I want to concur with the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) on his comments on the NEA to say I hope to speak on that shortly when it comes up, but I want to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Illinois.

One of the things that has not really been emphasized in the long career that the gentleman from Illinois has had in this House is his steadfast stewardship over the trust responsibility that this government has to our Native Americans, our first Americans. Whenever issues came up with respect to this government fulfilling its obligations to provide for our Native Americans, the gentleman from Illinois was there, long before others ever stood on behalf of Native Americans. I think for those of us today who are carrying on the fight, we need to look no further for an example of what kind of person we need to emulate than the gentleman from Illinois when it comes to standing up for our Native Americans.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, many people have remarked about how long the gentleman from Illinois has served in this esteemed body. I would like to say for me it gives me a great deal of pleasure to serve with such a titan of legislators like the gentleman from Illinois given the fact that he served in this House of Representatives with my uncle, John F. Kennedy, when he was a Member of the United States Congress in 1948. To think that I would have the opportunity to serve with someone who served with President Kennedy in the House of Representatives is truly something that I will always cherish and remember.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I will tell the gentleman that he is carrying on the great tradition of his uncle and of his father.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the pending legislation proposes $7.8 million for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program and I commend the gentleman from Ohio, RALPH REGULA, for seeking to accommodate the request I and others have made in this matter.

Indeed, this year I spearheaded a Coalfield Jobs, Environmental Justice and Trust Campaign to increase appropriations from the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund.

This is a trust fund with about $266 million a year in receipts and a balance approaching $1.5 billion. Yet, during this decade, appropriations for State Reclamation Grants have averaged only $140 million a year.

The purpose of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program, obviously, is not to collect fees assessed on coal production so they can sit idle in a government trust fund.

Rather, it is to make these funds available for the reclamation of abandoned coal mine lands thereby mitigating health, safety and environmental threats to coalfield citizens while creating jobs and bringing these lands back to productive uses.

Joining me in the effort to liberate a greater amount of the reclamation funds this year are the Associated General Contractors of America, the United Mine Workers and the Citizens Coal Council.

With that stated, I do want to express concern over bill language included in this appropriation measure that would authorize $7 million from the balance of interest earned on the Fund for the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative.

There is more than a sufficient unappropriated balance in the Federal share of the Fund to provide for this $7 million appropriation without tampering with the accrued interest.

Specifically, interest payments to the Fund are reserved, in part, for transfer payments to the United Mine Workers Combined Fund. In light of a recent Supreme Court decision, I am loath to see any diversion of these interest payments to new endeavors.

While I had contemplated offering an amendment on this matter, in light of the great degree of cooperation Chairman REGULA has shown on the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program this year I would rather work with him and his Senate counterparts to address this issue during conference.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4193, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999, includes funding for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Clean Coal Technology, Fossil Energy and the Energy Conservation Research and Development programs.

Without the benefit of the increased revenues from a non-existent tobacco settlement, and notwithstanding the very tight budget caps, the Appropriations Committee has maintained or increased spending on important energy research and development programs.

I am particularly pleased that the Committee has included report language directing the DOE to address in its FY 2000 budget, the House Science Committee's recommendation in H.R. 1277, the Civilian Energy Research and Development Act of 1997, with respect to peer-reviewed, cost-shared research.

I also want to express my strong support for the bill's report language prohibiting any funds from being used to implement the Kyoto Protocol. This language is consistent with the Administration's assurances that Senate ratification must precede actions to implement the Kyoto Protocol. Given the obvious problems with this unfunded, unsigned, and unratified Protocol, such a limitation is essential and timely.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Chairman of the Committee, Congressman RALPH REGULA, for putting this bill together and conducting the business of this subcommittee in a spirit of bipartisanship and cooperation. I know that his interest is ensuring that, within current budget allocations, programs are funded in a way to help protect our environment and preserve our natural resources. It has also been a distinct privilege to serve on this committee with our distinguished ranking member, Congressman SIDNEY YATES. His passion for the things in which he believes, including the National Endowment of the Arts, is a testament to what a man of principle can do through the force of his convictions. It is truly by the force of his intellect, and in many instances, the strength of his wit, that the NEA has survived attack after attack through all of these years.

As a member of this subcommittee, I will miss SID YATES, and the spirited debate, as well as humor, he injects into our hearings. As an individual with tremendous respect for this institution and those who have served in it, I can think of no better example of selfless dedication and commitment to public service embodied in SID YATES. This institution is a reflection of those who serve in it. Congressman YATES brings an air of dignity, of civility, of goodwill to this body that is in short supply. We will be weaker for his loss, but hope that we can attempt to live up to the high standards he has set for individual leadership and conduct in this body.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the primary funding mechanism for our nation's natural resources. Together, the four primary land management agencies funded under this bill—the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management—manage approximately 628 million acres of public land. Our nation's commitment to protection of animals, plants and mineral resources is largely carried out through this bill. In addition, our commitment to Native Americans is carried out through funding of the Indian Health Services and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Finally, research to improve our energy efficiency, and identify better renewable energy sources, are also included in this bill.

While I clearly support certain funding priorities included in this bill, I remain concerned about others. This bill contains only $139 million of the $900 million authorized funding for

the Land and Water Conservation Fund, with no funding for state matching grants. As the primary funding source for conserving our natural resources, protecting open space, and enhancing recreation opportunities, this fund should be a priority in our federal budget. I know that amendments will be offered to increase funding for the LWCF and I believe they deserve serious consideration.

Mr. SKAGGS and Mr. FOX will offer an amendment to increase funding for energy efficiency programs. Despite the success of these programs in conserving energy and saving money, the bill includes damaging cuts for building technology, the Federal energy management program, and transportation, among other programs. The amendment helps to restore funds to these important programs that actually result in cost savings, through reduced energy bills, and environmental protection through decreased energy use. I support this amendment and hope it will be approved.

In addition, I remain concerned about providing appropriate funding to support recreation activities on our public lands. The total economic benefit to the economy from outdoor recreation exceeds $100 billion and includes more than 2.5 million jobs. Yet, the funding we pour into our forest system, for example, is tilted largely in favor of timber production, rather than conservation. While the agreement to end the purchaser road credit is an important step in reducing the dominance of money losing timber programs, it is only one program among many that deserve scrutiny and reconsideration. Currently, only one percent of the forest service budget is spent on watershed restoration and compared to the economic investment generated, a very small portion of the budget is spent on recreation.

Congresswoman FURSE will offer an amendment that would redirect more Forest Service funds to watershed improvements and recreation management. This is an important amendment and it should be approved.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about some of the legislative provisions that have been added to this bill. I offered an amendment at full committee which was accepted by Chairman REGULA to reduce the size of the road through the Chugach National Forest that was authorized in this bill. While I appreciate the Chairman for accepting this language, it would be even better if this language were not in the bill at all because it circumvents an ongoing process between the stakeholders to determine the best location for the road. In addition, I am concerned that this bill may allow for new road construction on the Tongass National Forest and allows the use of K–V funds for administrative overhead expenses, which encourages timber salvage activities on federal lands. I hope that these issues can be addressed as we move toward conference in this bill.

In addition, I hope that the wisdom of the Chairman in not including certain damaging provisions in this bill will maintain through conference. The Administration has already threatened a veto of several provisions included in the Senate version which are, thankfully, not included in this bill. The Interior Appropriations bill should not be used as a vehicle for failed ideas and proposals that did not have enough support to pass out of the authorizing committee.

Mr. Chairman, putting a bill together of this scope and magnitude is a tremendous task. I want to thank Chairman REGULA, Mr. YATES and the committee staff for the important work they have done in putting this bill together and hope that we can continue to work to ensure that we have a bill that has the support of Congress and this administration.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge the work of the members of this subcommittee today led by Chairman REGULA, who throughout his service has been a conscientious worker on the substance of these Interior Appropriations.

Without question, the principal advocate for this measure has been SIDNEY YATES, a member who will complete his service of 48 years in Congress this year, one of the longest and most able members of the House—who has set the standards and positive temperament in which this measure has been shaped and the key programs that it funds. We will miss him. But SID YATES has made a big difference and an indelible positive mark on these key programs. He indeed has given generously and without reserve to this service. We should also acknowledge JOSEPH MCDADE, a long time in service as a ranking member and key participant regarding the topics before this subcommittee, again retiring. He will be missed.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I rise with significant concerns regarding the substance, funding and policy embraced in this 1999 Interior Appropriations bill. This provides 3% less funding than the 1998 measure, and that translates into less funding for many of America's most well-known and revered assets: our national parks, forests and public lands. This means that construction of needed facilities and partnerships will not be accomplished, and that key land parcels that will become available will not be purchased, and inholdings and problems will occur, depreciating these key land parcels.

One good measure continued is the fee demonstration program in the absence of authorization and limited funds. This helps in numerous ways to augment the shortfall of funding. Numerous measures are included, which hamstring the land management agencies and the implementation of policy based upon professional land management practices and solid study and science in which it is rooted. Hopefully, the amendments to reject these limits where it is possible to change these appropriation riders will be positively acted upon.

I am also interested in the curtailment of the timber roads policy, the timber road credits, that has been included in this measure and the emphasis upon road closure and maintenance; this is positive and much-needed, and I hope to be able to vote for additional limits on timber roads. I'm concerned about the projected 3.6 billion board foot target number included in the measure. The tendency to include legislated numbers or quotas for timber harvest have had the effect historically of distorting the use and mission of our national forests and result in the loss of the forest and taxpayer dollars.

Timber harvest should be left to the varied management plans and process, rather than attempting to superimpose a political judgment upon our nation's forest eco-systems.

While this rule for consideration of this measure has attempted to make a virtue of what is and isn't authorized this measure has gone to extraordinary lengths to permit repeated votes on pet projects and protect others from votes and help to special interests—all at the expense to our natural resources, parks, wilderness and the legacy of future generations, such as the Chugach Road, which mandates a twenty-six mile long, 250-foot-wide easement through an Alaska wilderness and spurns the current negotiations to resolve this matter. And proceeds with this road notwithstanding the result.

Mr. Chairman, the reduced role of the N.P.S. Denver Service Office is being advanced as a panacea, as if it alone were responsible for the high cost of construction, and of some celebrated projects like the Delaware Water Gap "outhouse." The fact is when we look behind these projects, we will find in many instances the U.S. Congress as advocate, not the N.P.S. Denver Service Office who was cast to do the bidding of those in public office.

The Denver Service Office has been a whipping post for a lot of projects that have been costly, and perhaps the employment of some private sector incentives and professionals will help, but this will bear close oversight to be certain as to quality and standards which today have been the prerequisite for the N.P.S. will be attained.

Mr. Chairman, I support the moratoria included in this measure on patenting of new mining claims, which literally provide for the give-away of our public land to special interests, often fragmenting the ecosystems and undercutting logical management of our public lands, and the moratoria on further leasing of the oil and gas leases on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). Congress needs to address these long-term problems with law, not these yearly moratoria. But until we have permanent policy, these actions and moratoria are essential.

I am certainly concerned that the appropriation process has been focused in numerous measures to undercut the Kyoto agreement, a treaty which hasn't even been voted upon. The purpose in these bills appears to prevent objective scientific research, monitoring and analysis, to in essence interfere with the nonpartisan attainment of facts to stop the progress to disarm the advocates of such a needed global agreement. This effort is improved and reflects badly on this Congress. We need such information and work now more than ever.

Mr. Chairman, finally, no doubt today this chamber will ring with arguments against funding the National Endowment for the Arts. Interestingly enough, one argument offered by those opposed to funding is how insignificant the federal commitment is. At less than one percent of the total $9 billion spent on the arts in America—and less than one hundredth of one percent of our total federal budget—they argue the money won't be missed. They try to minimize the action and effort to cut and its adverse impact.

Since the NEA figures are relatively small, I can understand some of the temptation to minimize the NEA's importance. The NEA works as the catalyst in each state, providing cultural activity throughout the nation. Nonprofit arts organizations depend on a partnership of multiple sources for funding. Private

funding sources are more willing to match funding when a federal commitment is present. When the federal commitment backs out, often private funding dries up.

The arts are important to Americans. In my home state of Minnesota, one million children were served by non-profit arts organizations last year. In 1994, by investing $255 million of total arts spending by Minnesota arts organizations, we saw a $900 million economic impact in our communities, both rural and urban. Only about $5 million of that money came from the NEA, but the message was clear that the federal commitment was there as the foundation and endorsement of state, local and non-profit participation.

Money from the NEA enables organizations to provide services that would otherwise not exist. It is important to communities without a philanthropic or corporate funding base for cultural activities. The less visible arts such as a "poet in residence" in a small town or visiting a school are greatly empowered by the NEA. Since NEA funding to Minnesota was cut in half in 1996, many small and mid-sized organizations are not receiving funding—and unfortunately none in rural areas.

In 1996, all NEA funding for a program in St. Paul called COMPAS was cut. COMPAS is an organization that sponsors hands-on arts activities that strengthen communities and individuals through creative self-expression. Their program includes Writers and Artists in the Schools, arts projects at Battered Women's Shelters, urban neighborhood arts projects, and programs to support creative expression among the elderly through writing, just to name a few. These programs stimulate important parts of the brain and provide tools for better communication skills in special needs populations. According to COMPAS, getting money from the NEA is like a Good Housekeeping seal of approval—it validates their function so they can secure other funding sources. Without the NEA funding, other prospects for funding are actually diminished—not enhanced as some NEA critics maintain!

Many may not realize that the NEA sponsors grants to Public Radio International. Prairie Home Companion, the weekly radio broadcast out of my hometown in St. Paul, was started through funding from the NEA. Top-notch, world-class arts organizations like the Minnesota Orchestra, the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, the Minnesota Opera and the Guthrie Theater suffered serious setbacks from 1996 NEA funding cuts. And many may not realize that the Fourth of July celebration on the Mall here in Washington was entirely sponsored by the NEA. Half a million people won't hear the Blues & Roots show and the National Symphony next year if NEA funding is eliminated.

Successful programs today that are proven may achieve alternative funding and be commercially viable, but what about the nourishment for tomorrow's American creativity that would be lost without NEA funding? It's time to recognize some of the ways so many Americans will be affected if this small amount of money is defunded. What some portray as a negligible amount is one of America's most profitable investments in itself. The NEA is a great bargain at $0.36 per person, both culturally and economically, with immeasurable returns. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the NEA and to reject the bogus argument to defund the NEA.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman REGULA and his colleagues on the Appropriations committee on their efforts to prepare this appropriations bill.

While the Subcommittee was not able to fund this project, I wanted to take this opportunity to draw everyone's attention to the efforts going on to provide an interpretive center for the Upper Mississippi. The Upper Mississippi River is a national treasure because of its unique ecological and historical value which is shared by no other part of the world. An interpretive center would allow visitors to explore the social, economic and environmental history of the Upper Mississippi in an integrated and compelling way. This truly is a great American venture which would benefit the entire nation and provide an educational and cultural base for future generations. There currently is no other project or facility along the Upper Mississippi River which celebrates this rare heritage.

On March 3 of this year, Mayor Terry Duggan, Jerry Enzler, Teri Goodmann and other Mississippi River Museum officials testified before your Subcommittee about their efforts to create a world-class interpretive center that will provide visitors a unique view of the Mississippi River. I commend the entire Mississippi River Museum staff and all of the many people in Iowa, along the Mississippi and around the country for all their hard work and efforts for this noble project.

The other body of this Congress has decided to provide funding for this project at a level of $1.2 million. As the appropriations process continues, I hope the benefits of the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge Interpretative Center will be fully considered.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments printed in part 1 of House Report 105–637 are adopted.

If an unprotected provision is stricken on a point of order, the Committee of the Whole shall immediately consider the amendment printed in part 2 of that report, if offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) or her designee. That amendment shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The amendment printed in part 3 of the report may be offered only by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) or his designee, may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he or she has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

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

Mr. Chairman, I do so only to make clear to the House what the concerns are of the administration as we move into the consideration of this bill. The Statement of Administration Policy indicates that on the committee bill as modified by the rule and associated motion, if it were presented to the President, the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill at this point.

They do so for a number of reasons. First of all, they obviously object to the rule which has put at risk the funding for the arts. Secondly, they object to the shortchanging of a variety of programs in the jurisdiction of this bill because of the inadequate allocation to the subcommittee which results in a serious shortfall of funds in a number of key programs. They specifically object to, for instance, the fact that funds are reduced by more than half of the $270 million administration request for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. They object to the fact that there is provided no funding for the millennium program protecting artifacts of our national heritage. They object to the fact that the bill denies most of the requested $128 million increase for Interior and the Forest Service to implement the Clean Water Action Plan. They object to the lack of adequate funding to deal with the Year 2000 computer problem. And they object to a number of legislative riders in the bill, as well, as they affect various environmental programs.

□ 1345

They also object to the fact that the administration's requested increase in energy conservation for development of technologies to improve industrial transportation and building efficiencies and to reduce carbon emissions are also significantly reduced.

So I would simply say, as we move into this debate, this bill has a long

way to go before it reaches a condition in which it would receive a Presidential signature. I think the committee needs to recognize that point today.

I would also question the earmarking of several projects in this House that are a very low priority given the very deep reductions that were made in the overall accounts in which those same projects are found.

It seems to me that, for a variety of reasons, this bill, at this point, despite the best efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee, the bill is not in the condition at this point that it would receive a Presidential signature. I urge the House to correct that as it moves through the process if it wants to avoid yet another appropriations bill which seems to be headed for a confrontation with the White House rather than a compromise.

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

I just want to comment in response to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the points that he makes. We have increased the Everglades restoration effort up to $20 million. Park Operations are up $99 million, which is the administration's request. The Bureau of Land Management is up $20 million. These are all increases. BIA tribal priority allocations are up $14 million. The National Wildlife Refuge account is up $18 million. This is all over last year's bill. BIA education and law enforcement, $20 million. In the Indian Health Services, where the administration was requesting less than last year, we have increased it $147 million. We have fully funded wildland fire fighting.

I think the steps that we have taken in management with the Denver Service Center will allow us to have additional funds in the future for construction.

So I am simply saying it may not be perfect by some definitions, but we have made a lot of very substantial increases and improvements over management in the past years.

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

Mr. Chairman, we ran out of time in the general debate, because I wanted to lend my words of respect and admiration to not only our chairman of our subcommittee, who has done such a wonderful job of putting this bill together, but certainly the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for all of his service and humor and wisdom in our subcommittee.

But, also, I think the fact that he made the statement that the members of the subcommittee are of high character and quality is personified, not only in him, but in the chairman of our committee as well as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and other Members on our side, especially the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), who worked so hard on the Democrat side to make this committee a success.

Mr. Chairman, I do support this bill. It is a good bill, crafted well. When many Americans think of the natural beauty of our country, they think of the area as managed by the agencies funded by this bill, our national parks, our forests, our monuments, our cultural treasures. The bill also provides funding for Native Americans through the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

I am pleased that our chairman, along with our subcommittee, have made Native American health a priority in this bill. The lowest life expectancies in this country exist among Indian populations, and they are the lowest of any nation in this hemisphere except Haiti.

Despite the President's emphasis on health care, this is an area that was miserably overlooked in the President's request to Congress. He really shortchanged the Indian population and their health needs. The Indian Health Service received the lowest funding increase in the Department of Health and Human Services budget request at less than 1 percent, while the overall funding request for HHS averaged a 7 percent increase.

In the area of diabetes, the chairman has included language tightening reporting requirements for Native American tribes receiving funds for diabetes prevention and treatment to monitor the usage and effectiveness of the program. Also in the bill is $1 million for an innovative diabetes program to be administered by the Joslin Diabetes Center, a leading center in diabetes research in our country.

I also want to bring Members' attention to the provisions in the bill addressing the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project. There may be an amendment to modify or strike the provisions contained in this bill through the subcommittee and then again through the full committee.

This project started as a simple scientific assessment of the public lands in eastern Washington and Oregon. Once begun, it took on a life of its own. This occurred back in 1994. Money was inserted into the Interior bill without authorization.

And 4 years later, now, we have spent at least $40 million on the planning process of ecosystem management, whatever that really means to whoever wants to define it, and there is no end in sight.

The implementation, according to the agencies involved, would cost upwards of $125 million a year for 10 years. That is not possible in this bill. It will not be possible over the next 10 years.

The language in the bill brings this unauthorized regional planning process, and that is really what it is, back down to the local level where managers better understand the capabilities and the challenges facing the land in a particular area. The administration has objected to this concept. If they would come forward in a constructive manner, I, speaking for myself only, would be willing to work with the administration on appropriate language. But I cannot support the imposition of a one-size-fits-all standards on our forests and BLM districts from northern Nevada to western Montana.

So I hope that the Members in this body will take particular care to look into the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project itself, understand what those of us in the West face regarding ecosystem management, and support the committee's version of this particular provision.

I also encourage my colleagues to support this bill and approve of all of the provisions within it, because it is a finely balanced and finely tuned bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an amendment that will be offered in a few minutes to provide full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts at the level of $98.5 million and urge my colleagues to join me in casting an important vote in support of the Nation's arts programs.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations for 22 years, I have been privileged to work closely with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and other supporters over the years to ensure the survival of the National Endowment for the Arts.

The National Endowment for the Arts is a critical institution for our Nation. This important organization has served as a catalyst for the expansion of arts institutions throughout our Nation. The NEA is responsible for building the cultural infrastructure of our country. Over the last 30 years, the NEA has nurtured a healthy infrastructure of cultural institutions in order to better serve the unique needs of each community.

In 30 years, the number of State arts councils increased from 5 to 56, the number of local arts councils grew from 600 to 3,800, the number of orchestras increased from 110 to 230, the number of nonprofit theater companies increased from 56 to 425, the number of dance companies grew from 37 to 450, and the number of operas grew from 27 to 120.

Since its creation in 1965, the NEA has awarded over 100,000 grants, and less than 40 have been considered to be controversial. It is estimated that the endowment cost each American just 64 cents a year. However, with this modest investment, the agency helps enhance the quality of life for all of our citizens.

I really think, when you analyze this, you see that the Endowment has been a catalyst. It has helped spread the arts all over this country. Instead of attacking it, we should be applauding it for a job well done.

I want to compliment both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), our chairman, for the work that they have done to try to fashion a way for the House to be able to work its will on this issue.

I just feel so strongly. In my own State of Washington, to see all of the various arts institutions grow and develop with small seed money from the NEA has really been something that I am proud of and I think everyone from our State is proud of. So I would like to see the money left in under the Obey amendment, but if that does not occur then we certainly want to support the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) when she offers an amendment to restore the money.

It is certainly, in my judgment, one of the high priorities for this bill.

I rise in support of the amendment to provide full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) at the level of $98.5 million, and urge my colleagues to join me in casting an important vote in support of our nation's arts programs.

As a Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I have been privileged to work closely with my distinguished colleague SIDNEY YATES, and other supporters over the years to ensure the survival of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is a critical institution for our nation. This important organization has served as a catalyst for the expansion of arts institutions throughout our nation. The NEA is responsible for building the cultural infrastructure of our country. Over the last 30 years, the NEA has nurtured a healthy infrastructure of cultural institutions in order to better serve the unique needs of each community. In 30 years, the number of state arts councils increased from 5 to 56; the number of local arts councils grew from 600 to 3,800; the number of orchestras increased from 110 to 230; the number of nonprofit theatre companies increased from 56 to 425; the number of dance companies grew from 37 to 450; and the number of opera companies grew from 27 to 120.

Since its creation in 1965, the NEA has awarded over 100,000 grants and less than 40 have been considered to be very controversial. It is estimated that the Endowment costs each American just 64 cents a year. However, with this modest investment, the agency helps enhance the quality of life for our citizens, by supporting theaters, touring dance companies, folk festivals, arts education, orchestras, museums, and a wide variety of other programs.

Many widely acclaimed programs began with the talent of individuals who had received seed money from the NEA, and many rural areas of our nation would not be able to enjoy arts programs without outreach by the Endowment.

We must recognize that the small investment made by the federal government in funding the NEA creates tremendous leverage in obtaining private investment. For every dollar spent by the Endowment, it attracts $11 in investment from the private sector. In fact, many private sector contributors rely heavily on the NEA's grant selection process as a guide to the kinds of programs that should be supported.

Endowment support has helped to increase audience support for all art forms. For example, the annual audience for professional dance has grown from one million to more than 16 million over the past 28 years. Audiences for the work of professional opera companies have grown to over 7.6 million, compared to only 5 million a decade ago.

Non-profit theaters serve an audience that has grown to over 20 million. Symphony performance attendance has risen to over 27 million annually. All of this has occurred with seed support from the NEA.

Also, support for the arts is support for the economy. The NEA's modest budget has annually generated matching funds estimated at over $1.2 billion. These monies permeate the economy. At least 1.3 million full time jobs are supported by the arts; $25.2 billion is earned through salaries, wages, and entrepreneurial income; local governments receive $790 million in taxes and fees; state governments receive $1.2 billion; and the Federal government receives $3.4 billion in income tax revenue.

It is clear that the outreach and support granted by the NEA to the arts has an incredible ripple effect throughout our economy, and restricting or eliminating the NEA's ability to perform that outreach would be both economically and culturally devastating.

In my home state of Washington, many arts and cultural institutions have benefited from NEA grants, including: Tacoma's Broadway Theater, the Pacific Northwest Ballet, the Seattle Art Museum, the Spokane Symphony, and the Seattle Childrens Theater.

Throughout the nation, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is serving the interests of the American people. It is important for our future, and it should continue to receive the support of Congress. Let's do what's right for the nation, and vote for the amendment to restore funding to the NEA.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and I want to particularly congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman, for the excellent balancing act he has accomplished, although a few more changes will need to be made and we are going to address the National Endowment for the Arts very shortly.

I am especially pleased that the bill eliminates the Purchaser Road Credit program. That is a major environmental victory. We were able to accomplish that with the help of our Western colleagues. We worked together. We reasoned together. This shows that when people sit down and reason together and try to work things out, we can actually make some serious progress.

The Purchaser Road Credit is being eliminated as part of an agreement under which Easterners and Westerners agreed to forgo other changes to amend the bill. That is a fair deal, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

There are some timber amendments that fall outside the agreement, those concerning the Chugach and the K–V Fund, and I urge my colleagues to support those amendments.

I also want to clarify language we agreed to have in the bill that enables the Forest Service to use the Roads and Timber Trails Fund for some new purposes. This could be a great plus for the environment if the Forest Service uses this money for true forest health projects as section 334 requires.

We will be watching very closely to see that this section is not violated by using the funds for salvage logging or road building.

Turning to the National Endowment for the Arts, this is something we go over time and time again. I think it is a sad commentary that we have to engage in this debate yet once again. We have already made NEA selection criteria more stringent. We have already limited grants to individual artists. We have already reduced NEA funding to about half of its peak level, and I think that is cutting too much but the will of the House has to be worked.

Yet even though we have addressed every legitimate concern raised by NEA opponents, and some that were not as legitimate, they are still hell bent on destroying an agency whose programs educate and enrich the lives of Americans in all regions and in all walks of life.

I simply do not understand it. I look at what NEA has done in my district in upstate New York, a rural area. We have the world class Glimmerglass Opera. It gets support. We have small county organizations like the Chenango County Council for the Arts doing magnificent work to introduce youngsters in their formative years to the arts.

It helps schools bring in a wide variety of arts programs. It enables our small cities to support symphonies and museums, all designed to enrich their lives. I do not see anything wrong with that. As a matter of fact, I think that is exactly what we should be supporting. These are institutions that would have a difficult time surviving without the small contributions that they receive from the NEA.

I think the Federal Government ought to undertake these sorts of legitimate activities through which the American public working collectively can enrich our culture in a way that is difficult for individuals working alone.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment. It is well thought out. It is well reasoned and it is good for this bill and it is good for America.

Finally, just let me say that this Member, along with so many of my colleagues, will miss the gentleman from

Illinois (Mr. YATES) when he is not here in the next Congress. I hope I am. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has been a tower of strength. He has been a person that you can talk to who will listen to you. He has just done so much for so many for so long and he will be sorely missed.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for serving America so well.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his kindness.

I rise for two particular reasons, and that is to support the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. It is a sad story that the amendment offered by the Democrats could not have been left in, that provided the $98.5 million, and that we will be subjected to a point of order of which then the Johnson amendment will hopefully be offered and supported to provide for the Endowment for the Arts.

But I would say that the American people stand alongside of those of us who enthusiastically continue to support the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. In fact, for every dollar the NEA invests in communities, there is a 20-fold return in jobs, services and contracts, and corporate America believes it is important to have a public-private partnership.

In Houston, Texas, the symphony, the opera, the ballet, all of my indigenous and community-based arts groups stand alongside of support. I hope we do not have to go through these shenanigans again, and I hope we vote enthusiastically for supporting the arts again for $98.5 million.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to join those who have already stood in support of the National Endowment for the Arts. It has been spoken to in many instances already, but let me say, for our State of Rhode Island, this is an issue of particular importance, because we are very proud in Rhode Island that our former Senator, Claiborne Pell, was amongst the champions of NEA when he first got here to the Congress in 1960 and, with the help of my uncle, President Kennedy, was able to fashion the National Endowment of the Arts early on. And what a success it has been.

In my State of Rhode Island, we have a program called Arts Talk that focuses on dropouts in our schools. We have found students in the Vo-Tech schools, who have no exposure to the arts, are able to get exposure through the programs like Arts Talk, which expand the arts to people that do not ordinarily have access to the arts.

What this has done is, it has helped awaken their imaginations, helped them have a better self-image, because in many instances they learn about their own cultural heritage expressions within the arts. In addition to that, they may find some inherent talent in their own being that will allow them to express themselves through the arts, either by playing an instrument, acting in a play or painting a picture.

These things may sound esoteric to us, but I can tell you in Rhode Island they have had a marked impact on helping reduce juvenile delinquency in the schools. We have actually seen students that we have paired up with this program have a greater attendance in the schools, because they feel good about what they are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a program that really does not just meet the eye with respect to the arts. The implications of this program go well beyond just the immediacy of having our young people exposed to the arts.

I would ask my colleagues to keep this in mind when we have the point of order on the Obey language which will strike it and, therefore, strike the $98 million for NEA; and I would hope we support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) to restore that funding, because I think it is so critical for our future generations to build their self-esteem and sense of self, which is so powerfully done through the arts.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for the work that he has done on this bill and on two other issues related in this bill, the Blackstone Valley Heritage Quarter and the support he gave Indian health services, which I must say was drastically underfunded, but thanks to the work that the chairman and the committee members provided, we are going to see an increase in Indian health services, which is something that I think we should all applaud.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also associate my words with the words about the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and this bill being a good bill, and also with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). Though we have opposed each other on many issues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) reminds me of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Natcher.

One time when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was on the floor and I was mad as a hornet, Mr. Natcher, being from Kentucky, who was in the majority at the time and in control of the bill and, with me, fuming right there at that microphone, said "Mr. CUNNINGHAM," he said, "I am from Kentucky and we have race horses. Quite often they come out of the block so fast that they break their legs, and we then have to shoot them. If you will settle down, I will help you pass your amendment." So I got the word of the then-chairman, Mr. Natcher.

But I would say that I am proud of what the Republican majority has done with the balanced budget, welfare reform, and tax relief for working families, and I am proud of this bill.

I have a potential sadness with this bill, in the fact that in 1995, on the Interior appropriations bill and the rule, the Republican Party was at an impasse. There was a group that wanted to increase the funding for the NEA and there was a group that wanted to strike the funding for the NEA. The result would have been that we would have lost that rule and the other side of the aisle would have taken over that rule and written it as they saw fit.

So then the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), got the Republicans of both groups in a room for 4 hours and we came to an agreement. That agreement was that we would continue to fund the National Endowment for the Arts for a certain period of time.

Then the problem was that they could not use the funding within the year and they would lose that amount of funding, so we agreed to let them keep it so they could establish a true endowment that would fund the NEA, and we also promised to work for a tax break where you could give to the arts and get an additional tax break.

That was a word and that was a bond. My view of a principles of your word is that if I give, say, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) my word, I would fall on my sword before I would break that word, unless I came to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and looked him in the eye and said, I cannot follow that because of these reasons, and let him respond.

But once an agreement had been executed, like the National Endowment for the Arts agreement, you cannot come back on your word.

I would ask the committee, many Members feel very strongly on both sides of this issue. That is fine, and they have fought for that. But the agreement was not just to reduce the NEA, it was not just to compel it to follow certain rules; it was, after the agreement, to eliminate it from the taxpayers, and Joe Six-pack would not have to pay for the NEA, but it could become its own endowment.

I would ask this House and those Members that signed and agreed, I was in the room, you can spin it any way that you want. I am not talking about the Democrats, they were not part of this agreement, I am talking about my own party.

You can spin it any way you want. I was in the room, I know the agreement, I know the acknowledgment, and I know how it was carried out. My potential sadness is that that word would be broken in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to live up to their word and vote against the Johnson amendment.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman, but I would point out, we came to the floor of the House from the committee with zero funding 3 years in a row; 1997 and 1998 and this year would have been zero had there not been an amendment in the full committee supported by some Republicans.

We got to the Senate for a conference on the bill, and the Senate made it very clear that they were not bound by any agreement made by the House.

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

(On request of Mr. REGULA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CUNNINGHAM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In my humble opinion, it should be struck, the point of order, the Johnson amendment should not be offered, or if it is offered, those Members should stick to their word. The chairman of the committee in conference should not yield and accede to the Senate provision, and then the word would be kept.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is rather difficult. The Senate has dug in, the other body, and also the President made it very clear that a $14 billion bill, which affects a lot of things in your State as well as others, would be vetoed over this issue. So it is pretty complicated.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand.

Mr. REGULA. We kept our part of the bargain. We came with the zero.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER) assumed the chair.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced the Speaker's signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 318. To require automatic cancellation and notice of cancellation rights with respect to private mortgage insurance which is required as a condition for entering into a residential mortgage transaction, to abolish the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to move to page 88, line 8, through line 6 on page 89, for the purpose of making a point of order.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, some of us have amendments in title I. How does the gentleman's proposal affect those amendments getting heard today?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, it would in no way affect the other amendments. We are doing this at the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), who would like to deal with the issue of NEA, is my understanding.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is not my request. It was my understanding that the request was, would I agree to it? If the gentleman wants to continue at another stage of the bill, it is all right with me, but to place this in my pocket is the wrong approach. I would just as soon hear it or just as soon postpone it.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield further, let us move on and dispose of this issue. Most of the speeches thus far have been on that issue, so I think it is important that we deal with it expeditiously. It will not affect in any way the gentleman's ability to offer amendments.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman saying he wanted to go to the NEA and for how long a period?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, 30 minutes has been allowed in the rule.

Mr. SANDERS. Then we will come back to the beginning of the bill?

Mr. REGULA. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we will go right back to the start of the bill after we finish this?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $81,250,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $16,760,000, to remain available until expended, to the National Endowment for the Arts: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2), subsections 11(a)(2)(A) and 11(a)(3)(A) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the two paragraphs beginning on page 88, line 10, and all that follows through page 89, line 6, include unauthorized appropriations in violation of clause 2 of House Rule XXI.

The language I have just specified is an appropriation of $98 million for the necessary expenses for the National Endowment of the Arts. Authorization in law for the National Endowment for the Arts expired in fiscal year 1993. Clause 2 of House Rule XXI states "No appropriation shall be reported in a general appropriations bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law."

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as the author of the language which is proposed to be stricken under the point of order, I would simply ask, is this the point of order that would allow the House to put back by recorded vote exactly what will be stricken 5 minutes earlier so that one party can claim victory over another, or is this a serious legislative approach?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask that the gentleman confine his remarks to the point of order.

Does anyone wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee of jurisdiction over NEA, I would like to speak on the point of order with respect to funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, and want to make a few comments to put NEA funding in context.

Last year the Interior appropriations bill that came to the House floor provided continued funding for NEA for fiscal year 1998.

□ 1415

The point of order was made that constituted funding for a nonauthorized program. The point of order prevailed and the bill left the House with zero funding for the NEA, and then the master of all arts came into play, Houdini. When we found this bill again, we discovered that there was an appropriation, even though it was not authorized.

This year we find ourselves in much the same position. The appropriations bill has been reported to the House with $98 million for the NEA, yet the NEA has not been authorized since 1993. For the past few years it has been continuing on a year-by-year basis only by virtue of the appropriations process. A point of order has been made that the $98 million should be struck on the grounds it constitutes funding of a nonauthorized program. Some of my colleagues may ask, well, what has the authorizing committee been doing? Let me explain.

Back in 1995 the committee reported an NEA authorization bill. It would have permitted the NEA to exist for 3 more years, phasing it out over that same 3-year period, giving plenty of time for the private sector, local States and municipalities to take over the program. In fact, the NEA would have ceased to exist as of October 1 of this year had that bill become law. However, there was no floor action taken on it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not addressing the question of the current legislation and I think his attention should be directed to that fact. I think if he wants to state the history of the appropriations, the point of order should be disposed of and the gentleman permitted to strike the last word or participate in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the Chair would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to confine his remarks to the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is entertaining debate on the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I was merely pointing out that there is a lot of history in relationship to what we are discussing today in relation to the point of order, so that someone does not fault the committee because we have not taken action, because we have taken action.

So I would suggest that it is definitely out of order to move ahead with legislation that has not been authorized by the authorizing committee, and I would hope that we would sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) makes a single point of order that the two paragraphs appropriating funds for the National Endowment for the Arts violate clause 2(a) of rule XXI by providing for an unauthorized appropriation.

As stated by the Chair on July 11, 1997, the authorization for the National Endowment of the Arts lapsed in 1993. The National Endowment of the Arts has not been reauthorized since the ruling of the Chair last year. Accordingly, the point of order is sustained and the two paragraphs are stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JOHNSON OF CONNECTICUT

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

Page 88, after line 9, insert the following:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $81,240,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $16,760,000, to remain available until expended, to the National Endowment for the Arts: *Provided*. That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2), subsections 11(a)(2)(A) and 11(a)(3)(A) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am proud to offer my amendment to restore $98 million in level funding for the NEA. I would have been equally proud to have risen to oppose a motion to strike NEA funding as adopted in the committee bill, and I salute my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), for his successful committee amendment, yet another sign of the breadth of support there is for the NEA.

I also salute the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for his long and consistent leadership in support of the arts and for his deep dedication to responsible stewardship of our Nation's resources. In this House we often refer to each other as the gentleman from a certain State or the gentlewoman from a certain State. Indeed, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has been a gentleman; not only a gentleman, but a wise gentleman and a leader, and I thank the gentleman for his fine service over so many years.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment. The reforms adopted last year directly addressed the causes of past problems, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) will make clear in a few minutes. Therefore I ask those 150 Republicans who supported the Republican amendment last year, which supported a Federal role for the arts to support my amendment this year.

I have been a lifelong supporter of the arts, because truly man does not live by bread alone. The arts are a medium through which we publicly discuss profound and great matters of life and death, love and duty, freedom and bondage, man's relationship to God and nature. NEA dollars help new plays to be written, new symphonies to be conceived, performing arts groups to develop and thrive, and the performing arts to reach our most rural communities and our most isolated neighborhoods.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Johnson amendment to the Interior Appropriations.

As my colleagues know, this amendment would restore funding to the National Endowment for the Arts, an organization which has wasted U.S. taxpayer dollars on art which has often been objectionable to Americans. By ending funding to the NEA, we are not ending Federal funding for the arts.

Contrary to popular belief, the National Endowment for the Arts is not the sole recipient of Federal funding for the arts. There are an estimated 200 arts and humanities programs or activities funded by and administered through various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, but are not getting one dime of NEA funding. These programs are programs such as the Commission of Fine Arts, the Holocaust Memorial Council, JFK Center for the Performing Arts, the National Gallery of Art, the Smithsonian, and many others.

The Federal Government also provides support for the arts through tax expenditures, such as the deduction for charitable contribution to the arts, humanities, culture, on income, gift and estate taxes. Zeroing out funding for the NEA will not end Federal funding for the arts. It simply ends a program which has misused taxpayer dollars with some of the sickening attempts to subsidize blasphemous, offensive and pornographic depictions.

In addition, I might point out that the NEA administrative overhead and bureaucrats earn about twice as much as the artists they seek to subsidize, and much of their subsidy goes to just a few large cities in our country. I do not know if this is what is called fleecing of America, but it is objectionable, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it clear the reforms that have been instituted in the past couple of years. They are listed here, and in addition, there are some others. First of all, we now have six Members of our Congress, three House, three Senate, that serve on the Arts Council: The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) from the House; Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. COLLINS and Mr. DURBIN from the Senate.

We put a 15 percent cap on funds that any one State may receive in order to ensure a more equitable distribution. We also added a requirement that 40 percent of the funds must go for State grants and set-aside programs. We put in a requirement that there would be a reduction of administrative funds, and we provided authority for the NEA to solicit and invest private funds. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) mentioned earlier one of the agreements. We have implemented that agreement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) mentioned about one city getting too much and we put restrictions on this, to broaden it all across America.

In response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), in this year's bill there is the establishment of a priority for grants for education for underserved populations and community music, and I mentioned earlier Jessup, Iowa had a group out there. They paid half for this, this small community, the NEA paid half, and they had a string quartet that spent 6 months with students in Jessup.

In 1996 Congress eliminated grants to individuals, seasonal support and subgranting so that we would not have a repetition of what happened in Minneapolis. These reforms have had a strong impact on the organization and the kind of grants it supports. In addition, Senator HELMS put obscenity restrictions in the NEA legislation in 1990, and just recently the United States Supreme Court upheld these restrictions in the Finley case as being constitutional.

So I just want to be sure that we are recognizing the enormous changes that have been made in the NEA.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to leave that chart, because I think it is very important. I appreciate the chairman of the subcommittee showing us all the good reforms, and they are good reforms. The problem is, even with all of these reforms, we still have a bad NEA in place. That is the problem, and that is why I rise in opposition to this amendment to add funding back for the National Endowment for the Arts.

I am not under any illusions about this amendment. We are going to have a tough time defeating it. But I think there are very important principles at stake here, principles that supporters of the NEA simply gloss over. Fiscal responsibility of course is one principle. Is it fiscally responsible to give taxpayers' dollars to some artists who produce art that offends many of the taxpayers? Time and time again, even with all of the reforms, NEA money trickles out to so-called artists who go out of their way to offend the sensibilities of working Americans. Is this a fiscally responsible use of taxpayers dollars? I do not think so.

Another principle is censorship, and I contend that the NEA censors artists by doling out money only to those artists that know how to work the system. The NEA picks winners and losers, just by the very virtue of being a government agency. It thereby censors those who do not meet their particular tests.

Artists need to have the freedom to produce their art and they should do so in a free market setting. By allowing the continued government interference in the arts, we risk compromising the artistic freedom of this country.

The Federal Government has no business in an agency like this. The Federal Government is producing art, culture through the Smithsonian, through the museums, through our art galleries and things like that. Those are legitimate concerns. But this is the National Endowment for the Arts that, in my opinion, does nothing to promote artistic freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Federal Government should get out of the arts business entirely, so I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility and against government censorship.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute if I may do that, and reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not reserve time; the time is controlled by the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thought she just yielded me 5 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would say to the gentleman I do have a lot of requests for time. I thought the gentleman wanted 5 minutes to speak.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I do, but I just wanted to yield myself 1 minute of the 5 minutes because I had requests for time from other people, and that is why I asked whether I may do that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. From the gentlewoman from Connecticut, the gentleman had been yielded 5 minutes. To yield the gentleman control of that time, so that he may control the dispensation of time, would require a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, she has yielded me 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Will I be able to yield time to other people?

The CHAIRMAN. Not absent a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask unanimous consent in order to yield that time to others?

The CHAIRMAN. To be able to control the 5 minutes and its distribution (as by reserving time or being seated), that is correct.

Mr. YATES. I do not understand that.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I certainly would be happy to have him yield time on his side; I also have them on my list.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I will take the 5 minutes now. I thank the

gentlewoman very much for that opportunity, and I thank the chair for what I believe was a misapprehension of my rights under the rules.

□ 1430

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) who preceded me, the minority whip, in connection with the speech he made is just wrong, wrong, wrong. The government does not actually control the giving of the grants. That is in the hands of panels, of civilians who are expert in the field. They are the ones who make the original selections.

It is true that there has to be a censorship because there just is not enough money made available under the appropriations for the National Endowment of the Arts to provide grants for as many applications as they receive. They, therefore, have to be selective.

The second statement of the gentleman was that the Federal Government should not be in this business. Well, the general welfare is the government's business. I remember statements like the gentleman's being made before 1957 in connection with Federal aid for education. The Republicans were opposed to Federal aid for education and they prevented that program from being enacted by the Congress.

Then in 1957 the Russians launched Sputnik and General Eisenhower, who was President at the time, President Eisenhower, sent a request to the Congress for Federal aid for education in mathematics and in science. The Congress quickly passed that. But no mention was made for education in the civilian sense. That took a later date.

Now, we do not have the Federal Government making grants for the purpose of studying the languages, history, philosophy, ethics, religion, legislature or the arts, as such, other than through the NEA. We do have the National Science Foundation. The National Science Foundation does an excellent job for mathematics and for the sciences.

But insofar as the political sciences are concerned, the National Science Foundation does not engage in that. In other words, the National Science Foundation does not contribute to the disciplines that will educate our children in the ways of peace. Only the arts and humanities represent the Federal Government in making those kinds of grants and in teaching in that respect.

Does the committee believe that education in science and math is enough? I do not think so. I think that the endowments have done a remarkably fine job over the years and I am constrained to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) to restore the funding for the arts.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that this amendment simply restores funding to the NEA that my amendment originally placed in the bill last week, funding that was just stricken by the Republican point of order.

Of course this amendment should be supported, even if the procedure being used is Mickey Mouse. If we have to support a Mickey Mouse procedure in order to provide funding for the arts, then that is what we will have to do.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, first I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a little repetitious. We have been through this so many times. But I want to take advantage of an opportunity to pay tribute to a very distinguished colleague who was first elected to Congress when I graduated from high school. That is the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The gentleman is a dear friend. He has been a devoted and committed Member of this body. We sometimes have our disagreements on all kinds of issues, but I respect him profoundly and I wish him all the best.

Let me add that I am totally opposed to this amendment. At the Constitutional Convention, the whole question came up of funding the arts and it was overwhelmingly rejected on the grounds that that is not an appropriate function of the national government.

In 1965 we got into "guns and butter." We got into funding everything. The national government swelled enormously, penetrating virtually every aspect of our lives. This is not a time to revive it; this is a time for downsizing, getting the national government out of our lives and getting folks back home more involved in participating in funding such things as the arts and humanities.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Johnson amendment restoring full funding to the National Endowment for the Arts in the amount of $98 million.

I strongly support full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Over the past 30 years our quality of life has been improved by the NEA. Support for the arts proves our dedication to freedom of expression, one of the fundamental beliefs that our Nation has been built upon.

Full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts will not detract from the quality of life in our Nation as a whole. The NEA is a dynamic investment in the economic growth of our Nation's communities. Arts are extremely important to the constituents of our districts, and by supporting them I know that I am ensuring that our rich, diverse American culture will continue to be memorialized and celebrated.

In addition, the cultural benefit they provide, arts organizations make a direct economic impact on our communities, providing jobs, often fueling a vital flow of patrons to restaurants and shops.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support the Johnson amendment restoring full funding to the arts, and I commend my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), for his support of this endeavor.

I am pleased to rise today in support of the Johnson amendment, restoring full funding to the National Endowment for the Arts in the amount of $98 million.

I strongly support full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Over the past 30 years our quality of life has been improved by the NEA. Support for the arts proves our dedication to freedom of expression, one of the fundamental beliefs our great country is built on. Full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts will not detract from the quality of life in our Nation as a whole.

The NEA is a dynamic investment in the economic growth of our Nation's communities. Arts are extremely important to the constituents of my district, and by supporting them, I know that I am ensuring that our rich, diverse American culture will continue to be memorialized and celebrated. In addition to the cultural benefit they provide, arts organizations make a direct economic impact on the community, providing jobs and often fueling a vital flow of patrons to restaurants and shops.

The NEA brings the arts to our young people. Each year, the arts endowment opens the door to the arts to millions of school children, including "at-risk" youth. An education through the arts improves overall student learning, and instills self-esteem and discipline. The arts also help prepare America's future work force by helping students develop reasoning and problem-solving skills, and enhancing communication ability—all important career skills for the 21st century.

The NEA has worked diligently for the past 8 years to create a more accountable and efficient system. In 1994 the NEA constricted the grantmaking process by eliminating subgrants to third party artists and organizations. The following year, the NEA eliminated seasonal operating support grants, and in the fiscal year 1996 and 1997 appropriations bills, Congress banned nearly all grants to individual artists.

Furthermore, the recent decision by the Supreme Court to uphold the decency standard passed by Congress in 1990 is a victory for both the National Endowment for the Arts and for the Congress. This decision is a significant step to protecting the caliber of art funded by the NEA.

The arts foster a common appreciation of history and culture that are essential to our humanity. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing by restoring full funding for the arts by supporting the Johnson amendment.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I will try and do two quotes here to perhaps change the mind of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and others on this subject.

Let us go back to the year 1787. During the Constitutional Convention, Charles Pinckney of South Carolina offered a motion to authorize the government to spend money on the promotion of literature and the arts and sciences. The motion was put up before the members and it was defeated overwhelmingly.

From that point on through the years of 1960, Americans enjoyed a vibrant and successful art community. Successful not because of the government, but without the government. Is the gentleman from Illinois repudiating all of that history?

Suddenly, almost 200 years later in 1965, Congress started talking about supporting the arts through Federal funding. But do my colleagues know which President said he was against funding for the arts? President Kennedy, who stated, "I do not believe Federal funds should support symphony orchestras or opera companies."

NEA has gotten very political. Everybody who is going to support the NEA would have to agree it has gotten very political, and the Federal Government has been the primary endorser of very controversial pieces of art. This art has been antithetical to our traditions and to our mores.

One of the great publishers of magazines and newspapers and a candidate for President, H.L. Mencken, said it best in this quotation:

After 20 years, he said, of active magazine publishing and newspaper publishing, I cannot recall a single writer who really needs government assistance. That is, not one of any talent whatsoever. A great many pretenders, of course, are doing badly. But I cannot see that it would be of any public benefit to encourage them in their bad work.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is the NEA has often not provided art that we can be proud of. It has been in large part social experiment for the elite. Some of the art produced was antithetical to our values. I do not support the Johnson amendment. Let's remember our history for almost 200 years when the government did not provide federal funding for the arts.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I must say I find it most unfortunate that we are still here listening to continuing political attacks on the NEA. I strongly support, and I think it goes without saying, the contributions the NEA has made to cultural standards in this country.

But I want to say now, as one who served as the Republican leader on the subcommittee that wrote the reforms in the early 1990s to deal with those questions of standards of decency and to protect against the controversial sexual and religious themes and, indeed, blasphemous themes, I want to say that as the Republican leader who wrote the reforms we put in protections and reforms in that legislation so that we would not be violating the community standards of decency. In fact, just last month the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the right of Congress to have those standards of decency.

Now, with respect to this question of whether or not abuses are continuing in the so-called Corpus Christi project, I can tell my colleagues categorically that no NEA funding was used under that, and let us not use this as a stalking horse or as a diversion. Let us support the Johnson amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge this House to vote to support the NEA and vote for this amendment. I find it most unfortunate, and cannot explain the irrational political attacks on the NEA. These attacks are bred of ignorance or willful, crass, and disingenuous political abuse.

Since its formation over thirty years ago, 2nd National Endowment of the Arts has provided the public side of a very valuable public-private partnership to foster the arts. The people in this room represent the private side of that partnership. For urban, suburban, and rural areas alike.

Nevertheless, there were abuses in recent years that became public in the early 1990's. There were blasphemous and irreverent productions that clearly violated community standards.

"CORPUS CHRISTI"

Now, all of us have been hearing from constituents about a play "Corpus Christi," which many people mistakenly believe was supported by the NEA. I want you to know that NEA funding did not support this play!

Should this event prove to show that the reforms we instituted have to be strengthened, then I can assure all our members that I will lead that effort and close any loopholes in current law.

In 1990, I served as Republican leader of the subcommittee that re-wrote NEA regulations to establish new decency standards and outlawed NEA support for projects with controversial sexual and religious themes, and those which violated community standards of decency.

In the past month, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld these standards, saying the federal government can consider general standards of decency and the "values of the American public" in deciding which projects should receive cash grants.

The NEA has provided the critical support which allowed production of such American classics as the original "Driving Miss Daisy," "The Great White Hope," and a "Chorus Line." The NEA has brought us the television programs "Live from the Lincoln Center" and "American Playhouse."

All told, over 11,000 artists have received fellowships from the Endowment. They've won dozens upon dozens of Pulitzer Prizes, MacArthur Awards, and National Book Club Awards.

Let's continue to support this worthwhile organization. Vote for this amendment. Support the Arts.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring back a chart that we looked at just a few minutes ago and have kind of a little different perspective on what we were doing. The gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) just mentioned some of the reforms.

When we go down this chart of NEA reforms, the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Illinois, the CLIFF STEARNS and the PHIL CRANES of the world who have been fighting this fight for dozens of years, and other people in this conference, trying to highlight the abuses of this program, I think here are some dividends that have been paid.

There is a $400,000 grant in Kansas in March of 1997, a review of that art project. It was called "Santa's Workshop" and it had Santa Claus masturbating. So this fairly recent phenomenon here of 1997, of where we do not quite have it right.

But the people who have the courage to come up here and say that this is not a proper thing to spend taxpayer money on, and have highlighted the abuse and the way the NEA is run, should be proud that we have made progress.

The subcommittee chairman should be proud of what he has been able to do, because that $400,000 grant to produce art showing Santa masturbating is more money than the entire arts agencies in Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, North Dakota, Wyoming, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and all the U.S. territories received combined.

Whether we consider that program art or not, whether we consider it the proper role of the Federal Government, this has been a poorly run Federal agency where 25 cents of every dollar goes into administration and most congressional districts receive little, if any, support from it.

It is an elitist organization, out of touch with the American people in terms of business management, out of touch with the American public in terms of what art is. We are making small progress, and that is something to be thankful for. But we can set our watches by this debate, because it will

happen again next year, and one year we will take this pot of money and give it to the communities to let them come up with programs better than we can do here. That day is coming.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Johnson amendment. As a congressional appointee by the Speaker to the National Council of the Arts, I have been monitoring the NEA and found that significant and positive changes have been made by this agency and Congress to ensure that taxpayers' funds are spent wisely and not on obscene and offensive art.

Like many others, before the NEA undertook these changes, some of which were internal and some of which were dictated by Congress, before that time I supported efforts to reduce, prioritize, or eliminate funding for the Endowment. I now think we should give the NEA a chance to work under new guidelines and mandates of law that now govern the agency and that we should level-fund it.

□ 1445

In recent weeks I have heard reports that NEA funded a theater called Project Corpus Christi, a play portraying Jesus as having sex with his apostles. I am glad to report the NEA did not fund this project. The Manhattan Theater Club, the theater involved in this controversy, did receive funds from the NEA but for a separate and noncontroversial play.

I think we should support, level fund this endowment.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, when we are on a tight budget, we have to make choices. We cannot buy expensive tickets to the theater or even go to the movies if we can barely afford to buy our food and pay our rent.

At a time when we are talking about a debt in this Nation of $5.5 trillion, when we are talking about balancing the budget, it is difficult to explain to the American people why we need to spend $98 million for such a program as we are talking about here today.

We all support the arts, but it does not seem fair to make the hardworking people of this country pay for exhibits that are only art by name, because in many cases they are pornographic, they are profane, and would be viewed with disgust by the majority of the people who see it.

When we are trying to balance the budget, as I mentioned, when we are trying to reduce the size and the scope of the Federal Government, can anyone honestly place arts on the same level as, say, providing for our national defense and improving our Nation's infrastructure, improving or saving Medicare and Social Security?

The National Endowment for the Arts has proven time and time again that they cannot be trusted as good stewards of the people's money. This is a travesty and a slap in the face of those people who call themselves Christians and who believe in the Christian faith and the religious values that have made this Nation great. I think we must show the American people that we are serious about changing the way Washington spends their money, and I think we should eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Johnson amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

As cochair of the Congressional Members Organization on the Arts, I represent over 140 Members of this House, bipartisan Members, who are dedicated to the survival of the NEA because we know that one of the greatest benefits is that it touches a broad spectrum of the population, both rural and urban, young and old, rich and poor, and everyone in between.

The arts are an important part of our economy, recognized by the Conference of Mayors of the United States, which has given us its strongest support and said that NEA must survive because of the economic benefits it means to every city in the United States.

When we spend $98 million on the NEA, we provide the first link in a delicate system that supports 1.3 million full time jobs in all the 50 States, providing $3.4 million back to the Federal treasury in income taxes. I know of no other investment we make as Members of Congress that brings back to the treasury such an incredible return.

But it is more than that. Test after test has shown that each child exposed to the arts is a better student.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Johnson amendment. There is no question that art serves many purposes. It communicates powerful emotions that are often difficult to express in other ways.

Yet art is best judged in the context of individual creativity and independent thought, not through a Federal bureaucracy. And freedom of artistic thought is very important to our society. We do not need a Federal agency determining which art is worthy of government funding and which is not. Citizens and private groups should decide what they think is quality art and spend their money to fund it accordingly. When the NEA gives grants to art projects, taxpayers are put in the position of supporting art they may find objectionable.

A recent congressional oversight study found private giving to the arts is at an all-time high. In fact, private individuals outspent the NEA 100-to-1. When it comes to supporting the arts, the private sector is where it is at. Local and State governments do likewise. Art thrives not on government handouts but on thousands of individual acts of creativity.

The NEA is no longer needed to fund art. Instead, it serves as a prime example of government overreaching its sphere of influence.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and I rise in support of Federal funding for the arts and funding for the NEA.

Mr. Chairman, I find it appalling that we are even debating whether to cut the funding of the National Endowment of the Arts today.

We spend more on the Marine Corp Band than we do on the NEA. In fact, we give less to the arts than any other western country. Even during the Middle Ages the arts were something to be protected and preserved and their importance was understood.

They were not mistaken. The arts are good for the public, and study after study shows that children who are exposed to the arts do better in school and have higher self-esteem.

The money from the National Endowment for the Arts touches the lives of millions of Americans.

At the Metropolitan Museum of Art, thousands of people flood in and out of their doors each day.

The American Ballet Company travels around the country bringing the grace of ballet to every area of our country.

Before the NEA was created in 1965, there were only 58 orchestras in the country; today there are more than 1,000.

Before the NEA, there were 37 professional dance companies in America; now there are 300.

Before the NEA, only one million people attended the theater each year; today over 55 million attend annually.

Mr. Chairman, the benefits of the arts and the NEA are evident, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, as one of the members of the Council on the Arts, I rise in strong support of the Johnson amendment and want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the NEA, and I do so not only as a proponent of federal support for the arts, but also

as one who has seen first-hand the inner workings of the NEA.

Along with Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. DOOLITTLE, I have the privilege of serving as one of six Congressional members on the National Council on the Arts, which basically serves as the Board of Directors for the NEA. Among the distinguished members of the National Council are Father Leo O'Donovan, the president of Georgetown University; and Wallace McRae, a third generation livestock rancher from Montana and the author of four volumes of poetry. Let me also point out that the new chairman of the NEA, William Ivey, is the former director of the Country Music Foundation.

This is not a radical group, needless to say. In reviewing and voting on NEA grant applications, the members of the National Council take their responsibilities to U.S. taxpayers very seriously. They are united by their commitment to making the arts accessible to all Americans—which is what this debate is all about.

Now we all know that NEA opponents delight in telling tabloid-like stories about objectionable projects funded by the NEA. But let's be clear on the facts. Out of more than 112,000 NEA-funded grants over the past 32 years, only 45 were controversial. That's less than four one-hundredths of one percent of all grants. Most importantly, reforms instituted by Congress and internally by the NEA have restructured the grant process so that the mistakes of the past will not be repeated.

We didn't abolish the Department of Defense because of $500 toilet seats and we didn't abolish the Navy because of the Tailhook scandal. We certainly shouldn't abolish the NEA because a few projects years ago were controversial. It's simply absurd.

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. In a nation of such wealth and cultural diversity, it is a tragic commentary on our priorities that year after year we must engage in a protracted debate about an agency that spends less than 40 cents per American each year—and in return benefits students, artists, teachers, musicians, orchestras, theaters, and dance companies and their audiences across the country.

But let's be honest—this isn't a fight over money. The Republican leadership wants to eliminate the NEA because they are afraid of artistic expression in a free society. This battle isn't about defending the values of mainstream America—this is about the GOP pandering to Pat Robertson and the Religious Right.

Polls overwhelmingly show that the American public supports federal funding for the arts. And if those reasons are not compelling enough for some, let's just talk dollars and cents. For every $1 the NEA spends, it generates more than 11 times that in private donations and economic activity. That is a huge economic return on the government's investment. And you certainly don't need to be from New York to see the impact of the arts on a region's economy.

The Republican assault on the arts—on cultural expression itself—is an outrage—and it must be defeated.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut, as the proponent of the amendment, has the right to close.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. And how much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, the government has an important role in funding the arts. Two years ago some of us thought we could combine two good principles; fund the arts, but do it by replacing the NEA with a block grant directly to the State arts commissions. We thought we had a viable compromise that would end the annual debate; an honorable effort to broaden the base. That failed. The block grants are not viable.

We need to fund the NEA and we need to increase the funding for the NEA. I appreciate the efforts of my colleague from Connecticut in making sure that will happen.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would encourage my colleagues to read the report that we issued last year: A Creative and Generous America, The Healthy State of the Arts in America. Because the arts in America are healthy. What is failing is the continued failure of the National Endowment for the Arts.

It is not a broad-based program. The NEA has failed in its primary mission to make that happen. More than one-third of NEA funds go to six cities, and one-third of all congressional districts fail to get any direct funding. That means one-third of America does not even see the NEA. In short, the NEA makes up a minuscule portion of arts support in America.

There is no credible evidence that the NEA has had anything to do with the recent growth and explosion in the arts. It is a failed small agency. And before my colleagues say how well it works, just a year ago 63 percent of NEA grantees could not reconcile their project costs, 79 percent had inadequate documentation of personnel costs, and 53 percent had failed to engage independent auditors.

This agency needs to be overhauled if not eliminated.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON), to restore funding for the NEA.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments in favor of limited funding are hollow and without merit. Government support for the arts is not a program for the elite. Eliminating the endowment will do nothing to reduce the deficit. The private sector cannot and will not provide sufficient funding to make up this loss in the credibility.

Some of the many reasons most Americans believe in government support for the arts is it stimulates economic growth, it invests in our communities, they are basic to a thorough education. We know that student achievement and test scores in academic subjects improve when the arts are used to assist learning in math, social studies, creative writing and communication skills. We know SATs and ACTs are elevated by students who have had the arts training.

I invite anyone who thinks the NEA is not needed to visit the Puppet Company Playhouse in Glen Echo Park, just a few miles from the Capital.

It's a two-hundred seat theater created out of a portion of an historic ballroom at Glen Echo Park. The audience is usually made up of children accompanied by their families and teachers, representing the cultural and economic diversity of Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia. An NEA grant allows the Puppet Co. to keep the ticket prices low so that many young families can attend the performances. The associates who run the Company work hard for modest salaries in the true spirit of keeping their company non-profit.

I think most taxpayers would be pleased to know that they support such a worthwhile project.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment. It is the right thing to do.

Art is how we remember. It is important, even vital, that we support and encourage the promotion of the arts so that the rich and cultural story of our past can be made available to future generations.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, for those of us who find ourselves supporting a gradual change, this is a difficult vote and a difficult amendment.

I am rising today in opposition to this amendment for a variety of reasons but, in particular, I would have supported the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) several years ago to gradually privatize the National Endowment for the Arts, and I believe as a politician who also loves the arts, that politics and art rarely mix. And if there is one thing that this debate has shown us today, it is that.

I think that the National Endowment of the Arts should move towards being a private national endowment over

time. Unfortunately, having talked to the National Endowment of the Arts this morning, I found that while they were given authorization to begin development programs to raise independent funds a year ago, in that year they have only raised $50,000. That is not a real effort, in my view, towards moving toward a truly independent national endowment, and my vote today should be seen by supporters of the arts and seen by the National Endowment of the Arts as a clear encouragement to them to move towards privatization.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for yielding me this time, and I certainly support her amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I consider myself one of the most conservative Members of this body, and my record as one of the fiscal conservatives is a matter of record. But let me tell my colleagues, regarding the arguments I have heard today, this is a question about whether or not we give any money to the arts. It is that basic; that simple.

This government has always supported the arts. From Washington, from Thomas Jefferson, from Abraham Lincoln, we have always, as a Nation and its founding leaders and through every administration, supported the arts.

Now, I admit that some mistakes have been made, and I have highlighted those mistakes. But it is not our responsibility or duty here to abolish Federal Government participation in the arts. With those mistakes that have been made, it is our responsibility to correct those mistakes. If we need tax credits, if we need to change the project basis, let us do that. But this is about funding our museums, this is about funding our symphonies.

Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a child who has attended or heard a symphony or visited a museum who would not benefit from this effort to fund the arts.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I listened to the debate, one thought kept crossing my mind, and that is how easy it is to be a philanthropist with other people's money. It is really easy to give away other people's money, $9.5 million.

The impression some Members would give us, and the movie stars, is that the arts and arts programs in this country are hanging by a thread, and if we do not fund the NEA all of the arts are going to go away. Well, the truth is that is not true.

The fact is there are several people that are contributing to the arts community in our country today. One is the Federal Government. Now, not just the $98.5 million that we are trying to stop being funded to the NEA. There are over 200 programs funded by taxpayers that go to the arts: Holocaust Museum, Commission of Fine Arts, Indian Arts and Crafts Board, JFK Center for the Performing Arts, National Endowment for Children's Educational TV, NEH, National Gallery of Arts, the Smithsonian.

How much money is the Federal Government spending of our tax dollars on the arts? Well, in 1997, it was $696 million, in 1998 it was $710 million, and in 1999 it will be $815 million that is going to go to fund the arts. So we are great philanthropists with other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I will just finish by urging my colleagues to vote "no" on the Johnson amendment.

□ 1500

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the 30 remaining seconds.

I urge support of my amendment in the strongest terms possible. This body votes R&D tax credits to support the creativity necessary to an entrepreneurial society. We support NIH funding to create the knowledge base for medical innovations.

We must support NEA dollars to support the infrastructure for a strong, vital, national, creative culture and community of the arts. We must do no less if we are to have the quality of inspired leadership that this Nation needs to sustain our democracy.

If my colleagues have never been in a HOT school, a higher order of thinking school, go. It will demonstrate why NEA dollars count, now and in the future.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my colleague NANCY JOHNSON's amendment to restore $98 million in funding to the National Endowment for the Arts. For a small and carefully safeguarded investment of taxpayer money, NEA funds activities that enrich all aspects of our society.

We will hear a good deal today about the economic benefits NEA offers to our local communities—and that's right. Last year, we invested $98 million in the NEA. This investment supported 1.3 million full-time jobs in local communities, generated an estimated $37 billion in economic activity, and returned almost three and one half billion dollars to the federal treasury in income taxes. Clearly, any investment which provides a return of nearly 35 times your initial investment is worth continuing. Since FY96, the NEA has directly contributed over $3 million in awards to the Connecticut economy, and 19 individual awards were recommended last year.

But more important is the immeasurable contribution that NEA makes to our nation's art and music, creativity and talent. When we invest in NEA, we add to the store of artistic expression in the world. We add to the human spirit. And that is the most important investment of all.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and fund this important program.

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

The latest Lou Harris poll found that 79% of Americans support a governmental role in funding the arts. Furthermore, 57% said they favor the federal government funding the arts. Federal funding for the arts is a good investment because the arts contribute to our society both financially and educationally.

From a financial standpoint, the NEA is an investment in the economic growth of our communities because the non-profit arts community generates an estimated $37 billion in economic activity, returns $3.4 billion in income taxes to the federal government each year, and supports 1.7 million jobs.

Federal funding for the arts is also a catalyst for leveraging private funding since recipients of NEA grants are required to match federal grants up to 3 to 1. It is also important to recognize that the NEA's budget represents less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the federal budget and costs each American less than 38 cents per year.

Our communities benefit from an investment in the arts when art is a part of a comprehensive educational program and last year, the NEA made arts education a top priority. In 1997, the NEA invested $8.2 million in support of K–12 arts programs. Through these programs, the NEA 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-tech workforce by helping students develop problem-solving and reasoning skills, hone communication ability and expand career skills for the 21st century. In my extensive work with education and technology, I see how important arts education is to developing our future workforce.

Exposing children to the arts is even 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 mentoring programs, in-school performances and apprenticeships in local school districts, colleges and universities. These programs have enriched the cultural fabric of our community. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the continued funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, in ardent support of the National Endowment for the Arts. I commend my colleague, NANCY JOHNSON, for her perseverance on this issue and thank Chairman REGULA for bringing to the floor a fine Interior Appropriations bill.

Every day, arts programs across the United States are helping Americans. CityKids is an

educational program in New York City, and let me describe for you what one of the students told me:

Chayka wrote:

My grandfathers, grandmother, father and uncle were all alcoholics. I lived in the projects oldest of 5 girls to a single mother and all I had was my ambition, drive, determination, and talent. The arts . . . has kept me sane. Now I've taken these skills that I've learned and through the arts I educate thousands of youths. It makes communicating to my peers about teen pregnancy, drugs, abuse, and racism heard effectively.

The National Endowment for the Arts is a powerful symbol for improving the quality of our lives and the refining of our communities. The arts clearly enhance community livability; attract industry; create jobs; increase the tax base; and enrich us all. Dance, theater, and music encourage personal achievement in our communities. In a time when we have balanced the budget, lowered taxes, and improved education in our country, we can take the time to appreciate the creative opportunities made possible by local arts organizations and the NEA.

The NEA does touch us in our communities. For instance, this weekend the 21st Annual New York Philharmonic Free Concert will take place at Heckscher State Park in my district on Long Island. Every year, this concert brings together 40,000 people and this free concert is made possible because the NY Philharmonic receives a grant from the NEA to offer free concerts throughout New York State and the region. 40,000 people take advantage of this opportunity and benefit from the NEA—families who otherwise may not have the occasion or the money to hear classical music.

As a result of Federal arts funding, the American people have gained access to a greater range of nonprofit arts organizations. Since 1965, the number of professional nonprofit theaters has grown from 56 to over 425; large orchestras have increased from 100 to over 230; opera companies from 27 to over 120; and dance companies from 37 to over 400. Additionally, countless small chamber and choral groups, museums, art centers, cultural festivals, cultural organizations and writers guilds have sprouted up in small towns, rural communities, medium-sized cities and suburbs throughout every corner of America. A Congressional initiative that allocated 7.5 percent of all NEA arts funding to help develop arts programming in under-served areas specifically helped us reach this outcome.

Over the past few years, Congress has instituted changes that have allowed for important reforms. I'd like to take a moment to highlight an excellent program that has been instituted in response to Congressional concerns about the fairness of the distribution of NEA grants. The new ArtsREACH program is designed to send grants to states that have historically been under-served. Specifically, ArtsREACH will provide direct planning and technical assistance grants to communities in targeted states to create coalitions of cultural organizations, local government and community arts agencies. They will work together to ensure that the arts are an integral part of achieving community goals. ArtsREACH will target local arts and civic leaders and help them to use the arts to build stronger communities. In fact, the United States Conference of Mayors recently passed a unanimous resolution endorsing ArtsREACH.

The arts make a difference in helping to solve everyday challenges. I have seen firsthand how the arts build communities. Public funding for the arts combined with private sector giving has had a profound impact upon the health, education and economy of our nation. Business leaders are building upon the economic stimuli and social problem-solving abilities created by the arts to nurture further growth at the local level. The arts enrich the lives of all Americans because they speak to our economic, intellectual and spiritual well-being. In my home state of New York, organizations supported by the arts provide 174,000 jobs. Nonprofit arts organizations alone have an economic impact of nearly $4.1 million.

Not only do the arts contribute to a stronger community, they also help prepare job-seekers and enhance creativity in the workplace. When hiring employees, more and more businesses are looking for those qualities developed through education and exposure to the arts.

The U.S. Department of Labor's report on the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills recently highlighted the important role of arts education in achieving many "core competencies" for the workplace, including creative problem solving, allocating resources, team building, and exercising individual responsibility. Employers recognize that individuals with a strong background in arts have the creative talent to innovatively approach challenges.

The arts inspire me and millions of Americans. On the cusp of a new millennium, when we are actually aware of our legacy and our future, the time is right to reinvest in our identity and to ensure that we remain a world leader culturally as well as economically.

I urge my colleagues to continue funding the National Endowment for the Arts. Help the arts flourish in small towns and inner cities across our great nation.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in strong support of the amendment by my colleague from Connecticut. The arts enrich our culture, our humanity, our communities, and our economy, and I am pleased to vote for this amendment to restore funding to the National Endowment for the Arts.

The small investment the government makes in the NEA—its budget is only .01 of our national budget—serves as a catalyst for local, state and private investment in the arts, and bolsters an industry that provides millions of jobs across the nation.

We see the results of this investment in Connecticut's thriving arts community. Connecticut's nonprofit arts industry—and it truly is an industry—contributed an estimated $1.3 billion to the state's economy in 1996, and provided jobs for roughly 30,500 people.

Just last month, New Haven demonstrated again how the arts can both build our economy and bring our community together. Performers from around the world came to New Haven for the annual International Festival of Arts and Ideas. An estimated 80,000 people traveled to New Haven to visit this summer's festival and enjoyed the artists, dancers, musicians and craftsmen. The arts means travel and tourism, money and jobs for the city of New Haven.

The arts build our economy, enrich our culture and feed the minds of adults and children alike. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress who supports the arts, I believe that the Federal government should remain an important contributor in this area.

Critics point to a few controversial grants that the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has made, and I agree that some funding decisions may have been unwise. However, in recent years, the NEA has taken strides to eliminate controversy from the grant process by eliminating "individual grants" and "subgrants."

In fact, most of the funding from the agency is directed toward 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.

In Delaware, the NEA provides assistance to the Delaware Division of the Arts and the Delaware Humanities Forum so they may grant funding to the Delaware Symphony Orchestra, the Delaware Theater Company, Opera Delaware and many other community and school activities.

When it comes to partnership between private, state, and Federal funding of the arts the NEA sets an outstanding example. According to the agency, one endowment dollar attracts twelve dollars or more from state and regional arts agencies as well as corporations, businesses and individuals.

In fact, NEA funded programs generate economic activity through tourism, urban renewal and economic development throughout the nation. According to the NEA, non-profit arts programs contribute an estimated $37 billion to the economy and are responsible for 1.3 million jobs.

It is also important to note that most industrial countries have a national budget for the arts and humanities. The United Kingdom, Canada, the Netherlands, France, Germany and Sweden not only have national budgets for the arts, but in most cases, provide more funding for the arts than the United States.

Federal support of the NEA opens the door to the arts for all Americans, sets a standard for private and public investment partnerships and generates economic development in our communities. In light of these facts, the Federal government can not neglect its responsibility in continued support of the arts, and I urge my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment to restore NEA funding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] to restore $98 million in funding for fiscal year 1999 for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Many speakers today will describe the overall value and worth of the NEA. They will note how we all benefit from the NEA, in every single one of our congressional districts and states.

We all know the NEA devotes 40% of its budget to partnerships with state and regional arts agencies, funding that is directed to projects tailored to those communities.

Before the NEA existed, only five states had state-funded arts councils. Today, all fifty states have such councils.

All of our constituencies benefit from NEA funds, programs that only cost taxpayers 36 cents each year.

In return, arts agencies, arts organizations, and arts programs and activities provide substantial social, educational and economic benefits.

I would like to speak, however, about two NEA grants to small local and regional museums in my district, the 3rd Congressional District of Massachusetts.

This year, the NEA awarded the Worcester Art Museum in Worcester, MA, a grant of $120,000 to support the creation and presentation of an exhibition on the lost Roman city of Antioch.

It is very fitting that the NEA supported this exhibition, which is the culmination of archaeological and artistic effort by the Worcester Art Museum undertaken throughout this century. One of the many breath-taking sights in the museum is to come upon the Antioch mosaics, which were installed around 1937, the result of a partnership between the Worcester Art Museum and various universities and museums in the United States and France to excavate the Antioch site between 1932 and 1939. Building on this work over the following decades, the Worcester Art Museum has become renown for one of the finest collections of Roman mosaics in the United States.

The NEA grant will support the creation of the exhibition, the accompanying catalogue, and the education programs—especially those for children—that will be part of this major exhibition of art and artifacts from Antioch. The exhibition will then travel to Texas and Ohio, where it will also enrich the lives of citizens, scholars and school children in those communities, as well.

Another smaller grant by the NEA was also awarded this year to the Higgins Armory Museum, a small museum in Worcester, MA that is among the best armory collections in the world. The exhibition schedule of the Higgins Armory Museum includes a series of professional development workshops for teachers, and visits by approximately 25,000 students from some 500 public and private schools throughout the six-state New England region.

The NEA provided a modest $5,000 grant to support an upcoming exhibition entitled, "Road Warriors: Knight Riders." This unique and creative exhibit will educate the general public about the medieval period of armor worn by mounted knights with a more contemporary icon, namely the various uniforms of motorbike culture. The exhibit will especially reach out to young people with education programs.

I am proud of the strong artistic and cultural heritage of central Massachusetts, and I am equally proud of the vibrant artistic community that is actively engaged in cities and towns throughout my district today.

On behalf of them and on behalf of the communities of Central Massachusetts that benefit economically, culturally and socially from their presence, I urge all my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment to restore funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

WORCESTER ART MUSEUM,
Worcester, MA, June 19, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: I am writing to encourage your support of the President's proposed increase in funding for the National Endowment of the Arts to $136 million for FY 1999. As a strong supporter of the arts in our community, you already realize how important federal funding is to the Worcester Art Museum's ability to sustain a high caliber of exhibitions and services.

As you know, the Worcester Art Museum has recently received a grant award from the NEA to support its upcoming exhibition, Antioch: The Lost Roman City, scheduled to begin its national tour in Worcester in the Fall of 2000. This matching award not only signifies a level of project excellence on a national level but provides the leverage for securing additional funding sources needed for the execution of this exhibition. When an exhibition or project receives the NEA's "stamp of approval," other funders are more inclined to follow suit. This federal funding will enable approximately 170,000 viewers the opportunity to understand and learn about the ancient city and culture of Antioch, an opportunity that would not be possible without the initial support of the NEA.

I thank you in advance for your advocacy on behalf of the Worcester Art Museum and cultural institutions nation-wide and encourage your continued efforts to reinforce the importance of federal arts funding and its impact on the economic and cultural health of our communities.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. WELU,
Director.

HIGGINS ARMORY MUSEUM,
Worcester, MA, June 30, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: The Higgins Armory Museum was the recipient recently of a $5,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts helping to fund the Museum's 1998–1999 winter and spring special exhibition. These annual events are an integral part of the Museum's ongoing educational programming which is designed not only as a benefit for the Museum's general audiences, but also as a collaborative effort with local and regional educators to tie in with public and private school interdisciplinary curriculum. The exhibition schedule each year includes a series of professional development workshops for teachers, and visits to the Museum by approximately 25,000 students representing some 500 public and private schools throughout Massachusetts and the entire six-state New England region.

I am writing to you on behalf of our Board of Trustees to express appreciation to you and your colleagues in Congress for the important part you play in making this kind of financial support available. It is extremely meaningful to institutions like ours if we are to continue providing the kind of educational and cultural programs to the audiences we serve.

When you are in the Worcester area and your schedule permits, we would welcome the opportunity to show you the Museum and how these federal dollars are being used. We'd also like to express our very sincere thanks in person. We are extremely proud of our institution, and I'm confident that you would be also. So please consider this an official invitation, and let me know whenever you can come to see us.

Sincerely,

KENT DUR RUSSELL,
Executive Director.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Johnson amendment to restore $98 million in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. As a member of the Interior Appropriations subcommittee, I have learned a great deal about the NEA in the last few years. I know that the NEA would admit it has made mistakes in the past, but it has instituted a series of management reforms to ensure that those types of problems will not recur. Even given those problems, opponents of the NEA can point to only a handful of questionable grants out of hundreds of thousands that have been awarded during the 32-year history of the NEA. After hearing real people and real artists discuss what the NEA has brought to them and to their communities, I know that the NEA is an incredible catalyst for bringing people together and expressing, in a creative fashion, the full range of the human experience.

The National Endowment for the Arts is successfully working to bring arts to underserved communities, through after school youth programs that are introducing our young people to the power of creative expression as an alternative to violence, and through folk and traditional arts that remind us of our common bond and what it means to be an American.

Moreover, the American public supports public funding for the arts. A Louis Harris poll indicates that, by a decisive 79 percent to 19 percent margin, a better than 3-to-1 majority of the American people is convinced that it is important that there should be federal, state, and local councils for the arts to develop new programs, research and provide financial assistance to worthy arts organizations. By 57 percent to 39 percent, a clear majority of the American people favor the Federal Government funding the arts.

Let's stop playing politics with this agency and follow the direction of the American people on this issue. Support the Johnson amendment and restore funding for the arts.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, today we have the opportunity to continue funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. The fact is that the NEA is an essential component of cultural programs across the country. Not only in big cities, but in rural communities and small towns. In northern Michigan, where communities are rich with pride in their unique culture and heritage, eliminating the NEA's role as a source of state endowments and grant funding will effectively silence many quality programs. I have received many letters from local arts councils, senior centers, community theaters, youth programs and museums detailing the positive effect their programs have had and how even a small amount of federal funding can impact their program. The arts draw these communities together to celebrate and to educate each other. The past controversy over the NEA has led to reform and restructuring of that organization. The NEA has a new Chairman, Bill Ivey. These reforms and this chairman should be given the opportunity to prove themselves, not be stripped of their funding. Support the Johnson Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 173, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—253

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—173

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bateman
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fossella
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Largent
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCrery
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Redmond
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Turner
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Dixon
Ford
Gonzalez
John
McDade
McNulty
Norwood
Young (FL)

□ 1521

Mrs. BONO changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, today during the fiscal year 1999 Interior appropriations bill vote on the amendment by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) to continue funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, I intended to vote "no" for her amendment. I thought I voted "no" for her amendment. The voting machine indicated a "yes" vote. I would like the RECORD to show that I intended to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, for the Members that are asking, it is our plan to roll votes until 5:30. At that time we will catch up whatever amendments would be pending and we may have to rise for a suspension that has to be done today. When we reconvene, we will then roll votes again until 8, or let us say 8:30. Hopefully if everybody works at it, I think we can finish this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for a colloquy at this point.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to discuss the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse which is owned and operated by the National Park Service. The lighthouse, the tallest in the world, is located along the Outer Banks of North Carolina, which is a beautiful part of my district.

The lighthouse is being threatened by the ocean and beach erosion. Two proposals are currently being debated on how best to save this historical structure. Either relocate the lighthouse inland or to stabilize the lighthouse where it is by building an additional groin to complement the three that are already in place.

As we have both mentioned in previous conversations, the moving of the lighthouse would change the character and the historical importance of this structure. At this time, I am curious if the subcommittee has taken a stance on how best to save the lighthouse.

Mr. REGULA. The subcommittee has not taken an official stance. However, the subcommittee believes the historical structure can be saved in a more cost-effective way than relocating it inland.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Ohio knows, the Senate Interior appropriations bill provides $9.8 million for the relocation of the lighthouse. However, the House bill does not address the issue. When the Interior conference convenes, does the gentleman intend to accept the Senate position or choose an alternative?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am committed to supporting a proposal to save the taxpayer money while protecting the lighthouse. I am currently working with other Appropriations Committee members to provide the appropriate money necessary for the construction of the fourth groin during the conference committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment and look forward to working with him during this process.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) for a colloquy.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the manager of the bill for a moment of his time to discuss a program of particular importance to me and many of my colleagues, the National Black Footed Ferret Conservation Center.

Mr. REGULA. I would be pleased to join in a colloguy with the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, the National Black Footed Ferret Conservation Center is of critical importance to these highly endangered species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has decided to relocate this facility to an area near Fort Collins, Colorado, to take advantage of the area's habitat, infrastructure and proximity to educational and research institutions. I am grateful for the chairman's support of $1 million for the construction of the facility. However, I respectfully request full funding of the President's request in order to construct this important facility. An additional $800,000 was appropriated in the Senate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the many challenges the gentleman faces with balancing competing needs and projects, but I would like to emphasize the importance of this facility and the role that it plays in the survival of the species. I respectfully ask the gentleman to work in conference to secure full funding for this important project.

Mr. REGULA. As the gentleman from Colorado pointed out, there are many competing demands on the limited funds provided in this bill. I feel we have done as well as we could. However, I recognize the importance of the National Black Footed Ferret Conservation Center in recovering endangered species as well as its importance to public education. While we cannot meet every request, I assure the gentleman that I will keep his concerns in mind as we reconcile the differences between the House and Senate bills in conference.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) has asked me to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, 1998 marks the centennial of Guam's relationship with the United States. As the gentleman knows, during World War II, Guam was the only American territory occupied by the Japanese. The people of Guam were steadfast in their desire for Americans to return to the island. The Japanese were aware of this loyalty. As a result, many islanders were persecuted and tortured for their loyalty to the United States. The gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) has stated his concern that, unlike other Americans, the people of Guam have never received full reparations for the atrocities they experienced during World War II. He has fought for recognition and eventual reparations to the people of Guam.

Mr. REGULA. I am aware of the gentleman from Guam's concerns and efforts in this area.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Guam has also noted that $400,000 has been added to the technical assistance program in the Insular Affairs account without specific designation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has expired.

(On request of Mr. YATES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. REGULA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Guam has expressed his interest in having $300,000 of those funds allocated to establish a War Restitution Study Commission to verify claims from the people of Guam for the purpose of determining amounts of individual compensation for those who suffered atrocities. Is the gentleman aware of the gentleman from Guam's request?

Mr. REGULA. I am aware of the gentleman from Guam's request that funds be made available for this purpose, and I believe that once such a commission is authorized, consideration should be given to providing funds to meet this need, along with consideration of other territorial needs.

□ 1530

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with him. I thank him for entering into this colloquy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), $596,425,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,062,000 shall be available for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150); and of which $3,000,000 shall be derived from the special receipt account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)); and of which $1,500,000 shall be available in fiscal year 1999 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to such Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; in addition, $32,650,000 for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program, to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than $596,425,000, and $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities: *Provided*, That appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burrows in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKAGGS:

Page 2, line 13, insert "(decreased by $1,000,000)" after "$596,425,000".

Page 3, line 6, insert "(decreased by $1,000,000)" after "$596,425,000".

Page 69, line 15, insert "(decreased by $500,000)" after "$320,558,000".

Page 70, line 17, insert "(decreased by $3,000,000)" after "$630,250,000".

Page 70, line 22, insert "(increased by $20,000,000)" after "$150,000,000".

Page 71, line 4, insert "(increased by $16,000,000)" after "$120,000,000".

Page 71, line 5, insert "(increased by $4,000,000)" after "$30,000,000".

Mr. SKAGGS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is sponsored by me and my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX). It will remedy, I believe, one of the major imbalances in this otherwise pretty good bill, producing savings in energy and money and, in the process, providing some real benefits to the environment.

The amendment that we are offering would shift funds from elsewhere in the bill to add $40 million to the energy conservation and efficiency accounts. That includes a $16 million increase for weatherization, $4 million for State energy grants, another $10 million for building technology programs, and increases of $5 million each for the industry and transportation energy conservation programs in the bill.

These are investments we need to make as a country, because the track record that has already been established shows that they pay off many, many times over. The President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, for instance, has estimated that past investments in these areas have produced improvements in efficiency that are already saving

American consumers $170 billion a year. Even if they have exaggerated this by 50 percent, which I do not believe they have, this is clearly a great return on investment.

It is also not just about money. The companies that, for instance, make home appliances, report that new appliances benefited by the kind of R&D that these programs support use significantly less energy than older ones, 50 percent less for refrigerators, for example. A 1995 study by the Department of Energy shows that well over three quads, that is, I believe, three quadrillion Btu's of energy, can be saved if the department and industry can continue to work in this area to replace old appliances with efficient new ones.

Similarly, experts at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory estimate we can save another 10 quads of energy by the year 2020 if we will accelerate, as these programs will do, if we can accelerate the use of advanced energy efficient building, heating, lighting, and related technologies in new housing and other construction in this country, all of which can be done without increasing building costs.

Transportation is another area where increased efficiency pays off, even when, as now, oil prices remain low. Transportation accounts for fully two-thirds of this country's oil consumption. The Department of Energy and industry are working to reduce this by a million barrels a day which will, in turn, greatly aid in our efforts to bring down air pollution.

There are also immediate payoffs for the weatherization and State grants programs. The Oak Ridge National Labs reports that in 1996 weatherization meant a savings of 33 percent in the gas used to heat weatherized homes while, overall, that program and State energy programs have a favorable cost benefit ratio of about two to one.

We really need to maintain momentum in these areas. That is why, while I regret that I need to suggest to the Members that we have offsets in some other accounts, this will really move the country ahead in dealing with these pressing needs for energy conservation.

The offsets that are included in this amendment include a million dollars from BLM's Wild Horse and Bureau Program and from two of DOE's programs, Oil Technology and Advanced Turbine Research, both of which, I think, do not produce the kind of returns on investment that we have enjoyed in the efficiency and conservation areas. They are not bad programs, but I think it will serve us well to give them somewhat less emphasis while we beef up in these other conservation areas.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me just point out to my colleagues, that, while the bill now nominally funds these programs at about $630 million, a big piece of that really is an accounting change from last year's approach. An apples to apples comparison would be $586 million, down significantly from this fiscal year.

By comparison, if we were really just keeping on the course that we were on as recently as 1995, adjusted for inflation, we would be spending about $860 million this coming fiscal year on these programs. I think that would have been a wise investment. But at least let us keep making the progress that this amendment will enable us to make. I urge my colleagues' support for it.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) in offering the Skaggs-Fox energy conservation amendment. I have been a strenuous supporter of funding, as many of my colleagues have, for the Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Conservation Program funded through the Department of Energy accounts in the Interior Appropriations bill. These programs go to the heart, Mr. Chairman, of the Federal Government's cooperation and community based solution to the needs of the people.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for working with me on this amendment in supporting increased funding for these important programs. I also want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and his excellent staff for their work on this very difficult appropriations bill.

I am concerned that, under the bill, energy efficiency programs at the Department of Energy will be reduced by $25 million below fiscal year 1998 levels and approximately $200 million under the budget request.

We urge the support of the House for a reallocation of funding within the bill in order to better serve our Nation's energy, economic, environmental, and security needs. This is the most important vote in favor of energy efficiency during the past 5 years, and we need Members' help.

The bipartisan amendment will add about $16 million for the Low-Income Weatherization Program, which helps over 60,000 low-income, elderly and disabled citizens weatherize their homes each year, in both cold and hot climates.

We propose to add back $4 million to the State Energy Program, which produces enormous energy savings for schools, hospitals, and other partners with State government and the private sector. We propose to add another $20 million to energy conservation programs in transportation, buildings, and industry. Major innovations in lighting, windows, building design, industrial energy efficiency, and automotive technology can be traced to these programs. A recent study estimated that these types of programs save our economy over $170 billion per year.

The proposed cuts will actually hurt real people and will hurt our Nation's important environmental, economic, and energy security goals. Weatherization helps low-income Americans through the installation of insulation and otherwise improving the energy efficiency of homes. On average, these improvements can save poor households over $200 a year in energy costs. That can make a huge difference in each family.

The State Energy Program provides leveraging of funds to conduct energy improvements in schools and hospitals so that more money can go into education and health care. This program reaches into small business and homes to reduce energy costs and apply innovative technologies to solve our energy challenges.

Our amendment is supported by a broad coalition, Mr. Chairman, of low-income advocates, business groups, and energy and environmental groups, including the National Association of State Energy Officials, the National Community Action Foundation, the National Association of State Community Services Programs, the National Association of State and Utility Consumer Advocates, the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, the Alliance to Save Energy, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the Substantial Energy Coalition, the Sierra club, and the list goes on.

I urge my colleagues to support the Skaggs-Fox amendment and place a higher priority on people, our environment, and our national energy strategy.

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

Mr. Chairman, once again, this Congress has failed to adequately support energy efficiency programs that work for the American people. This is a failure born of shortsightedness and is particularly troublesome given the challenges our Nation confronts in the next century. With regions around the world competing to develop the most efficient economies possible, we are holding ourselves back in this race by declining to support energy conservation.

The Department of Energy's renewable energy and efficiency programs have been extremely successful. These programs have saved American consumers billions, and I underscore the word billions, of dollars in utility bills. They have made housing more affordable for low and moderate income families, and these vital programs have helped communities nationwide reduce air pollution levels that burden local industry and threaten public health.

The evidence is clear, energy efficiency is a wise investment, an investment with substantial return for consumers, business and the environment.

Every dollar cut from energy efficiency programs represents a lost opportunity to make our buildings and motor vehicles more efficient and less costly for manufacturers and owners. These cuts in energy funding take dollars directly out of the pockets of our constituents.

I believe that the American people want government that works. They want a government that saves money and improves our quality of life. The amendment before us will restore adequate funding for programs that achieve these important goals.

Mr. Chairman, a wise man once said that those who fail to see the forest through the trees are doomed to get lost in the woods. We are lost indeed. I ask all my colleagues to support the Skaggs-Fox amendment so that we may find a way to a cleaner environment and a stronger economy.

I ask simply that we look at the heat waves that are affecting our cities across this Nation, how it is we are handing out simple fans to people and how many senior citizens are suffering because of lack of energy efficiency to the point where they will not put on their air conditioning system because the energy costs are so hard for them to burden. That is but one example across our Nation. From Massachusetts to Illinois to California to Texas and Florida, energy efficiency is important if we are going to deal with global change.

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

Mr. Chairman, this committee over the last number of years has already reduced the fossil energy funding by 30 percent over the last 3 years. Over the same period, we have increased conservation funding by 14 percent.

I represent an area which has extreme coal reserves. We had 10 years ago 12,000 coal miners. We have today 2,500 coal miners. They do not work in eastern Pennsylvania. They work in western Pennsylvania.

We have done everything we could to increase the efficiency of burning coal. We have 600 years of coal deposits so we are trying to find ways to use this energy resource. We right now are more dependent on foreign oil than we were in 1974 when I came to Congress.

We actually had long lines. We had to line up at a gas station to get gas in part of the time when I first came to Congress because of the shortage. Gasoline prices were over $2.00, and at the time the Saudis told us, you had better increase your fossil fuel research, do it more efficiently or you are not going to have the reserves, you are not going to burn coal efficiently and consequently you are going to depend on us more and more.

We started a program. Because we could not work fast enough, we were not as efficient as quickly as we would like, we have not been able to accomplish our goal. On the other hand, we have come up with what we feel is reasonable funding over a long period of time so that when this oil from overseas dries up, we will have the reserves and the efficient energy from coal that we need.

If we have further cuts in fossil energy, it will result in increased emissions and increased energy consumption due to continued reliance on outdated technology.

We have done a marvelous job over the years in reducing emissions. In the area I represent, in all of western Pennsylvania, as a matter of fact, you had big globs of coal dust and steel deposits, iron ore deposits on the automobiles at one time. We have cleaned all that up. Ninety-eight percent of what goes in the air has been cleaned up substantially, and this has come about because of the research that we have done.

This would be a drastic blow to the areas that are doing research on fossil energy if we were to cut the money from this area to increase conservation.

So I would ask the Members to consider very carefully that we have these massive deposits of coal which we need to increase the efficiency and effectiveness, and the only way we can do it is by fossil fuel research. We want to continue that program. I would hope we would defeat this amendment.

□ 1545

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

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make clear that the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX) and I are proposing does not touch the $113 that is in the bill for coal. It deals with oil recovery research and the gas turbine program, a big piece of which was once managed by Westinghouse, which I think now has been sold off to a foreign company, Siemens. So we are trying to look for the most bang for the buck and are not going after the coal account.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. Even though that company was sold off with less than 50 percent to Siemens, it will still be run by an American company. Of course, that research ties in. We are continually trying to work with fossil fuel, oil research and so forth to increase the efficiency of these resources in the United States. So that is the reason I am so concerned about cutting fossil research.

Mr. SKAGGS. If the gentleman would yield further, I do not think we are in disagreement at all about the goal. I believe it can be demonstrated that the kind of payback we get, already demonstrated by technology in use in the economy, has really made a much greater contribution toward oil independence, for instance, than is likely to come from the other programs that we are cutting.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I know the gentleman may think that, but we are over 50 percent dependent today. Then we were 34 percent dependent. So it is all relative, in how dependent we are.

In the short term the gentleman may be right. But, long-term, we could have a breakthrough with one of these research projects and reduce the emissions and increase the efficiency substantially. So we think this is a counterproductive amendment, and we would hope Members would vote against it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Fox-Skaggs amendment. The committee's recommendation for energy conservation is over $630 million. This is an increase of 14 percent above the 1996 level. By comparison, the other Department of Energy programs in the bill, fossil energy research, Strategic Petroleum Reserve operations and the Naval Petroleum Reserve operations have been decreased by 34 percent since 1996.

The General Accounting Office has been monitoring the use of funds in the Energy Conservation Program and reports that there is more than $265 million in funding appropriated in prior years for energy conservation programs that is yet to be spent by DOE. That is on top of the $630 million recommended by the committee for fiscal year 1999.

I know there are those who say that fossil energy research is bad, but energy conservation and energy efficiency research is good. Let me remind my colleagues that traditional fossil fuels will continue to account for the vast majority of our energy needs for the foreseeable future. Improved technology for extracting and using fossil fuels will do more to improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions than most of the programs funded under the energy conservation account.

The advanced turbine system program has great potential for improving efficiency and lowering emissions. The portion of this program that has traditionally been funded in the energy conservation account receives great support; however, the portion traditionally funded in the fossil energy account does not. That just does not make sense.

Again, we have that old false argument: fossil is bad, conservation is good. The fossil energy research program, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve operation and the Naval Petroleum Reserve operation have all tightened their belts. They are focused; they have

streamlined their operations and substantially reduced their appropriations requirements over the past 3 years.

On the other hand, the energy conservationists have displayed an attitude that "we want to continue to do everything we have done in the past, and any new programs that require more funding." That attitude is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has done the responsible job of providing funding for energy conservation programs. The proposed offsets to increase energy conservation funding are totally unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, when I was a kid, my mother always told me to work smarter, not harder. For the largest part of the 20th Century, the United States has worked harder, not smarter. We have fought making automobiles more efficient, we have fought making homes more efficient, we have fought making industry more efficient because we felt we lived in a world of inexhaustible energy.

We also believed simultaneously that this fossil fuel or nuclear fuel which we were consuming would have no impact upon the environment. Well, it turns out that there is a negative impact on both the economy and upon the environment if we use fuels that are not as efficient, not as smart, as those that are the best available.

But what has happened over the years is that the energy conservation strategy, one which over the last 20 years since the first oil shock has proven to be very effective as a mechanism for having us rethink our relationship with energy, still is battled by the forces of old energy, shall we call it, and that old energy is so powerful that notwithstanding their dominant role in the provision of energy in our country and around the world, they still believe that they should be beneficiaries of handouts inside of the Federal budget.

Now, what the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is offering this afternoon is a very modest amendment, one which will adjust the Federal budget in terms of our priorities so that the energy conservation, the "working smarter, not harder" strategy which does not get the rest of the subsidies, the rest of the benefits that the other more powerful energy industries in America receive, move just a little bit of this money, just a very small amount of the money over into this agenda. This is ultimately the way in which, it seems to me, we should be wanting to deal with Kyoto, that we should be wanting to deal with this global warming issue.

Mr. Chairman, the CO_2 that is emitted up into the atmosphere is a relatively small percentage, yes, of the overall atmospheric gasses, but because it creates a cover over our sky, it creates a greenhouse effect, as the earth's warming sends up these rays which then are reflected back down.

Now, how long do we want to go? How many weather forecasts are we going to have to see before we begin actually investing in an alternative strategy; not displacing the old strategy, but having a better and more sensible mix for the 21st Century?

That is what the Skaggs amendment is all about. It is moving our energy agenda to the 21st Century, so that we have the proper strategy to deal with these environmental issues, and, ultimately, economic issues which will face our country.

So I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for his amendment, and I hope that it is adopted by all the Members here today. There could be no more important amendment. In fact, if the President was ever going to veto a bill, I would hope it would be over an issue like this, because it is so directly related to the future of our relationship between energy and the environment.

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

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support for the amendment. I know the gentleman is extending his remarks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX) as well.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure Members understood, I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts does, that these accounts in this bill this year have been cut by about $24 million under fiscal year 1998, and that is a very important fact to keep in mind.

There was some reference to the fact that we had increased funding here. We have not. The bill proposes to cut it by $24 million. The amendment we are offering would make that up plus a little bit more, but it is not as if it is anything more, as the gentleman pointed out, than a modest change.

Finally, I am sure the gentleman's mother instructed him as well that the cheapest energy is the energy you save, which is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. When we pass legislation out here mandating better appliance standards, after all, what is a utility? What is a coal or oil or nuclear power plant? All it is is the combined demand of refrigerators and stoves and toasters. If we make them more efficient, we reduce the need for us to have to pollute the atmosphere for the children of the next generation. Support the Skaggs amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that we get the facts out. The committee has heard all of this and we made a balanced judgment. We already have $265 million in that account for efficiency from prior years that is unspent. You add that to the fact that in our bill efficiency gets twice as much as fossil research. With the $265 million that is unspent, energy efficiency would have three times as much as fossil.

We need balance. Obviously the committee does not quarrel with efficiency, or we would not have given double the amount of money to efficiency that we gave to fossil. But, on the other hand, we want to have some security.

We are spending $200 million a year on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the oil that is there. Why? To be secure from oil shortfalls from the Middle East. We fought a war called Desert Storm. Do you think we would have been there had there not been oil under the desert? No way.

So there are a lot of factors that have to be considered. Obviously efficiency is important, but security is also important.

I am struck by the fact that for every barrel of oil we take out, we leave two in the ground. Now, with research on fossil energy, we will improve that record. If we could just get two barrels out for every barrel we leave in the ground, we would have a lot more oil, and we would be a lot less dependent on foreign sources for petroleum.

It is a matter of balance. Efficiency is great, but I likewise say fossil research is great. Some of the money that would be in the Skaggs amendment and the Fox amendment would go to the big three auto makers. Do you think they need to have additional money to do research so they can make their vehicles more efficient? We found out that simply by mandating the miles per gallon, that we are getting the efficiency and competition from around the world that has brought that about. They do not need to have additional subsidies.

Where does this money come from? For those of you that are concerned about the environment, it comes out of the Bureau of Land Management's Wild Horse and Burro Program. That program has enough problems without reducing their funding. Instead of taking money out of that, we ought to see how we can better manage the BLM wild horse program. It takes money out of the turbine program. Why are we spending money on turbine research? So we can use our fossil energy sources more efficiently.

Anyone will tell you we are going to be dependent on coal, we are going to be dependent on petroleum, we are

going to be dependent on the fossil sources. So let us concentrate on not only efficiency, but how to make fossil energy more efficient, in getting it out of the ground and making it available.

The turbine program is very effective, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has pointed out. The other programs in fossil I think are giving us a better handle on resources.

When you look down the road with a growing economy and a growing population, the need for fossil resources will be much larger, and if we do not put money in fossil research, we are going to become more and more dependent on other nations, other sources, for our security, because petroleum is essential to every facet of life.

Therefore, I think it would be very unwise as national policy to not just double efficiency, but because of the $265 million in unspent funds, we would triple it.

□ 1600

I think it ought to be 50–50, frankly. Fifty percent on efficiency, 50 percent on fossil, and perhaps we should have an amendment that takes some out of energy efficiency and puts it in fossil.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to strike a reasonable balance in the committee, and the Members endorsed this policy as we have it today. I urge the Members to vote "no" on this amendment. Vote for security in terms of our access to petroleum domestically, our access to the more efficient way to use our coal resources, and at the same time recognize that we have a balance in terms of efficiency.

I think the bill is a common sense, responsible approach, and I urge Members to vote "no" on the Skaggs-Fox amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not originally intended to speak on this amendment because it involves dear friends on both sides of the issue. But I had intended to speak on the importance of the fossil energy R&D programs which, in the Committee on Science, which I have the privilege of serving on, we have consistently tried to support over the years. We have recognized the value of increased efficiency brought about by research on fossil energy.

I am also one of the greatest exponents of energy conservation R&D because I understand the importance of saving energy.

So what we have here is a situation which requires balance. Now, on balance, I am inclined to support the position taken by the chairman of the committee. I would point out that what he has had to do in the House is to take a substantially smaller allocation than in the Senate and make that allocation cover in some reasonable way a number of accounts which have to be covered. Now, obviously, his decision is somewhat short of absolute perfection, but I am not sure that we have the wisdom in this body to achieve absolute perfection.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) said, that the allocation for fossil energy R&D only represents half as much as the allocation for energy conservation, and it may not be wise to take even more from fossil energy R&D in order to increase some of these very valuable energy conservation R&D programs.

I would suggest that we focus on an end-game strategy whereby in conference with the Senate we may be able to reach agreement on some slight increases in both of these accounts. It will not be a great deal, I am sure, but we are about $75 million under what the Senate has appropriated in these 2 areas. I think that the Chairman might be able to figure some way to squeeze an extra few million into these accounts as the bill comes out of the conference so we can come a little bit closer to the Senate figures. This is what I am going to urge and I think it is a reasonable approach.

I would be very concerned if I had to make a judgment between how to divide scarce dollars between these two accounts, because both of them are very important to me. We have had to face a situation where the committee has recommended considerably less than the President has recommended for both of these accounts. If I had my way, I would accept what the President recommends on both of these accounts. However, I am unlikely to have my way.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have enormous respect for the gentleman's analytic insights in all of this and was privileged to serve on his committee for a few years, so I hesitate to challenge him in this respect.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman hesitates, but he will go ahead.

Mr. SKAGGS. But I will go ahead, Mr. Chairman.

I assume the gentleman does recognize that we are already getting huge payoffs, real money, real energy saved presently from the conservation and efficiency efforts, whereas the prospects for eventual savings down the road for some of these other programs in the fossil area are just that. We believe they will produce these results, but they really do not have anything like the track record on energy saved presently that we are able to get from these dollars going into conservation.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's point of view on this, and I would not quarrel with it, but I would point out that there are other factors here. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), in his usual eloquent way, pointed out that we have a situation here where energy conservation is being battled by the forces of old energy, old energy being of course fossil energy. Well, being sort of old myself, I think I tend to come down on the side of the forces of old energy. There are some old people working in these old energy fields that need jobs.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, there is a matter of the social dislocation caused by the impact of what we are spending here, and I recognize that, as I think all of us should recognize, that in the long run, fossil energy is what we may have to depend upon when all of the more esoteric forms of energy have contributed as much as they can to our economy.

Coal, as a practical matter of fact, is still the largest source of energy that we have in this country or in the world, and we might as well learn to get the absolute, most effective use of that coal in the long run without neglecting of course the importance of saving energy, which I cannot quarrel with.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, our amendment does not touch coal.

Mr. BROWN of California. I accept that. Now let us get together and fight to get a little bit more money for these accounts when we go to conference with the Senate, and I trust the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) will be a conferee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do so to express in the strongest possible terms support for the Fox-Skaggs amendment which will restore needed funds for energy conservation programs, including low-income weatherization. That is very important, if one comes from the northeast part of the United States. Even with these added funds, the programs will still be funded at significantly lower levels than they were 4 years ago.

Now, I know it is not easy to be in the position of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), as the chairman, to deal with all of the competing requests. I think he has done a magnificent job overall, but I think the bill needs a little tweaking and I would think that he would not mind a little tweaking.

These programs are needed now more than ever before. We are actually more

dependent today in 1998 on foreign oil than we were at the time of the Arab oil embargo, and we know even more how burning fossil fuels can harm the environment. That is a serious consideration, and we are in a more competitive economic environment, which makes efficiency of the essence.

These conservation programs take a sensible approach to addressing those needs. They do not mandate any actions; they underwrite efforts that create new methods to save energy, help get those methods put into practice, and particularly important, help poor Americans take advantage of these methods.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do what they have done in the past and restore funding for these important programs. Let me commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), particularly. He has been a real leader in this effort since he first came to the Congress, and I think emphasizing programs that try to demonstrate that government is compassionate and can appreciate the problems of those who are in special circumstances is very important, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), has done that. I think it is also very important to encourage the type of research into energy conservation that we are calling for here.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman agree, though, that if we spend 3 dollars on conservation efficiency, for every 1 dollar we spend on fossil research, that that is a pretty hefty balance in favor of efficiency. They have to go together, because the boilers, for example, will allow us to burn coal, get more Btus out of a lump of coal, and it gives us more security rather than depending on imports. We are faced with 60 percent of our petroleum coming from offshore here in the very near future, and we do not want that to happen.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, that is a cause for real concern, and as my dear friend and colleague knows, I have been a supporter of the clean coal technology program that some of my friends who probably were labeled green are somewhat offended by that, and I never could quite understand the logic.

But let me say in terms of this amendment, this bill here today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), have done an outstanding job. They deserve our support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. However well-intentioned, the gentlemen's turbine research offset is unfortunate.

In 1992, the Federal Government entered into a commitment with the Nation's gas turbine developers to develop a new generation of turbine. It would break through the temperature barriers that limit today's turbines; it would be more efficient, it would be more economical, and it would be much cleaner, so clean that it could be placed in the most environmentally constrained regions of the country.

Together, government and industry took the risk, and it is about to yield terrific results. The United States is on the verge of having turbine technology that no competitor can touch. In the coming year, the first prototypes will be assembled. In the year 2000 they will be tested, fulfilling the government's 1992 commitment. By 2001, the United States will be building and using a turbine that will be superior to any other in the world. Once that is done, our Nation will have a large share of what is expected to be a huge and growing market for advanced turbine technologies.

As the program has progressed, the developers who moved forward have been expected to pick up larger and larger shares of the costs. As the concepts have matured, industry's cost-sharing has exceeded 60 percent. Although industry now provides the major funding, our government's commitment must be honored.

If Congress withdraws its support, U.S. leadership in this field will be jeopardized. It is possible the program can be completed without government backing, but no one knows how long that would take, and we would run the risk of having this program caught up, passed up by foreign competition.

But if we honor our commitment, when the program is completed, we will have the best turbine in the market. Government support is still a critical part of this program. It is still a part of our commitment of 1992, and therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Skaggs amendment on energy efficiency and conservation programs.

I appreciate the difficulty in balancing the critical needs of our country in preparing the Interior Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999. However, today I rise in strong support of the Skaggs amendment to restore much needed funding for our country's energy conservation programs. Of particular interest to my home state of Florida is the recommended $10 million increase in funding for building technologies.

The windows and glazing programs, which is funded through the Building Technology Category, provides funding for a promising new technology with enormous energy saving potential for the commercial windows market. I am hopeful that the Skaggs amendment will lead to a funding increase in the windows and glazing programs, which would allow the further development of plasma enhanced chemical vapor deposition (PECVD) techniques for electrochromic technologies. This technology provides a flexible means of controlling the amount of heat and light that pass through a glass surface providing significant energy conservation opportunities. The Department of Energy estimates that placing this technology on all commercial building windows in the United States would produce yearly energy savings equivalent of the amount of oil that passes through the Alaskan pipeline each year.

In recognition of the importance of this technology, the State of Florida has provided over $1.2 million toward the advancement of PECVD techniques for electrochromic applications. The program is being undertaken in conjunction with the University of South Florida and utilizes the expertise and patented technology of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado. The State of Florida's program has made significant progress toward making electrochromic windows a reality. This program is an excellent example of successful technology transfer from a national laboratory as well as an example of a successful public/private partnership.

The Florida program is consistent with industry priorities and goals of the Department of Energy's windows program. Earlier this year, twelve other members of the Florida Congressional Delegation joined me in sending a letter to Chairman REGULA and Ranking Member YATES in support of PECVD funding to help further the development of this important technology. A significant portion of our country is experiencing the hottest summer on record. I believe this only helps illustrate the importance of our conservation programs.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SKAGGS for his commitment to energy conservation in his years in this House, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Skaggs amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS).

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) will be postponed.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, today I intended to offer an amendment to provide funding to prevent the spread of a serious threat to our Nation's urban ecology. Action to stem the incursion of these pests is required immediately if we are to control and isolate this ecological hazard.

Humans are not directly threatened by this insect; nevertheless, the flora that makes our communities livable and aesthetically pleasing places to inhabit is imperiled.

The Asian Longhorn is a tree killer. The beetle prefers to gestate in the leafy, deciduous trees that line roads and avenues in urban and suburban neighborhoods. In killing our trees, the beetles implant their larvae in the bark of healthy trees. The larvae feeds off the tree's wood to grow, eventually felling their hosts, and then moving on to repeat this devastating cycle elsewhere.

The ability of this insect to multiply and spread rapidly throughout our entire region is what makes the prompt action of our government, in conjunction with local authorities, so necessary. Currently, a 12-block area on Chicago's north side has been infected with the Asian Longhorn. Local ecologists fear that the zone of infestation may be larger than this area and are currently conducting expansive searches throughout the city to identify other infestations.

Dealing with this threat is no easy task. The remediation of this intruder requires a painful solution. The felling of inspected trees is the only proven means of preventing the spread of Asian Longhorn throughout America.

□ 1615

To date, there is no known usable pesticide to eradicate the beetles.

Sadly, infected trees will have to come down. In parts of New York City, the site of an early infestation last year, more than 1,000 trees were felled to prevent the beetle's spread. The Federal Government provided technical support and $500,000 in assistance to New York with replanting efforts in affected communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge us to do the same in Illinois. The amendment I intended to offer would have appropriated $1 million for beetle eradication and the replacing of trees in infected areas. I feel strongly that our potential spread of this foreign intruder and the danger it poses to our urban ecology warrant Federal assistance to avert ecological disaster.

Our memory of past ecological disasters should serve us well in rising to the challenges presented by the Asian Longhorn. As all baby boomers remember, our Nation's trees were visited by another alien pestilence in the 1960s. During that decade, Dutch Elm Disease killed hundreds of thousands of graceful elm trees in cities and towns throughout America. The quality of life was diminished. Property values declined.

Since that period, many urban areas have never recovered their forestry resources. We can ill afford another blight of this nature.

In Chicago, an aggressive tree planting program works to make the city green once again. The Asian Longhorn beetle threatens to derail our community's effort to make a beautiful, ecologically safe landscape.

Stopping this pest before it spreads and replacing the trees lost to accomplish this goal are enterprises worth funding by Congress. Future generations will thank us for our foresight.

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

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

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it was in the early 1960s, I think 1963 or 1964, that the United States was invaded by Beatles from abroad. It was a different kind of "beetle" back then. Now, we have beetles in the congressional district that I represent. Asian Longhorn beetles.

Mr. Chairman, let me echo some of the comments that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) just made. Last week, the Asian Longhorn beetles were found infecting a dozen blocks in the Ravenswood neighborhood in Chicago's North Side in my congressional district. City officials and scientists from the United States Department of Agriculture are still trying to determine the extent of the infestation.

This threat is very real. This beetle came to the United States in wooden packing crates from Asia. A few years ago the Asian Longhorn beetle turned up in New York. It killed thousands of trees and cost more than $4.3 million to kill them.

Experts tell us this invader could wreak the same kind of destruction in Chicago and, if allowed to spread, pose a threat to hardwood forests around the country.

Because this problem was just discovered, we did not have time to work with the subcommittee to find a way to address this issue. But we would appreciate any effort that the chairman could make as this bill goes to conference with the other body to find funding or a way to help the City of Chicago address this problem.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will not offer my amendment today, but instead will ask that the honorable gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, encourage the Forest Service to consider the situation in Chicago concerning the Asian Longhorn beetle infestation, and urge the Forest Service to devote necessary resources to eradicate the beetle and help the City of Chicago quickly replace the trees lost during this undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GUTIERREZ was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman from Illinois, I am very sympathetic because Ohio's elms have been devastated by the Dutch Elm disease, which is an infestation carried by beetles. The gentleman understands that limited resources are available to the Forest Service for this purpose. However, I recognize the threat posed by the Asian Longhorn beetle, and we will encourage the Forest Service to examine this situation, along with other similar problems, because one of the things that makes our cities beautiful are the trees.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation; and hazardous fuels reduction by the Department of the Interior, $286,895,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $6,950,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: *Provided*, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the "Fire Protection" and "Emergency Department of the Interior Firefighting Fund" may be transferred and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a Bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., Protection of United States Property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended without further appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums recovered from or paid by any party are not limited to monetary payments and may include stocks, bonds or other personal or real property, which may be retained, liquidated, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary and which shall be credited to this account.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, $6,975,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901–6907), $120,000,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than $100.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 Offered by Mr. SANDERS:

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $20,000,000)".

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $50,000,000)".

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this tripartisan amendment is also supported by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), and does two important things that I believe most Members of this body agree with.

First, it deals with a very serious problem of underfunded mandates, of forcing citizens in close to 1,800 counties in 49 States to pay more in local property taxes than they should be paying because the Federal Government has fallen very far behind in its payment in lieu of taxes on federally owned land.

In my own State of Vermont, over 50 towns in our southern counties are affected, including Bennington, Rutland, Addison, Windham, and Windsor Counties. This amendment addresses the overall problem of underfunded payments in lieu of taxes by increasing funding for this program by $20 million, from $120 to $140 million.

Mr. Chairman, in real dollars, PILT payments to counties and towns all across this Nation have been decreasing for a very long time. In real dollars since 1980, appropriations for payment in lieu of taxes have decreased by nearly $60 million, a one-third decline. And while this amendment will not rectify by any means the entire problem, it will at least allow communities around this country to know that we understand their problem and that we are making some real attempts to address it by appropriating an additional $20 million.

Mr. Chairman, I should add that the authorization level for PILT today is approximately $257 million, over twice the appropriation level. In other words, the authorizers understand the problems facing the communities, but unfortunately in recent years the appropriation process has not followed suit.

Mr. Chairman, the PILT program was established to address the fact that the Federal Government does not pay taxes on the land that it owns. These Federal lands can include National Forests, National Parks, Fish and Wildlife Refuges, and land owned by the Bureau of Land Management.

Like local property taxes, PILT payments are used to pay for school budgets, law enforcement, search and rescue, fire fighting, parks and recreation, and other municipal expenses.

Mr. Chairman, this is the important point that I think has to be made. There has been a lot of talk in this body in recent years about fiscal responsibility and about devolution, respect for counties, towns, and cities; saying we are the Federal Government, we have all the power, but you have got to respect the other agencies of government throughout America.

If we are serious about these concepts, then it is time for Congress to pay its bills. That is what this issue is about. The U.S. Government owns property and we should begin making the payments in lieu of taxes that we are supposed to.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would begin to address the unfunded mandate by increasing the payments in lieu of taxes program to approximately where it was 10 years ago. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, the $50 million that we are using for these purposes, the purposes include $20 million for payment in lieu of taxes, $30 million for deficit reduction. Over a $5 trillion national debt; this amendment begins to address that issue. The funds would be transferred and offset from the Fossil Energy Research and Development Program.

In this regard, let me quote from the report of the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution, the Republican resolution. And this is what that resolution says:

"The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars on research and development since the oil crisis in 1973 triggered this activity. Returns on this investment have not been cost-effective, particularly for applied research and development which industry has ample incentive to undertake. Some of this activity is simply corporate welfare for the oil, gas, and utility industries. Much of it duplicates what industry is already doing. Some has gone to fund technology in which the market has no interest."

That is the Republican budget resolution, not BERNIE SANDERS.

I should mention, Mr. Chairman, that over the years we have put $15 billion into fossil energy programs. That is a lot of money.

Let me conclude by saying this. This amendment is endorsed by the National Association of Counties, by the Taxpayers for Common Sense, by Friends of the Earth, by Rural Public Lands Council, by the Sierra Club, by USPERG and Public Citizens.

This amendment is good environmental policy and it is good public policy in the sense that it tells communities all over America that we are going to pay our bills.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to help accomplish what I believe is long overdue, to begin addressing an inequity to the taxpayers in over 1,700 counties whose homes are located near lands owned by the Federal Government.

In fiscal year 1998 my home State of Kentucky is anticipating an estimated decrease of $62,000 in PILT funding to eligible county governments. While I do not doubt the benefits of continued investments in fossil fuel developments, I remind my colleagues that we are looking at an authorized program that is only funded at an estimated level of 46 percent.

In my own district, it is difficult to justify to the good citizen of Edmonson County, the home of Mammoth Cave National Park, that it must accept a decrease in PILT funds while the Congress continues to fund $320 million to research activities and programs that ought to be borne mostly by the private sector.

The fact is PILT funding is critically important to county governments that must rely on these annual payments to provide many basic services to their citizens, from education to solid waste management.

These services, by the way, often benefit the Federal lands and facilities. In fact, Edmonson County today is providing a costly 24-hour ambulance service for the National Park Service, as well as its own residents.

Unfortunately, Edmonson County was one of 56 counties in my State of Kentucky that experienced a decrease in PILT payments in 1997. With an annual budget of $629,000, a cut of $3,000 translates into either reduced public services or higher local taxes. In a county with a per capita income of less than $7,200, the importance of PILT funds cannot be overestimated.

These dollars are stretched to help pay county employees' salaries, administrative expenses, and the modest salaries paid to the local magistrates. At a time when Congress is encouraging State and local governments to accept more responsibility, an increase of PILT payments becomes more essential to help provide public services and much-needed relief to local taxpayers in Edmonson County and the thousands of other counties in which Federal lands are located.

However, let me assure my colleagues that the case of Edmonson County is not a unique situation. Without the increased funding proposed in the Sanders amendment, hundreds of county governments will again be shortchanged by the Federal Government. In the current fiscal year, an estimated 190 counties will have to absorb cuts in PILT funding greater than $100. Even worse, 11 States will see reductions of $1,000 or more.

I want to remind my colleagues that the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act calls on the Federal Government to compensate local governments to offset losses in property taxes due to Federal ownership of lands within their boundaries. The 105th Congress now has the opportunity to finally honor that commitment and to help reduce our deficit. A vote for the Sanders amendment is a vote for taxpayer fairness.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because of the merits of the proposal put forth by the sponsors but because of the offsets that they are proposing.

They are proposing $50 million in reductions in the Fossil Fuel Research and Development Program. I say, Mr. Chairman, we in this country are dependent upon research and development in our fossil fuel program. We have a tremendous problem in this country in that we are dependent upon foreign oil. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), highlighted that a few moments ago.

In the United States we purchase 6.8 billion barrels of oil per year. Half of that is imported. That situation is probably only going to get worse with the recent discovery of oil in the Caspian Sea. We should not be reducing research and development into our fossil fuel program; we should be increasing it.

We now have the technology to convert coal and waste coal into liquid fuels; however, that needs to be perfected. As was mentioned many times during the debate on the last amendment, we have between 300 and 500 million years of coal reserves right here in the United States. That is more in coal reserves than the rest world has in oil reserves. I ask my colleagues to think about that.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be dependent upon our coal reserves, we need to invest in research and development so we can perfect technologies that we already know and so we can be looking into the next century to find alternative uses for the huge coal deposits that we have in this country.

□ 1630

I am very proud to represent northeastern Pennsylvania, where we have the largest anthracite coal deposit in North America, arguably the largest deposit in the world. It is a high Btu, low sulfur fuel that we cannot continue to turn our backs on by reducing the investment in research and development in fossil fuels. Because, quite frankly, that is what we have been doing over the last several appropriation cycles.

So I encourage all my colleagues to reject this amendment, to continue to invest in our own natural resources so we can be prepared for the next century.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the gentleman from Minnesota, (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) for their hard work and diligence on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor I rise in strong support of this amendment, which would restore desperately needed funding for the PILT program. Each year thousands of counties across the Nation lose out on millions of dollars in property tax revenue simply because the Federal Government owns the property. In my district, the Federal Government owns large portions of the land. For example, approximately 70 percent of Gogebic County is in the Ottawa National Forest.

Since the Federal Government does not pay property taxes on its own land, the PILT program was established to compensate our counties for the land the Federal Government owns. Since its adoption in 1976, the PILT program has neither kept pace with its authorized funding level nor with the true cost of providing services in support of Federal lands. In fact, the PILT program is currently funded at less than half of its authorized level.

Rural counties rely on PILT payments to provide essential services, such as education, law enforcement, emergency fire and medical research, search and rescue, solid waste management, road maintenance, and other health and human services that need to be provided on Federal property. Without adequate funding for this program, rural counties will struggle to provide these vital services.

Mr. Chairman, if the Federal Government was required to pay taxes on the property it owns like any other individual or corporation, it would have been delinquent a long time ago for failure to pay taxes. The Federal Government has decided that it is in the best interest of this Nation to own and protect and to keep certain land. This does not mean that we must penalize our local communities because they have the fortune that the Federal Government has jurisdiction over these lands. It is irresponsible for the Federal Government to take these lands off the tax roles and then not justly compensate these local communities.

Mr. Chairman, this is only a small increase in the PILT program, but its impact and importance to rural counties is tremendous. In fact, Mr. Chairman, 49 of the 50 States receive PILT payments. I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for equity by voting in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, once again I wish to thank the gentleman from Vermont for his authorship of this amendment.

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

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to add one point.

The subsidies for fossil fuels are targeted in the Green Scissors 1998 report, which is supported by organizations representing more than 8.5 million environmentalists, taxpayers and deficit hawks. So this is a popular concept that we are addressing, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his strong support.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words to speak in support of the Sanders amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases payments in lieu of taxes funding for counties and schools by $20 million for fiscal year 1999. More than 20 years ago this Congress recognized a serious inequity that existed in areas containing a high percentage of Federal property. Because the Federal Government does not pay taxes on its own property, these areas were left without any source of funding to provide for local schools and county services.

In 1976, we attempted to correct this inequity and provided funding in the form of payments in lieu of taxes, or PILT payments. However, since providing these payments, this Congress has failed to fully fund the PILT program. Each year 1,789 communities in 49 States lose needed Federal payments due to the failure of the Federal Government to appropriately compensate these communities for lost property tax revenue on federally owned lands. The Sanders amendment corrects this shortcoming and provides an increase of necessary funding for communities in my own State of California.

To put this into perspective, many of the areas that will receive this funding were under water in January of 1997, when midwinter storms caused severe flooding. At that time the State of California suffered approximately $1.8 billion in damage. Each of the 10 counties in my district was declared a natural disaster area. The additional dollars in PILT payments are sorely needed to rebuild after the serious disaster.

There are other reasons, however, to support this amendment. This money goes directly to local schools and rural counties who can least afford any loss of funding. In one California county recent funding losses have forced a school district to completely cut out extracurricular activities, including sports and field trips, food service for one of its elementary schools, library services, two-thirds of its transportation services, all fine arts programs, teacher training courses, its school nurse program and all capital expenditures.

If these same cuts had been made in an urban and inner city area, lawsuits would have been filed and services leveled would have necessarily been restored.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot of discussion over the need for Medicare and the need to provide medical services for many of our elderly residents. Before any of our citizens can receive Medicare or Medicaid assistance, they first must have roads to travel on to get to the hospitals, ambulances to carry them in, when needed, and hospitals to go to. By underfunding our rural counties, we have forced these counties to cut back on these kinds of county services.

Other county services that have been cut include search and rescue, law enforcement, snow plowing, bridge maintenance and all local ground support for maintenance of Federal lands. If these county services were to go away, the Federal Government would not have an infrastructure in place to service its public lands. When visitors get lost on public lands, it is the county search and rescue that comes to their aid, and when visitors on public lands need police protection, that need is filled by county services.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Sanders amendment because it gives necessary assistance to counties otherwise left without a source of funding. I urge my colleagues to vote for public schools and county services by supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his support and for his eloquent remarks. I would just mention, Mr. Chairman, that in terms of the offset that we are talking about, fossil energy programs have received over $15 billion in 1995 dollars in Federal funding since 1974.

Maybe it is about time we pay attention to the counties and the small towns in California and Vermont.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

The gentleman from Vermont is attempting to increase funding for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program to reimburse localities for their lost tax revenue because of national parks, military installations and other Federal lands within their borders. This is an important issue, and the gentleman from Vermont and his colleagues raise some important arguments. I know that in my State of Pennsylvania there are some worthy local governments that are hoping to see a needed increase in their Payment in Lieu of Taxes. But I cannot support this amendment because of what is being cut in order to pay for this.

The fossil energy program at the Department of Energy is very important for the work it does to support cost-shared research and development to make the energy resources we use the cleanest and cheapest they can be. This program is not very well known, except maybe here in the House around July of every year when it seems to be the most convenient and popular offset for a number of other important programs that deserve funding. But the fossil energy research at the Department of Energy is fulfilling the vital function of protecting our energy security, increasing efficiency, and making our energy use cleaner.

Domestically, the simple fact is that U.S. resources, like oil, coal and natural gas, are the main sources we rely on. The Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration reports that 85 percent of our energy currently comes from fossil fuels. This figure will go up, not down, in the coming years. By 2015, 88 percent of the energy we consume will come from fossil fuels. Our national appetite for energy continues to grow and it is expected that by the year 2015 our energy needs will grow by almost 20 percent.

Internationally, in the new post-Cold War world, I think we all know what a wide range of uncertainties that the U.S. faces that have the potential to disrupt our energy imports. Fossil energy research helps make us make the most of our domestic energy resources as well as stretch to the maximum the fuels we do import. Here at home, fossil energy is the biggest thing we have going, so we ought to make the most of it.

Renewable fuel research, solar, wind, geothermal, nuclear, and a lot of other options make a lot of sense too, and I think we should do more work in those areas. But oil, natural gas and coal are what our domestic energy distribution is currently based on, and that fact is not going to change overnight no matter what advancements we make in using other energy sources.

The emerging renewables, solar, wind and geothermal, currently supply less than 1 percent of the energy needs in the United States. I have nothing against these alternative energy sources, and I think they can help diversify our Nation's energy mix, but under any realistic scenario they will only supply a small fraction of our energy needs for the next decades. On the other hand, our Nation is going to rely more and more on natural gas in the future. It is a clean burning fuel, and it can solve many of our energy and environmental problems.

But where are we going to get this gas and how much are we going to pay for it? We still need technological advancements to economically produce the trillions of cubic feet of natural gas located in difficult-to-access geological settings within our borders, and that is the work that fossil fuel research is doing.

There is also coal, our most abundant energy resource. I am sure most Americans do not realize that coal supplies 55 percent of our electricity. Increasingly stringent environmental regulations are making coal power generation and pollution control more expensive. Innovative, low-cost approaches to environmental controls are needed. The efficiency of power generation also needs to be improved to make sure we get every bit of available energy out of the coal we burn.

There is simply no way we can give up the use of our vast domestic coal deposits and yet still keep energy prices affordable and keep our economy competitive. That is also something that the fossil fuel research program is working on.

Finally, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont cuts $50 million from the fossil energy research to pay for only a $20 million increase in the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program. The remaining $30 million would go to deficit reduction. I would like to say that I think we all know there has been a lot of good work on this issue of cutting the deficit, and there is definitely a lot more work to do, but the way this amendment is structured, I am concerned that this may simply be a gratuitous swipe at this year's easy target, fossil energy research, depositing the $30 million in change for deficit reduction.

Fossil energy research offers tangible benefits to the American economy and does not deserve to be viewed in this light. Fossil energy research does not deserve this $50 million cut. Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

The splendid argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania misses the mark. We are not talking about fossil fuel research, we are talking about adequate funding and fair funding of payment in lieu of taxes, and our amendment on this matter in no way is a reflection adversely on the splendid work of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The gentleman from Ohio has done a splendid job balancing all these interests. We understand the extremely difficult job he has had to do, and we appreciate the consideration for payment in lieu. We are just trying to rearrange the chairs on the deck of Good Ship Regula here.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I think it is money instead of chairs.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Well, Mr. Chairman, the money in the bank of Good Ship Regula, then.

But I was not only an author, original coauthor of payment in lieu of taxes. When I was administrative assistant, my predecessor, John Blatnik, actually wrote the language that became in 1976 the payment in lieu of taxes legislation based on a very simple, elemental principle.

□ 1645

These lands: national forests, national wilderness areas, national parks, scenic waterways, are held in trust for all Americans to use and enjoy. But what about the neighbors to those wonderful national treasures, the neighbors, the communities, the people that live next to them who have to support the services provided for all those national treasures?

Take a look in my own district. Cook County is 82 percent in public ownership. Lake County is 92 percent in public ownership. St. Louis County, which is about the size of the State of Massachusetts, is 62 percent public ownership. That remaining small amount of land held in private hands has to provide the property taxes to support the services for all those 6-million-plus people who come from all over America to see these great national treasures.

We have debated on this floor many times the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in the Superior National Forest, land with water so pure that you can paddle along and drink the water right fresh from the rivers and the lakes, and they want it preserved for all Americans. That is terrific. But in order to do that, there are expensive landfills, there are expensive sanitation programs that St. Louis County and Lake County and Cook County all have to support that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars every year.

St. Louis County's budget has gone up $77 million since we enacted the Payment in Lieu of Taxes. That is a 30-percent increase, even with being very frugal. But Payment in Lieu of Taxes has not gone up at all for them.

And yet, when the fisherman with the fish hook caught in the eye from Iowa or Illinois who has gone up there to go fishing needs rescue, it is the St. Louis County, the Lake County and the Cook County sheriff's department and rescue department that are going to have to send the people out to haul those people out of the woods and save their lives. They have to be paid. Those services have to be paid for, and we are not keeping up with the cost.

St. Louis County has 3,000 miles of county roads to support the Superior National Forest and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and the Voyageurs National Park. They are not getting any increase in funds for those counties to provide the support services that are necessary. That is what this amendment is all about. It is not us against them. It is not Minnesota or Vermont against Pennsylvania. It is all of us together.

It is unfortunate we have had to deal with this account for coal research. But there has been, as has been said previously, billions of dollars in coal research, plenty of money for that and still plenty of money available for it.

What we are saying is, keep faith and trust with the people who live in these national treasures to whom we said, "We are going to help you keep pace."

The value of lands in St. Louis County in those areas that are held in national trust is 27 cents an acre, authorized funding under Payment in Lieu of Taxes. If those same lands were in timber production, as they well should be and could be, they would be valued at $2.59 an acre.

Counties certainly take care of all the road and rescue and fire and safety and other needs of the county to provide for all the services that would be necessary to support that activity. We are not saying return those lands to private commercial development. We are saying keep them in national trust, but also keep our trust with the people who are neighbors to those national lands and let them keep pace. Why should they have to continue to dig ever deeper in the property tax that stretches them too far?

This amendment restores a measure of fairness and equity to all those neighbors of these great national treasures.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Sanders amendment. The offset is not my first choice, but the issue of PILT is so important, I think, to rural America that I am supporting this amendment.

The only thing sure in life is death and taxes. That is for my colleagues and I. But for the Federal Government, for 2 decades I feel they have straight-armed, they have stiffed rural America, because they took lands into public ownership with a promise to pay and have never delivered in 20 years what is a fair Payment in Lieu of Tax payment. The Federal Government today continues to purchase private land and remove it from the tax rolls and continues not to pay its fair share of taxes or PILT.

What happens to my colleagues or I if we do not pay our taxes? Our property is sold, our taxes get paid. Maybe it is time for a Federal land tax sale to pay the debt that I think is owed to rural America. The Federal Government is the largest owner of land in America, where we are approaching 40 percent. We are the most delinquent taxpayer in the history of America.

The Sanders amendment is a small step in the right direction. It does not solve the problem. And the question is asked, what is the impact when land is taken out of the tax base? It is the following: It has been devastating to rural America. Zero economic growth. Zero job creation. No aid for roads, water, sewer, and public schools and local services. A devastating impact.

There are 1,789 counties involved, 49 states affected by this lack of Payment in Lieu of Taxes. Now, in Pennsylvania, where I come from, we pay $1.20 an acre. It was 60 cents in one of the last bills I helped get through. I had sponsored it for 6 or 8 years. I gave up sponsorship to get a House bill through the Senate, doubling it to $1.20.

Now, we own 840 million acres approximately. If we were paying $1.20, the bill would be in excess of a billion dollars.

Now, someone mentioned a few moments ago that this included military bases. That is not true, if my understanding is correct. There is impact aid which got a $40-million increase, a different budget or different part of the budget, different appropriations bill. But it is urban and suburban and it has been increased with some regularity and they get $640 million.

Now, as I look at it, when we remove property from the tax base of rural America, with no chance of economic growth, military bases bring jobs to the community, they bring stimulus to the community and the spin-off is tremendous, yet we are giving them $640 million. And that is a fairness issue.

For two decades we have underfunded PILT. In 1994, when PILT was reauthorized, Congress developed a 5-year phase-in to make up for the forgone revenues caused by 17 years of inflation and they raised the authorization to $255.5 million for this year. Despite those good intentions, we are still stuck at $120 million, which is inadequate for the communities that have been shortchanged. $135 million is needed just to bring us to level funding.

The Sanders amendment gives us a shot in the arm. I am from the East and I know this is a Western issue, but it affects Pennsylvania and it affects this country. Public land owners need to contribute to local services, and for those of us who continue to support more and more ownership of land by

the Federal Government, it is time to pay up.

Too often issues affecting rural America are overlooked and subsequently underfunded. I am here to say today, as a new Member of this Congress, it is no different than when I went to the State senate. Rural America has been getting the short end of the stick in a lot of ways, and this is just one of them, because they do not have the united voice of urban-suburban America.

It is time for the Government to pay up or turn back to the States or local governments this public land. And if we continue to not pay our share, maybe it is time for a tax sale, where we sell some of the Federal land to pay the tax base back to the local governments where it should be in the first place.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his perceptive remarks. He is right on the money, and I would again reiterate that since 1974 the Federal Government has put in over $15 billion in fossil energy research while we are shortchanging rural America.

According to the CBO, the beneficiaries of the Petroleum Research and Development program are some of the largest multinational corporations in the world, including Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips Petroleum, etc., shortchanging rural America, providing corporate welfare for large corporations that do not need it.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, does Allegheny National Forest get many visitors?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, yes, it gets visitors.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman would yield further, do the visitors spend a lot of money in the communities?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this would not affect the Allegheny National Forest. The PILT payments do not affect the Allegheny National Forest. They affect some other land in my district.

To the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), who I consider a good friend and an outstanding chairman, I think the PILT issue does not really affect the NF because they get timber payments. But it is so unfair, when we have taken all of this land out of the local tax base across this country. I am arguing for it for fairness for rural America.

I come from the most rural district east of the Mississippi, and I will be tough on rural issues. I just think somehow this Congress has to pay up at some point in time and pay what should go back to local communities.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, would he favor putting this public land on the market and getting it back in the private sector?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think there is public land owned in America, yes, that should go back. It would be better served in local communities' ownership, local, State government, yes.

I think the Federal Government should not own 40 percent of America. I think we own too much land, and we have been accumulating it for decades, and that is a policy that should change.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was not planning on coming here to speak on this, but I have to. Simply sitting back in my office and listening to this discussion, my feelings, and the time that I worked with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), my feelings for him are of great affection and normally I am on the same side. And in fact, as it comes to the Payment in Lieu of Taxes issue, my heart is with him.

However, when they come after the fossil research, we are in a situation right now, I happened to be in Kyoto last December, and everybody is jumping up and down and screaming to us that the sky is falling, that we have to come up with alternative methods and cleaner methods of providing energy.

I thought that the Skaggs amendment was interesting, because we were talking just previous to this about the comparison of conservation to doing clean fossil fuel technology. And the fact of the matter is, in conservation we can only do so much. It takes energy to run the world. It takes energy to run industry, to run our everyday lives. With conservation, we can do a lot but we can only do so much.

The question then is going to be where will this energy come from? Will it be from domestic production? We have got so much coal, and if we have the ability, the fact of the matter is, yes, we have spent a lot of money on fossil technology and we have not hit the home run yet, but we are getting closer and closer every day.

Just yesterday on the way down here I traveled through the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). I was down at Peach Bottom Nuclear Power Plant. And the fact of the matter is that even those who are proponents of nuclear energy say that they realize we are not going to build in our lifetime any more nuclear power plants. And right now we happen to have cheap oil. So at a time when 85 percent of the energy of this Nation is coming from fossil fuels, the question is where are we going to go?

And by the year 2015, as my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) and others have said, we predict it is going to be up to 80 percent of our fuel usage from fossil fuel. We are going to see more and more nuclear power plants come off line.

So if in fact global warming is a reality, how are we going to deal with this? How are we going to develop the kind of technology that is going to let this Nation be self-sufficient?

Everyone wants to go after the fossil fuel technology. That is what is running this country. And, yes, I come from the coal fields of southern Ohio. I come from the coal fields of southwestern Pennsylvania. I lived in those two States almost all of my life. My family were miners of coal. And it was their labors beneath the soil of this country that gave this energy, this cheap energy to this country that allowed the industrial revolution to move forward. It allowed us to have the kind of life-style that we enjoy and have the power that this great country has today, because they went under the earth to dig that coal. And now we want to say to them, forget about it. We have got a problem with Payment in Lieu of Taxes. Let us forget about the coal miners.

I am going to tell my colleagues what. When those capitalists in other parts of the world, like the Middle East, finally figure out how to get control of us, when they finally figure out how indeed they can hold us hostage like they did in the 1973 oil embargo, in the 1979 oil embargo, I sat in those lines, as many Members here did, waiting for fuel. We could get fuel on odd days if we happened to have an odd number, in even days if we happened to have an even number. We forgot about that because the price of oil has gone down.

□ 1700

But now we are going to attack the fossil fuels in order to solve a problem that has nothing at all to do with the fossil fuels.

If in fact we are worried about global warming, if we are worried about having a certain style of life for our children and their children's children, we have to continue to invest in this technology. For the foreseeable future, we are dependent upon these fossil fuels. There is no way around it.

I wish that my friends, who have a very valid point on payment in lieu of taxes, would have come up with a different offset. I would like to be able to

support them. But what they are doing, I think, in my estimation is wrongheaded, and I would urge the Members of this House to soundly reject my friends' amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we get the facts out. I understand the concern of my colleagues who would like to have more payment in lieu of taxes, but let me point out that their public lands generate an enormous flow of visitors, all of whom spend money and pay taxes on the purchases they make which flow to the respective governments. Two hundred seventy-eight million visitor days in the Park Service, 850 million visitor days in the Forest Service, 30 million visitor days in the Fish and Wildlife, 65 million visitor days in BLM.

Let me point out something else. This committee has cut fossil energy research by over 30 percent over the past 3 years in spite of the fact that we have become less secure as far as our energy needs. At the same time while we were cutting fossil research by 30 percent, we were adding 18 percent to PILT.

It would be nice to have more PILT money obviously, but we have to strike a balance. We have to be less dependent on other resources around the world. We have to make our country's energy secure. None of this will mean anything if we do not have security as far as the access to energy.

Electric utilities have made dramatic reductions thanks to fossil research. Let me point out that the fossil research is all matched. It is not all Federal money. That is the reason that the gentleman's amendment puts $20 million into PILT but takes $50 million out of fossil, because PILT spends out every dollar. Fossil will be spent out over a period of years as the research develops being matched by the private sector. This is not an unfunded mandate that we are addressing. That is an erroneous use of a term. This is giving counties money to compensate.

These Federal lands do not send children off of the lands into the school system. They do generate an enormous flow of money from the visitors that come into the communities. Therefore, I think it is important that we keep the fossil programs going.

EPA is proposing to reduce the small particulate requirement from 10 to 2.5 PM. That is .04, the diameter of a human hair. How are we going to get to these mandates, imposed by EPA unless we continue a program of fossil research? Keep in mind we have reduced it already 30 percent over the 3-year period while we were increasing PILT by 18 percent. In 22 eastern and midwestern States, the regulations will require a reduction in ozone and smog. How are we going to keep these plants operating unless we continue the research?

Certainly, the private sector is committed to this. They match the money that we put into energy research dollar for dollar. I think it is vitally important to this Nation's future that we maintain this research in fossil. The new regulations are going to cost utilities $7 billion. You talk about cost to your taxpayers if we do not give them more PILT. They are going to pay it in the electric bills if we do not do the fossil energy research.

One of the great values of fossil energy research is the fact that we are holding down the cost of gasoline at the pump. We are holding down the cost of electricity, items that contribute substantially to the cost of living. That is a benefit to everybody in the United States. We have the world's strongest economy today on a per capita basis. Why? Because we have cheap energy, because our industries have modernized, because the people in this country work hard and they work smart, as one Member said earlier. But to do this we need to support the fossil energy research programs. I do not think it makes good sense in terms of national policy to reduce energy research further. We already are cutting it by 30 percent over the past 3 years.

I understand why the Members who have public lands would like to have more money for their programs. But nevertheless we have to strike a balance. That is what we have tried to do in this subcommittee.

I would urge Members to vote against this amendment. I do not think it is responsible public policy in terms of the 265 million Americans that would be affected adversely by failure to continue a strong program of fossil energy research.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94–579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, $10,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; $98,407,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY FUND

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 102–381, funds made available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities such as release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq., and Public Law 103–66) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under Public Law 94–579, as amended, and Public Law 93–153, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of Public Law 94–579 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this Act by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys

collected from each such action are used on the exact lands damaged which led to the action: *Provided further*, That any such moneys that are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which funds were collected may be used to repair other damaged public lands.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to $100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed $10,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards.

Section 28f(a) of title 30, U.S.C., is amended by striking beginning with the words "The holder" and continuing through "$100 per claim." and inserting in lieu thereof: "The holder of each unpatented mining claim, mill or tunnel site, located pursuant to the mining laws of the United States before October 1, 1998 shall pay the Secretary of the Interior, on or before September 1, 1999 a claim maintenance fee of $100 per claim site.".

Section 28g to title 30, U.S.C., is amended by striking "1998" and inserting in lieu thereof "1999".

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigations, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, $607,106,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, except as otherwise provided herein, of which $11,648,000 shall remain available until expended for operation and maintenance of fishery mitigation facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers under the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan, authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, to compensate for loss of fishery resources from water development projects on the Lower Snake River, and of which not less than $2,000,000 shall be provided to local governments in southern California for planning associated with the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $6,256,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, for species that are indigenous to the United States (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsections (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii)): *Provided further*, That of the amount available for law enforcement, up to $400,000 to remain available until expended, may at the discretion of the Secretary, be used for payment for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activity, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate: *Provided further*, That hereafter, all fees collected for Federal migratory bird permits shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, to be used for the expenses of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in administering such Federal migratory bird permits, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That hereafter, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9701 and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary shall charge reasonable fees for the full costs of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in operating and maintaining the M/V Tiglax and other vessels, to be credited to this account and to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for environmental contaminants, up to $1,000,000 may remain available until expended for contaminant sample analyses.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $66,100,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, $30,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543), as amended, $15,000,000, for grants to States, to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), $10,779,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 101–233, as amended, $12,700,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION FUND

For necessary expenses of the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund, $800,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201–4203, 4211–4213, 4221–4225, 4241–4245, and 1538), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–96), and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301–5306), $2,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of amounts previously appropriated to the African Elephant Conservation Fund, Rewards and Operations account, and Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Fund may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, donations to provide assistance under section 5304 of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, subchapter I of the African Elephant Conservation Act, and section 6 of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 shall be deposited to this Fund: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, all penalties received by the United States under 16 U.S.C. 4224 which are not used to pay rewards under 16 U.S.C. 4225 shall be deposited to this Fund, to be available to provide assistance under 16 U.S.C. 4211: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, not more than three percent of amounts appropriated to this Fund may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to administer the Fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 104 passenger motor vehicles, of which 89 are for replacement only (including 38 for police-type use); repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: *Provided further*, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not spend any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the purchase of lands or interests in lands to be used in the establishment of any new unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System unless the purchase is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in the report accompanying this bill: *Provided*

further, That hereafter the Secretary may sell land and interests in land, other than surface water rights, acquired in conformance with subsections 206(a) and 207(c) of Public Law 101–618, the receipts of which shall be deposited to the Lahontan Valley and Pyramid Lake Fish and Wildlife Fund and used exclusively for the purposes of such subsections, without regard to the limitation on the distribution of benefits in subsection 206(f)(2) of such law: *Provided further*, That section 104(c)(50)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361–1407) is amended by adding the words "until expended" after the word "Secretary" in the second sentence.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD:

Page 16, after line 17, insert the following, and renumber all lines accordingly:

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

(a) UNIT SC–03.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, make such corrections to the map described in paragraph (2) as are necessary to ensure that depictions of areas on that map are consistent with the depictions of areas appearing on the map entitled "Amendments to the Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated May 15, 1997, and on file with the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) The map described in this paragraph is the map that—

(A) is included in a set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System" and dated October 24, 1990; and

(B) relates to unit SC–03 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

(b) UNIT FL–35P.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, make such corrections to the map described in paragraph (2) as are necessary to ensure that depictions of areas on the map are consistent with the depictions of areas appearing on the map entitled "Amendments to the Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated October 22, 1997, and on file with the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) The map described in this paragraph is the map that—

(A) is included in a set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated October 24, 1990; and

(B) relates to unit FL–35P of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

(c) UNIT FL–35.—The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, revise the map depicting unit FL–35 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System to exclude Pumpkin Key from the System.

Mr. SANFORD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical correction that has been brought to our attention by the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is one offered by myself and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH). It is one that has been discussed with the majority and the minority without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general administration of the National Park Service, including not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706, $1,333,328,000, of which not to exceed $12,500,000 may be used for salaries and expenses of the Denver Service Center, and of which not less than $600,000 is for salaries and expenses associated with new hires of mineral examiners at the Mojave National Preserve, and of which $12,800,000 for research, planning and interagency coordination in support of land acquisition for Everglades restoration shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201 of Public Law 100–203.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, statutory or contractual aid for other activities, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, $41,939,000, of which $4,500,000 is for grants to Heritage areas in accordance with section 606 of title VI, division I and titles I–VI and VIII–IX, division II of Public Law 104–333.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California:

Page 17, line 22, after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by $2,000,000)"

Page 37, line 10, after the first dollar amount insert "(decreased by $2,000,000)".

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this important amendment to the Interior appropriations bill which will provide urgently needed recreation and after-school opportunities for our Nation's youth. This amendment will rejuvenate the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program, or UPARR program which has languished for the last couple of years.

The UPARR program, the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program, provides competitive matching grants of up to $200,000 to local communities to help them design programs to meet youth recreation needs. Research shows that many of our most serious youth-related problems, including juvenile crime, drug use, gang activity and teenage sexual activity occur most frequently during the hours immediately after the end of school when 5 to 7 million children go home alone every afternoon. The Urban Parks Program helps local communities to fund programs to reduce juvenile crime, to provide safe havens for our youth and to offer constructive academic or recreational opportunities after school. That is why the Urban Park Program is supported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues, Major League Baseball, the National Recreation and Park Association and the National Council of Youth Sports. Many other organizations support this effort.

This program enables and makes small grants to communities to try to recover, to revitalize, to rehabilitate the recreational facilities in their communities so that they will then be able to offer young people an alternative to doing nothing or to getting into trouble in after-school hours and on the weekends. This is an effort to try to reclaim a baseball field, to try to reclaim maybe a tennis court, to reclaim a recreational area for young people, swimming pools, bathhouses. Very often some of our older facilities have fallen into disuse. They have not been kept up. Now, what we see is in partnership with organizations like the Professional Golf Association, in partnership with the National Basketball Association, with the Sporting Goods Manufacturers, with Major League Baseball, we are coming together, attracting private money with these grants to revitalize these recreational facilities.

This money is offset because I take it from an account where we are giving $11 million to the Northern Mariana Islands, and I am reducing that by $2 million for the purposes of the Urban Parks and Recreation Program. I am doing that because the money that goes to the Northern Marianas to date, they have been unwilling to match that money and that is a requirement of that money. Yet what we see is communities all over the country seeking to match the money from the Urban Parks Program. They have put up their money, they have gotten local sponsors, they have gotten the private sector to buy into these, and they want to use the money. But we see an account with respect to the Northern Marianas where there is over $80 million that is sitting there, sitting in their account, and they are unwilling to match it and now we are going to add another $11 million.

What I am suggesting is we would be better to give that money to the city of Phoenix or to Pueblo or to Bridgeport or to Savannah or to Peoria or to Kokomo or Kalamazoo, where these communities are hungry to do something

for their young people, they are hungry to try to combat crime problems, to combat drug problems, to create sporting activities, to create sporting teams, to create academic programs combined with sports programs so that young people will have these kinds of alternatives.

□ 1715

Rather than have this money languish in an account where the recipient of the money refuses to match it, we ought to give it to those communities that they are seeking to match it.

There is a huge backlog of communities that are desiring this effort that have gone out and made the push, made the push within their private sector to gather resources to get in-kind contributions or to get monetary programs that have worked with citizen programs where people volunteer to rebuild, to paint facilities, to recapture much of what many of us have experienced when we grew up when we knew the importance that recreation played in our childhood, and teaching us the rules of sportsmanship, and teaching us the discipline of practice, and teaching us how to engage with other individuals, and giving us productive time to use when we were not in school or not engaged in other activities.

That is why it is important that we adopt this amendment. It will not harm. It will not harm the account with respect to the Marianas because, as I pointed out, they have a huge backlog of money that they have been unwilling to match for the purposes for which Congress has appropriated that money.

So I would urge my colleagues, many of you have heard from your mayors, many of you have heard from the sporting good manufacturers, many of you have heard from volunteer organizations in your communities that are struggling, struggling to try to rebuild and recapture and revitalize these facilities.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we owe it to our children. We now understand, there are studies, there, you stack them up, they are taller than I am, that tell us the most important time to capture the time of young people is that time from after school until the time that their parents or guardians come home. That is when most of the crime is committed by young people. That is when young people get into trouble most of the time.

But in many, many communities, and if you look at the list of the communities that are making applications for this program, in many communities they simply do not have a constructive alternative to offer to these young people.

We have done this with the UPARR program. We can continue to do it with the UPARR program, and we can do it in the constructive fashion so that we can take advantage of the energies of these young people and the willingness of the local communities to come up with the matching money, to come up with the local energy to create these facilities. I would hope that the House would approve this amendment, and I ask for an aye vote on this amendment.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has said we have heard from the manufacturers of tennis rackets, from the manufacturers of basketballs, tennis balls, guns, you name it, all these sporting goods outfits. Now we are going to hear from the people that work in the parks, that work in the forests, that work in the fish and wildlife, that work in BLM, and I am going to speak for them.

The gentleman is asking them to fix the roof in their spare time. He is asking them to go out and repair bridges in their spare time. We saw that when we were out in Yosemite. The employees told us "we did a lot of the work here to offset the damage from the big flood ourselves in our free time."

We had oversight hearings this year. We have $10 billion, not million, $10 billion of backlog maintenance. That is not my number. That is a number from the Director of the parks, from the Director of the Forest Service, from the Directors of the Fish and Wildlife Services, and from BLM, $10 billion of maintenance left undone.

One of the people testified that, for every dollar of maintenance that is neglected, it costs $5 down the road. Let us not take money out of these programs. If we have extra money, let us address the backlog maintenance. Let us not worry about manufacturers of tennis rackets or baseball bats.

That is what UPARR is. Build tennis courts. Build baseball fields. It is nice. But 47 States have surpluses. It is about time for them to come into this program. Let the States work with the local communities to provide these recreational facilities. I have not had any State offer money to deal with backlog maintenance on Federal lands. If you want to take care of those precious crown jewels that we keep talking about, we need any extra money that we have to be spent on backlog maintenance.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Nobody has been more diligent in trying to warn this Congress and the country about the backlog in the national parks and in the public lands with respect to maintenance and even, to some extent, and clearly, in acquisition.

But let me say that is not the competition that this amendment is. This is money that is put into an account for the Northern Marianas. They have been unwilling over the last several years to match that money; and there is now, according to the budget, about $80 million sitting in that account.

All I am suggesting is that we take that $2 million and help these cities. People are volunteering their time here. I work every weekend with organizations and try to help organizations that are paying for the ball fields and trying to recover these facilities so that they can use them for their children. So we are not matching volunteers here. We are matching an account that has more money in it than they can possibly use as opposed to this program where people can use it for recreational opportunities for the young people.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, I understand the gentleman's point. Frankly, since the gentleman mentioned it, I am going to take a quick look at that and see if we cannot get that $80 million to put into backlog maintenance. I think that is a wonderful idea.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would support the gentleman. We can do it right now.

Mr. DICKS. But, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, why does the gentleman not, for the gentleman's diligence and good work, at least give him the $2 million?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest to the National Governors' Association that they adopt the Miller amendment. I think, with their surpluses and all but maybe a handful of States, 47 to be exact, they ought to take care of this. I do appreciate the gentleman calling to my attention this money that is available.

Mr. MILLER of California. Now the gentleman is going to steal the money from me. No good deeds go unrewarded.

Mr. REGULA. It could end up with about $9 billion of backlog instead of $10 billion if we can get that $80 million the gentleman has been telling us about.

I realize it is not exactly apples and oranges. But all I am saying is that, when we are faced with $10 billion in backlog, when we are faced with our employees who are spending their free time, many of them, doing this work in our public lands facilities, I do not think we should start building tennis courts and golf courses and baseball fields in our communities. That is a local responsibility.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we can make that argument

about a lot of efforts. But when we address the crime bill and we are looking at the priorities, this was one of them. The point is, this provides, you know, a small match that brings together a lot of private resources and some public resources at the local level. The governors of the State, unfortunately, this is not on their agenda. These are a lot of cities that are trying to provide some local recreation opportunities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REGULA was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this ought to be in the crime bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. It was.

Mr. REGULA. I think that is a logical place to put it rather than to take money from our parks and our forests.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am not taking them.

Mr. REGULA. I understand, but the gentleman from California is not offsetting. But if that money is available, we would like to get it and use it for public lands.

Mr. MILLER of California. But that is not my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Miller amendment. Not to get into a fight with the chairman or anyone else, but I think that, in other parts of this budget, we are taking out all the money for summer jobs in this country.

We are looking at cities filled with kids where, on the one hand, we are not going to help them get a summer job, and, on the other hand, we are not willing to put some money to invest in recreational facilities so that they can be involved in organized activities that will keep them out of difficulty.

We all know from our own childhood, if not from someplace else, that idle hands are the devil's workshop. I remember in the crime bill discussion, we had an awful lot of people out here jumping up and down saying that midnight basketball was not a good idea. But if we go by the places even in this city at night where there is a light and a hoop, we will see kids playing basketball. I think we would rather have them doing that than some of the other things they can think of doing.

For us to take $2 million out of $80 million that is sitting somewhere being unused because we have a law that says we have to put the money in there, we made some kind of deal, but they never match it. I am up here because Seattle put in a grant for $250,000, and we know how to use it. We have got the matched money ready to go, but we would like access to this money.

I think there are cities all over this country where, whether you like it or not, as we have devolved programs from the Federal level down to the State level, there are lots of States dealing with lots of things they did not use to deal with, so they are unwilling to take care of the needs of cities.

If somebody does not take care of the needs of cities, we are going to be in serious trouble in this country. So I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a brief moment?

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman mentions Seattle, Washington, I wanted to point out that in the past, funding has also contributed to the development of programs and projects such as the innovation project established in Tacoma, Washington. The goals of this innovative project were to provide at-risk youth alternatives to gangs and drugs through participation in outdoor recreation activities and to develop life skills such as self-esteem, leadership, decision-making and cooperation.

The program was designed to operate as an extensive partnership involving professionals from the disciplines of parks and recreation, education, city government, social services and criminal justice.

It was designed to operate year round with expanded activity during the summer months and over extended holiday periods. Youth participants were involved through various avenues such as schools, home school associations, youth service agencies, and neighborhood community centers.

The program has provided various activities such as backpacking in Olympic National Park; whitewater rafting on the Thompson River in British Columbia; cross-country skiing in Mount Ranier National Park; winter camping, inner-tubing and snow shoeing in various winter sports areas; water safety instruction; fishing, canoeing, boating and swimming, mountain packing on designated State and Federal lands; weekly environmental education outdoor skills workshops, leadership training for advanced youth participants and youth hosteling and meeting travelers from around the world.

I have listened carefully to my chairman, and it seems to me for this small investment if we can do and provide more opportunities for kids after school to be in programs like this, and if the Park Service can play a role in this, I certainly support the gentleman from California.

I will work as hard as anyone on the backlog, but if we have got $80 million sitting in a trust fund and the chairman can get $78 million of it for the backlog and we can get $2 million for this urban recreation thing, I think that is the kind of program the American people support. It is prevention of crime that we should be focusing on, and having some opportunities out there through this bill seems to me to be a good idea.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, on the point both he and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) have made, if we go back into our childhoods, we all know the value of a coach, the value of the mentor, the value of the after-school recreation director that helped us get over some trouble spots when we were young children, when we were adolescents. That opportunity and that relationship is being denied to too many children today in America.

This is a small effort. This is not going to solve a problem, but this has been an effective effort when we put the money into it. Unfortunately, the last couple of years it has languished, and I just think it is an important one that should be embraced by the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). People should understand what is going on here, and again I will have to say that my understanding is limited as well, but my understanding of what we are talking about is an agreement that was reached with the Northern Mariana Islands as part of a change of their status that they used to be like all the other people who were appendages of the United States but they were not independent, nor were they States.

In order to change their status and become not dependent on American welfare programs and not dependent on other social benefit programs, they decided to become somewhat independent and have more of a free enterprise approach to their economy.

Part of the agreement that we made with them was to provide them certain infrastructure projects that cost a certain amount of money, and what we are talking about here is breaking an agreement or not setting aside the funds that are necessary or taking advantage of funds that may or may not be available that are in contradiction, and this is in contradiction to an agreement we have reached with these people in the Northern Mariana Islands.

This stems from and, again, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and I have an honest disagreement on this, as do Republicans and Democrats have honest disagreements, as to what labor policy should take place in the United States but also in the Northern Mariana Islands.

□ 1730

I happen to believe in a less regulated society and less regulations dealing with labor law, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) believes in more regulations for labor law to protect the interests of labor and protect the interests of various working people. I disagree with that philosophy. That is not the philosophy of the Republican Party, but I respect the concern of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) about that.

Unfortunately, the amendment we are talking about now, however, based on this opposition to this labor policy in the Northern Mariana Islands, is negating an agreement that we have reached with those islanders in order to have a change in their legal status.

I would suggest that this is not the fair approach, not a judicious approach. Even though it can be argued that the funds may be better spent someplace else, an agreement has been reached. We would not want to break any other agreement with any other peoples around in order to fulfill these same obligations and opportunities for spending money that have been talked about today.

So I reluctantly rise in disagreement, but I understand the honest philosophical motivations that the gentleman has in making his approach.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, two points. One, I have been working on UPARR for many years, both on the resources side and on the crime bill side, and the only reason we are tapping this account is that this account is now building up an amount that is supposed to be matched on an annual basis. It has not been matched for the last several years, so we are just putting money into an account, when money is now hard to come by. It has $80 million in it unmatched, and to take $2 million for this fiscal year, if they spend the money, there is no harm to them. But there is no indication they can spend anywhere close to the $80 million because of the matching requirement that other communities have. It is an effort to try to address the crime problem here and use the money without harm.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think it is clear that the gentleman is accomplishing two things with one move, and that the gentleman honestly disagrees with some of the labor practices on the Northern Mariana Islands and is able to express that through this amendment, which also transfers funds to a program that the gentleman appreciates.

However, I would say that I oppose this amendment still, but understand my colleague's desire in this attempt. But I would oppose it, because, number one, I do disagree with his theory on labor practices, as is happening in the Northern Marianas; and, number two, I would think we should make sure if we have reached an agreement with the Northern Mariana Islands and it takes a certain amount of money to fulfill that agreement, that we keep that in the budget so we can fulfill our pledge, rather than trying to do other things.

There are many other things we can do with this money that we can argue are very beneficial to the people of the United States, but we made an agreement with these people and we should keep it. So I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words in support of the amendment which would place $2 million in the Urban Recreation and Recovery Program. I think the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has done something very good here, and I think the House recognizes there is no one among us who is more expert about this particular program, the value of it, the efficacy of the work that is done through this program and the need to put money into it.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has identified a source of funding which is not going to hurt anyone. The $2 million out of this $80 million from the Northern Mariana fund is money which is not being used. There is no likelihood this money is going to be matched by the Northern Marianas at any time in the near future. This is a very good program, and we really need to be funding it.

There is a great deal of willingness on the part of many Members of the House, it seems, to spend money on prisons, but not as much willingness to spend money on parks; not as much willingness to spend money on prevention, rather than waiting until after the problem has arisen before we deal with it. That, I think, is a very serious mistake.

There has been a recent study that was done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that said that if young people, high school age, are going to get into trouble, they are going to do so in those hours right after school lets out, the hours between 3 and 7 o'clock or so in the evening.

One of the reasons people in those situations get into trouble is because there is nothing for them to do when school lets out. There are millions of young people in urban areas and in rural areas alike across this country that have no access to recreational facilities after school is out. By spending a few dollars on recreational programs, we can avoid the need to spend a great deal of money later on the construction of prisons and for other purposes in the criminal justice system.

We know very clearly that if young people have access to recreational programs, if young people can hook up with a mentor, some older person that can establish a relationship with them, that their life is much less likely to take a bad turn and they are much more likely to develop into good, sound, solid citizens.

Money spent on these recreational programs, money spent for these parks, is money well spent, and we are well advised to adopt this amendment. It is a good, sound, solid amendment, a good use for this funding.

I urge all Members to get behind this amendment and support this expenditure of $2 million for our Urban Recovery and Parks Program. It is a very good purpose, a very good idea.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the Miller amendment. This is an amendment that would provide a very tiny amount of money for an authorized program, the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program. $2 million is what would be proposed here, what is proposed here in the amendment. It has an offset, which is as benign as any offset that anybody could come up with in trying to fund something that is entirely legitimate.

We are trying to find $2 million out of a $10-plus billion bill. That is $2 million. That is not two percent, it is 2/100ths of one percent of the $10-plus billion bill that we are talking about.

Every Member in this body, from whatever district they hail from, whatever State, whatever kind of district, they have communities which could benefit from this kind of legislation.

In my area, there are two communities that have asked for just $50,000 and $100,000 respectively under the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program, which has not been possible because there are no funds in that authorized program. They would, of course, have to match it. It is one of those cases where you build a partnership on the part of the Federal Government and the State or local government, particularly in this instance the local government, to do something which is of great benefit to people.

So I would urge Members to listen to their mayors in those communities, or whoever is their chief operating officer, in those communities that are struggling to find recreational opportunities for their youth.

It is summertime. There are so many opportunities for kids to find trouble. It is in the ballparks and the playgrounds, those active places for recreation, that kids go and stay out of trouble. Our public parks are where the McGwires and the Griffeys hit their first home runs, where the Grant Hills played their first competitive basketball.

But beyond that, urban parks offer families brief refuge from urban decay,

from bus exhaust and traffic congestion. The urban park, with its water fountains and little league baseball fields, is the place where the vast majority of Americans are going to be spending their leisure time this summer and around the clock, not just in the summertime, but around the clock. It is a place where many children first learn team sports. It is the place where families get together to fly a kite or bike or walk or rollerblade along a river greenway.

One of my particular interests, Mr. Chairman, has been that many of our urban centers, particularly in the earlier settled parts of the country, many of our urban centers run along riverways that not so long ago functioned as industrial sewers. Because we have put billions of dollars, billions upon billions of dollars into the Clean Water Act over a period of years, and because of the more recent industrial restructuring that has gone on, these riverways now are a place that could be restored as green space to provide for recreation, a true wealth of recreation for use by our urban families.

In those cases, communities that I could name one right after the another, and, again, every Member could name in their own districts, these communities need some help with the restoration to make these areas available for their families for recreation. That help could come clearly from the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program that we are proposing here, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is proposing, just $2 million, with a benign offset to be used.

Some communities have recreational facilities that are in such poor shape they endanger kids' safety and health. These dollars could help repair, reconstruct and rehabilitate such facilities. In the past, these grants have been provided recreation for the disabled, repaired swimming pools, resurfaced tennis and basketball courts, purchased picnic tables, created arts and craft areas, fitness trails and bocci courts for senior citizens.

The public knows that this is money that is well spent. They expect money well spent to be appropriated by their government. So I urge support for the Miller amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today also in support of the Miller amendment to fully fund the administration's request of $2 million for the Urban Parks Recreation and Recovery, or UPARR. This invaluable program provides competitive matching grants for the revitalization of local recreation areas and the improvement of recreation programs and services in low income inner-city neighborhoods. These opportunities are targeted at urban youth and the expansion of pre- and after-school activities.

Mr. Chairman, in my own district in the City of New Brunswick, which is located in the central part of New Jersey, UPARR grants have been used to renovate jogging paths and playing fields and to construct new playing fields at Buccleuch Park. The park is used as a recreational facility by local high school sports teams, as well as sports teams from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

In addition, a UPARR grant made additional renovations possible so that senior citizens and disabled persons from the senior citizen resource center next door could make use of the park's facilities. Other UPARR grants have facilitated similar activities at Feaster Park, Joyce Kilmer Park and Recreation Park, also located in New Brunswick.

The National Park Service anticipates applications from 100 to 150 urban localities across the country for UPARR grants in fiscal year 1999, requests which will total approximately $20 million. The $2 million that we are trying to add to the bill today with this amendment will enable the Park Service to award 10 to 15 grants, only 10 percent of those requested. This, as has been mentioned by my colleagues, is a modestly funded program, but one that has a large impact on those communities that are fortunate enough to receive these grants, as I know from my own City of New Brunswick.

I urge my colleagues to support urban neighborhoods and urban youth by voting for the Miller UPARR amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), and the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333), $40,812,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2000, of which $7,700,000 pursuant to section 507 of Public Law 104-333 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Park Service may hereafter recover all costs of providing necessary services associated with historic preservation tax certification, and such funds shall remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, including the modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, $149,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Denver Service Center may not levy any assessments against specific construction projects.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 1999 by 16 U.S.C. 460l-10a is rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, $69,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended, of which $500,000 is to administer the State assistance program: *Provided*, That any funds made available for the purpose of acquisition of the Elwha and Glines dams shall be used solely for acquisition, and shall not be expended until the full purchase amount has been appropriated by the Congress: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available for land acquisition at Everglades National Park and Big Cypress National Preserve, the Secretary may provide for Federal assistance to the State of Florida for the acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, within the Everglades watershed (consisting of lands and waters within the boundaries of the South Florida Water Management District, Florida Bay and the Florida Keys) under terms and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary, to improve and restore the hydrological function of the Everglades watershed: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading to the State of Florida shall be subject to an agreement that such lands will be managed in perpetuity for the restoration of the Everglades.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGOVERN:

Page 19, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $30,000,000)".

Page 70, line 17, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by $30,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Before recognizing the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), the Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1745

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today along with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), in support of an initiative that is vital to our children, our families and our Nation: Reestablishing the Stateside program

of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his graciousness as we take up debate on this important issue. He and his staff have always extended every courtesy to me and my office, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the ranking member, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and their staff for all of the help that they have provided me.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has a proven track record and strong bipartisan support. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a simple idea. It uses money from nonrenewable public resources like offshore oil and gas drilling and reinvests the money into a renewable resource: Public open space.

A trust fund was established over 30 years ago to meet the need for more open space and in that time, over 37,000, over 37,000 park and recreation projects, from neighborhood parks and ballfields to scenic trails, nature reserves and historical sites, have all been developed. This is a real American success story.

Unfortunately, the spirit of this program has been misdirected in recent years. Though Congress has funded the Federal program which has protected Federal lands, the Stateside program has been zeroed out. For those who believe that the Stateside program is better provided by the States, I would respectfully disagree and say that the States cannot do it alone. The Stateside program is already a partnership, as States and towns match every Federal dollar. We can leverage good money on good projects.

The Stateside program acknowledges State leadership on parks and open space projects and works in lock step with what I would say is a Republican philosophy to devolve power back to the States. It is a nonregulatory program that lets States take the lead, a successful program with a successful track record administered at the State level. That is why governors from all over the country support the Stateside fund.

Not funding the Stateside program amounts to a broken promise made to the American people. When we decided to open the Outer Continental Shelf to oil drilling, exploitation of a nonrenewable resource, we pledged to use some of the revenues for the public good, to protect open space. Every year, the Land and Water Conservation Fund takes in $900 million from oil and gas receipts, but less than 25 percent of this has been appropriated over the last decade. We are breaking our promise to the American people by not spending this money in the way in which it was intended.

This amendment that we are offering today is a step in the right direction toward renewing that promise. It is the perfect time to revitalize the Land and Water Conservation Fund program. Right now, States are developing their own plans to invest in open spaces. With our strategic investment, we can help them fight sprawl, revitalize urban areas, and conserve cherished cultural heritage sites.

In some low-income urban communities, such as Chelsea in Summerville, Massachusetts, the Stateside program is responsible for virtually all parks in the city. Without the Stateside fund, there would literally be no public open space in those communities.

Kids in cities need safe green spaces to play in. Without safe, healthy parks, they go from home to school and back without ever interacting with a natural area: Trees, grass, places to explore. Unused open space in rural areas is natural area. Unused space in a city is a vacant lot with garbage, glass, dirty needles and possibly drug dealing. Vacant lots also increase childhood asthma by increasing airborne dust. Transforming a dangerous vacant lot into a community garden or neighborhood playground gives a neighborhood hope and increases public health and safety.

I have seen some of the great things the Stateside program can do. In my home city of Worcester, Massachusetts there are about 40,000 annual visits to Green Hill Park, an innercity green space which received $225,000 in the 1980s to revamp a farm zoo in that park. This is the kind of investment we need to save our urban neighborhoods.

Our amendment proposes to take $30 million from the fossil energy turbine program and redirect it to the National Park Service for the purpose of funding the Stateside program. What will $30 million do? It gives the States something to work with. They have not seen Stateside funding since 1995. It will help get grant programs back on line, and it will help further demonstrate the need and support for the program by using the $30 million strategically.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this bipartisan effort to reinstate the Stateside program with the Land and Water Conservation Fund to ensure we have a better environment for everybody. Please support the McGovern-Pappas amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). This Interior appropriations bill contains within it the appropriations for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. However, only $139 million is appropriated for this important fund, despite it reaching levels of $5 billion. Moreover, there are no funds in this bill for the Stateside matching grant program.

In my State of New Jersey, there is much debate about the future of urban sprawl, loss of open space and farmland, and the need recreational opportunities. This fund was originally intended to be a Federal complement to State efforts to provide for parks, recreation and open space. The Federal component, however, is gone.

This issue is critical to the Northeast and every region across this country with urban sprawl. I have even introduced my own bill to help further address this problem in my region, H.R. 3566. Open space is critically important to preserve the quality of life for those that live in high-growth areas. The Federal Government can play an important role in providing money to cash-strapped States and local governments that seek to fund efforts to improve their quality of life.

This amendment is a much-needed amendment to provide an additional $30 million for the Stateside of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Under the formula written in the law, States, through the Stateside program, would receive up to $2 million each to help improve quality of life for communities and families.

Finally, I want to thank the chairman for crafting an overall good bill. It is a very lean year, I understand, and represents a $200 million reduction from last year. Offsets such as the one identified in this amendment are harder to find in lean bills. However, I must respectfully state my opinion through this amendment that the Land and Water Conservation Fund in general, and State grant program in specific, must reflect a higher priority of this Congress and administration.

This amendment will help save an important Federal program that helps States. It is consistent with Republican priorities by giving power to States. It does not create more Federal land ownership; it allows flexibility on the local level, and as a former local elected official, this is the type of program that will help existing open space and recreational efforts of local governments.

This is an amendment that this Congress should support, the Stateside program. I strongly urge passage of the McGovern amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to rise in support of this amendment and others that seek to enhance the utilization of resources from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The fact is that there is from the offshore oil and gas revenues a commitment until appropriated of $900 million a year. The measure before us appropriates only a small portion of those dollars.

Now, I understand the limitations that the subcommittee members face, but I think that completely terminating, and it has been done in past Congresses, the funding for the State set-aside for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is the wrong way to go.

I think we have a commitment here. I know that this amendment is really only a modest beginning as we try to restore the integrity and the necessity for the funds to the States for these particular programs. I mean the basic tenet is that as we deplete resources from the Outer Continental Shelf, both oil and gas, that the resources of some of the dollars that come from those resources are provided for setting aside and purchasing some lands for the legacy of those that come after us.

So I strongly support this, empowering and providing the States this opportunity.

I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) for raising this. I just wanted to comment briefly that I recognize our colleague from Illinois' distinguished service and had noted that in my earlier remarks that I put in the RECORD, as well as the continued good work of the chairman of this committee and others that have served here, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE). While over the years we have had our differences about how to proceed with policy, I think that they have been conscientious Members, especially of course the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), who has left I think an indelible mark on many of the special programs that exist in this subcommittee of appropriations on Interior.

I have concerns about the bill, especially the underfunding, and I think that that needs to be remedied in terms of how we have allocated the dollars so that this subcommittee would have the funding that would reflect the will of the American people in terms of the concerns that they have with these programs. I am concerned about some elements in the rule where some amendments are given favored treatment, others are ruled out of bounds in terms of reaching them, but generally, there is a lot positive in this bill and I am really torn in terms of a decision to support it.

But I am not torn about this amendment. This is a good amendment, and I urge the Members to support it and hope that we can restore some full spending at some time to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and I again commend the gentleman.

So I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues to increase funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund for stateside matching grant program. I do regret the decision to offset the funding from the Energy Conservation Program, but do support the opportunity to discuss the unmet commitment represented in the Conservation Fund.

When Congress first passed the Land and Water Conservation Act in 1965, they recognized the need to "assist in preserving, developing, and assuring accessibility to all citizens of the United States of America of present and future generations . . . To outdoor recreation resources . . . " To insure that access, the Congress pledged to provide funds for States in planning, acquisition, and development of needed areas and facilities. The fund was also to be used for Federal acquisition and development.

While the funding source for LWCF has produced a more than generous level to conduct both portions of the program, the program has been too successful. The $900 million authorized level has been diverted to fund other programs with minimal funding for the Federal funding and, since 1995, no money for State matching grants.

The State matching program has been an integral component of State and local recreation programs. I am certain that many of my colleagues have visited recreation centers, wildlife areas, and parks funded in part by LWCF.

Unfortunately the lack of matching Federal funds has created a major backlog in State and local community programs. The McGovern amendment would be a start to address those pressing needs.

While I support the restoration of funding for LWCF, I am concerned about the source of the offset. It is my hope that should this amendment be successful, other options will be considered by a conference committee as offsets.

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

Mr. Chairman, how quickly we forget. I can remember not too many years ago when people stood in this well wondering where were we going to get energy, when we had OPEC tying up petroleum, lines at the gasoline stations. We said, let us not let that happen again. We had a special commission meeting all hours of the day and night trying to address the problem. Industries closed down, hospitals and schools were suffering problems. How quickly we forget. We forget we sent soldiers, disrupted families, spent billions of dollars in Desert Storm to protect our energy supply, and now we want to take another hit at energy conservation.

These programs result from the experience of OPEC tying up our energy supply. They result from an understanding that we have to conserve. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) not long ago was making a strong case for energy conservation. Here we have a bill that says, let us take another bite out of energy conservation to fund local facilities, golf courses. We remember when the Land and Water Conservation funds went to the States. It was easy money. It came from the "Federal Government."

So they did not worry too much. The State built swimming pools, golf courses, tennis courts. That is not a wise investment when we are threatening the energy security of this Nation. That is what this amendment boils down to.

We have enormous needs in our Federal lands. We are the Federal Government. Forty-seven States advised the National Governors' Association that they have surpluses. If they have surpluses, they should be building the tennis courts, the swimming pools and the golf courses in their communities. We have $10 billion of backlog maintenance. This is the testimony of the administration. We have land management agencies that are trying to deal with in-holdings. We need whatever funds we can get to buy in-holdings where people are living in the center of parks and forests and other government facilities.

Given the backlog of maintenance of $10 billion, given the backlog of inholding purchases that we should make of $8.6 billion, it certainly makes absolutely no sense to take money out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We do not have enough.

See that stack of three looseleaf notebooks? They represent requests from Members of this body, some 2,000 letters we received, many of them are multiple, of course, from Members saying, buy this land, do this project. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) is here, and he hears the same thing over in the Committee on Resources.

We are already, woefully short of the funds that we need to meet the needs brought to our attention by Members in testimony. We had an entire day of Members testifying in front of our committee about the needs in their districts on Federal programs, and 47 States with surpluses, and we are proposing to give them money to build golf courses, tennis courts, swimming pools? Forget it. And to take it out of energy conservation?

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the gentleman in enforcing accountability in this program, but I would simply say that this is not what we are talking about when we are talking about the importance of this program. We are talking about open spaces for families, we are talking about areas in inner cities that otherwise would be left vacant.

□ 1800

The beauty of this program is, kind of like the State revolving fund, it would leverage more money from the State. It is not just the Federal Government giving money, but we are getting money from the State, and that is in keeping with the spirit that you believe.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we are talking about open spaces on Federal lands too. And we are talking about all those millions of visitors that want to go to our Federal lands, and I think it is the responsibility of the cities to fund these programs. Most of them have income

tax programs, they have other sources of revenue. And from what I read, many of the cities are doing pretty well and the States are doing well because the economy is strong.

One of the reasons the economy is strong is because energy is cheap. Of course, the gentleman was not here, but if he had been here when we had these debates, when gasoline was $1.50 a gallon, he would understand that this is an unwise proposal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I appreciate that, and I also appreciate the importance of protecting Federal lands, but I think we can do both. And what we are talking about here is really a very modest investment to try to help leverage State funds to protect open spaces in States all across this country, and I would again urge support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REGULA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think while this is a noble cause, and while it would be nice if we had the money, we do not. We do not have the money to meet the Federal responsibility. We do not have the money to do the backlog. We do not have the money to buy the in-holdings. We do not have enough money to meet Federal needs, as evidenced by those hundreds of requests from all of my colleagues for additional programs.

If we had a great amount of money, it would be different. If we had energy security, it would be different. If we had a stable Middle East, which is an enormous source of petroleum, it would be different. But I hope we have learned our lessons in the past, and I would strongly urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Chairman I rise in strong support of the amendment of my fellow Freshman Class colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN and would urge all of my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Chairman since its enactment in 1964, over $3 billion have been appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for matching grants to the 50 States and U.S. Insular areas for land acquisition and recreation development. Through this program more than 2.3 million acres have been acquired and recreation facilities have been built on some 25,000 sites.

In my own district, LWCF funds have been used for very important land acquisitions at the VI National Park on St. John and hopefully, very soon, to create a National Park Service presence at the recently authorized Salt River National Park on the island of St. Croix.

Equally and vitally important are the funds provided from the LWCF for State and local recreation programs, known as the Urban Parks and Recreation Program. When the LWCF was enacted over thirty years ago, one of its stated purposes was to assist in the preservation, development and assuring the accessibility to outdoor recreation resources. Using this mandate, the LWCF has been used to build ballparks in urban settings from Oakland, California to Washington, DC to my own area in the Virgin Islands.

In years past, the UPAR program received bipartisan support for increased funding every year, because members on both sides of the aisle recognized the importance of recreation in the development of our young people. That is why I strongly support the amendment of my colleague from Massachusetts which would restore funding for the LWCF program to the level requested by the Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to urge my colleagues to again resist efforts to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Every federal dollar spent by the NEA leverages many additional public dollars at the state and local level. Last year, the $98 million dollars allocated to the NEA helped create a system that supports 1.3 million full time jobs in states, cities, towns and villages across the country, providing $3.4 billion back to the federal treasury in income taxes.

We must continue to support the NEA not only because of the untold benefits this agency has on our culture but also because of the importance that artistic expression and creativity has on the development of our children.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to the Gentleman from Illinois, the Ranking Member on the Interior Appropriation Committee, Mr. YATES. My colleagues, those of us from the U.S. offshore areas are very thankful to Mr. YATES for the support he has given to our needs over the years. Whether it has been for disaster assistance as was the case with Hurricanes Hugo and Marilyn in my district or to our many other important needs, Chairman YATES as he was known for so many years, was always willing to come to our aid.

And so I want to say to Mr. YATES on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands, whom I am privileged to represent, thank you for your support. You will be sorely missed in this body but we wish you a very enjoyable retirement and come and visit us in the Virgin Islands. God Speed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will be postponed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), as the manager of the bill, to discuss for a moment a program of particular interest to me, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and many others of my colleagues. It is a subject which has broadly been discussed, the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

As the gentleman knows, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which uses revenue from offshore oil and gas drilling for the protection of recreation, historic and natural resource lands across the country, is of critical importance to the State of New Jersey and other States across the Nation.

I appreciate the historic support offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for this program. Funding levels for the Land and Water Conservation Fund in recent years, however, have resulted in a backlog of unmet acquisition needs at many parks, forests, and wildlife refuges.

I am grateful the Congress finally addressed this need last year by appropriating an additional $699 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund funds, and I know that that could not have happened without the support of the gentleman from Ohio.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question related to the $699 million contained in last year's Interior Appropriations bill. Of the $699 million appropriated, it is my understanding that $362 million will be used to address high priority land acquisitions and backlog maintenance needs around the country, but the final decision of what projects will be funded has not yet been made.

Mr. Chairman, I would inquire, is it the gentleman's intention to finalize the list of acquisitions before the end of the fiscal year 1998?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman that yes, it is. I can assure the gentleman from New Jersey that it would be my intent, and I think my colleague in the Senate feels the same way, to spend these funds this year on high priority land, such as inholdings, high priority land acquisition and backlog maintenance projects.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and would ask his indulgence for one more question.

Despite the extraordinary funding for Land and Water Conservation projects, there will continue to be an annual need to address ongoing acquisitions within Federal units. In fiscal year 1999 the administration requested $270 million, which is in line with regular funding levels in recent years, but the House bill was unable to achieve this level this year.

I realize the chairman of the subcommittee has worked on under strict budgetary constraints and in fact received a lower 302(b) allocation than

last year. However, it is my fervent hope that the conferees from this body can work to arrive at a final Land and Water Conservation level that is at least consistent with the Senate's appropriation.

Is it the gentleman's intention to move in this direction?

Mr. REGULA. Yes, it is. As the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out, there are many competing demands on the limited funds provided in this bill, and I feel that we have done as well as we could.

However, I certainly recognize the importance of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, particularly in meeting the need for purchase of in-holdings and in meeting ongoing acquisition needs, as well as its importance to many Members of this body who support projects in their district. Here is an example, all three of these are Member projects letters.

While we cannot meet every request, the subcommittee will certainly strive to work with the Senate to reach a more adequate funding level in conference. And let me say parenthetically that we imposed moratoria on a great deal of offshore drilling which, of course, substantially reduced the flow of money into the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the commitment of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and look forward to working with him on this important issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer an amendment this afternoon that I believe makes dollars and makes sense. My amendment was based on the simple premise that government agencies responsible for administering programs with similar and complementary purposes can achieve greater success by working together in our urban communities.

Interagency cooperation, the wise use of tax dollars and the development of innovative approaches that employ ideas from a variety of disciplines and sciences, should be promoted more often by this Congress. That is what my amendment sought to accomplish.

Also, I believe that my amendment would have been timely. We are currently in the middle of what scientists predict will be the hottest July in some 600 years. We have never recorded a month hotter than the one we are currently experiencing. In the Midwest and New England, major utility corporations do not have the power to deal with the added costs of cooling urban areas. Rolling burnouts have already occurred and are predicted to occur with more regularity as the summer progresses and the heat rise.

In Chicago, Commonwealth Edison says they are not sure who is going to get electricity at what point. However, the heat wave that currently grips our Nation, raising temperatures above 100 and the heat index above 110 in cities throughout America, is not an anomaly. This decade has witnessed the six hottest summers on record.

We should begin to expect these types of weather effects more often. We should also note that excessive summer heat is worse in our cities and metropolitan areas. Thus we should focus our attention to our urban communities where dangerous summer heat has become a public health hazard.

Currently, the Department of Energy conducts research into the causes, consequences, and possible solutions to the urban heat-island phenomenon. This research demonstrates that summer temperatures are 5 to 10 degrees higher in central cities than in surrounding areas.

As my colleagues can imagine, the energy costs and air pollution resulting from these heat islands present critical problems for urban communities and their residents. But beyond the higher utility bills and air quality that heat islands foster are serious public health concerns that must also be addressed.

I represent an urban constituency. Asphalt, brick and tar are common in my community. In 1995, in my congressional district alone, 100 people died because of excessive summer heat. Throughout the City of Chicago in mid-July of 1995, nearly 600 people died during the worst heat wave this decade. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration study of heat waves demonstrates that in certain sections of the city the mercury was 10 degrees higher than in the suburbs of the City of Chicago. The heat index, which also factors in humidity as well, was nearly 15 degrees higher.

Now, this year the Dallas area has witnessed the effects of urban heat island. For 15 straight days in Dallas the heat has reached 100 degrees or more. More than 80 people have died as a direct result of heat-related illnesses in the Dallas area and across the South.

DOE research has shown that the heat-island phenomenon is prevalent throughout the country. I believe we should look for solutions to this serious public health concern. The Forest Service currently administers a program that should be integrated with the Energy Department's heat-island research to help lessen the effects of summer heat in urban areas. Between these two agencies, we understand the problem and we can come to an important solution.

The DOE can supply the data that helps local communities plan where urban green space must be improved and expanded. The Forest Service can help local communities plant and maintain trees and flora. By cooperating, sharing, and working together, these agencies can fulfill their missions more effectively.

I do not believe that additional appropriations are required by this amendment. The programs in question also will not have to be changed. What the amendment would have required is coordination and innovation, not dollars and regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that this is a win-win situation for our government and cities. Developing solutions to problems of urban heat and pollution cannot be put off any longer. Let us get the agencies working together on this.

Mr. Chairman, I will not offer my amendment today, but instead would ask to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GUTIERREZ was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the members of the subcommittee work with me to compel the Forest Service and the Department of Energy to sit down and coordinate their efforts to reduce heat and pollution in order to save energy and to save lives. I would urge the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula), the manager of the bill, to follow the progress of these agencies towards achieving that goal.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we will urge them to do that. I do not know if the gentleman heard my opening statement, but I pointed out that we have pushed all agencies to coordinate wherever possible to gain efficiencies in the expenditure of monies as well as to serve the public better.

So this is an example, I think, where two agencies can coordinate their efforts to meet the needs that the gentleman from Illinois has outlined in his remarks.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I look forward to working with him.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, concerning the proposed National Eagle Center in Wabasha, Minnesota.

Many of my colleagues may recall a CBS report last winter concerning efforts in the City of Wabasha, Minnesota, to construct a National Eagle Center. In his news report, anchorman Harry Smith stated that it makes his heart quicken to see this magnificent symbol of our Nation in its natural environment: Hundreds of bald eagles

perched in the cottonwoods and fishing along the banks of the Mississippi River near Wabasha, a community of 2,500 people made famous by the movie, "Grumpy Old Men."

Mr. Chairman, Harry Smith is not unlike millions of Americans who are thrilled to have a rare chance to see a bald eagle in the wild. In fact, CBS News officials said the network received more phone calls requesting copies of this story of Smith's than any other.

For the past 9 years, 70 volunteers from in and around Wabasha, Minnesota, have generously donated their time and talent in order to share this once-in-a-lifetime experience with the thousands of visitors who come each year to see this remarkable bird. These thousands of visitors come to Wabasha because nowhere else in the lower 48 States can one find a better view of this, our national symbol.

□ 1815

Nowhere else can visitors benefit, free of charge, from a trained staff of volunteers who help them spot and learn more about the Bald Eagle.

But as my colleague knows, Minnesota can get very cold in the winter, and that is why the City of Wabasha and the State of Minnesota have joined forces and contributed $1.9 million, about half the amount necessary, to construct an indoor eagle viewing and educational facility for the benefit of visitors from all over the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the subcommittee, if he would lend his support for the National Eagle Center. I understand the chairman will consider this request as the Interior bill is taken up in conference with the Senate.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota is correct in his understanding. Recognizing the level of commitment on the part of the State of Minnesota and the community of Wabasha, as well as the national interests served by this center, I will work with the gentleman from Minnesota in his efforts to include supportive language in a statement of managers to accompany the conference report on the Interior bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with me on this project, which is so important to my home State, the community of Wabasha, me and, most importantly, to millions of Americans eager to see this remarkably beautiful symbol of our Nation.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 55, line 14, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 20, line 4 through page 55, line 14 is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 375 passenger motor vehicles, of which 291 shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed 305 for police-type use, 12 buses, and 6 ambulances: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to implement an agreement for the redevelopment of the southern end of Ellis Island until such agreement has been submitted to the Congress and shall not be implemented prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full and comprehensive report on the development of the southern end of Ellis Island, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

None of the funds in this Act may be spent by the National Park Service for activities taken in direct response to the United Nations Biodiversity Convention.

The National Park Service may distribute to operating units based on the safety record of each unit the costs of programs designed to improve workplace and employee safety, and to encourage employees receiving workers' compensation benefits pursuant to chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to return to appropriate positions for which they are medically able.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the United States Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340; classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; and to conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries (30 U.S.C. 3, 21a, and 1603; 50 U.S.C. 98g(1)) and related purposes as authorized by law and to publish and disseminate data; $774,838,000 of which $68,096,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations; and of which $16,400,000 shall remain available until expended for conducting inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries; and of which $150,871,000 shall be available until September 30, 2000 for the biological research activity and the operation of the Cooperative Research Units: *Provided*, That none of these funds provided for the biological research activity shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property, unless specifically authorized in writing by the property owner: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of topographic mapping or water resources data collection and investigations carried on in cooperation with States and municipalities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the United States Geological Survey shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 53 passenger motor vehicles, of which 48 are for replacement only; reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gauging stations and observation wells; expenses of the United States National Committee on Geology; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Survey duly appointed to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts: *Provided*, That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in 31 U.S.C. 6302 et seq.: *Provided further*, That the United States Geological Survey may contract directly with individuals or indirectly with institutions or nonprofit organizations, without regard to 41 U.S.C. 5, for the temporary or intermittent services of science students or recent graduates, who shall be considered employees for the purposes of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims, but shall not be considered to be Federal employees for any other purposes.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for minerals leasing and environmental studies, regulation of industry operations, and collection of royalties, as authorized by law; for enforcing laws and regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other minerals leases, permits, licenses and operating contracts; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements; including the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $116,402,000, of which $72,729,000 shall be available for royalty management activities; and an amount not to exceed $100,000,000, to be credited to this appropriation and to remain available until expended, from additions to receipts resulting from increases to rates in effect on August 5, 1993, from rate increases to fee collections for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities performed by the Minerals Management Service over and above the rates in effect on September 30, 1993, and from additional fees for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities established after September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That $3,000,000 for computer acquisitions shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this Act shall be available for the payment of interest in accordance with 30 U.S.C. 1721(b) and (d): *Provided further*, That not to exceed $3,000 shall be

available for reasonable expenses related to promoting volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, $15,000 under this heading shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Director of the Minerals Management Service concurred with the claimed refund due, to pay amounts owed to Indian allottees or Tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4202 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 8201 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $6,118,000, which shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, as amended, including the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; $93,074,000, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, an additional amount shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, from performance bond forfeitures in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations, may use directly or through grants to States, moneys collected in fiscal year 1999 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1268), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training: *Provided further*, That beginning in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, cost-based fees for the products of the Mine Map Repository shall be established (and revised as needed) in Federal Register Notices, and shall be collected and credited to this account, to be available until expended for the costs of administering this program.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $185,416,000, to be derived from receipts of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund and to remain available until expended; of which up to $7,000,000, to be derived from the cumulative balance of interest earned to date on the Fund, shall be for supplemental grants to States for the reclamation of abandoned sites with acid mine rock drainage from coal mines, and for associated activities, through the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative: *Provided*, That grants to minimum program States will be $1,500,000 per State in fiscal year 1999: *Provided further*, That of the funds herein provided up to $18,000,000 may be used for the emergency program authorized by section 410 of Public Law 95-87, as amended, of which no more than 25 percent shall be used for emergency reclamation projects in any one State and funds for federally administered emergency reclamation projects under this proviso shall not exceed $11,000,000: *Provided further*, That prior year unobligated funds appropriated for the emergency reclamation program shall not be subject to the 25 percent limitation per State and may be used without fiscal year limitation for emergency projects: *Provided further*, That pursuant to Public Law 97-365, the Department of the Interior is authorized to use up to 20 percent from the recovery of the delinquent debt owed to the United States Government to pay for contracts to collect these debts: *Provided further*, That funds made available to States under title IV of Public Law 95-87 may be used, at their discretion, for any required non-Federal share of the cost of projects funded by the Federal Government for the purpose of environmental restoration related to treatment or abatement of acid mine drainage from abandoned mines: *Provided further*, That such projects must be consistent with the purposes and priorities of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act: *Provided further*, That the State of Maryland may set aside the greater of $1,000,000 or 10 percent of the total of the grants made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended (30 U.S.C. 1231 et seq.), if the amount set aside is deposited in an acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund established under a State law, pursuant to which law the amount (together with all interest earned on the amount) is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of its title IV grants are deposited in an acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund, the State of Maryland must first complete all Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act priority one projects: *Provided further*, That hereafter, donations received to support projects under the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative and under the Western Mine Lands Restoration Partnerships Initiative, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1231, shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended without further appropriation for projects sponsored under these initiatives, directly through agreements with other Federal agencies, or through grants to States, and funding to local governments, or tax exempt private entities.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary for the operation of Indian programs, as authorized by law, including the Snyder Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), as amended, the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001-2019), and the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), as amended, $1,558,425,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000 except as otherwise provided herein, of which not to exceed $96,028,000 shall be for welfare assistance payments and notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, not to exceed $114,881,000 shall be available for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with ongoing contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements entered into with the Bureau prior to or during fiscal year 1999, as authorized by such Act, except that tribes and tribal organizations may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet indirect costs of ongoing contracts, grants, or compacts, or annual funding agreements and for unmet welfare assistance costs, and of which not to exceed $383,451,000 for school operations costs of Bureau-funded schools and other education programs shall become available on July 1, 1999, and shall remain available until September 30, 2000; and of which not to exceed $52,256,000 shall remain available until expended for housing improvement, road maintenance, attorney fees, litigation support, self-governance grants, the Indian Self-Determination Fund, land records improvement, the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Program: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, and 25 U.S.C. 2008, not to exceed $42,160,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available to tribes and tribal organizations for administrative cost grants associated with the operation of Bureau-funded schools: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, compact agreements, or grants, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 or grants authorized by the Indian Education Amendments of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2001 and 2008A) shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee: *Provided further*, That hereafter to provide funding uniformity within a Self-Governance Compact, any funds provided in this Act with availability for more than two years may be reprogrammed to two year availability but shall remain available within the Compact until expended: *Provided further*, That hereafter notwithstanding any other provision of law, Indian tribal governments may, by appropriate changes in eligibility criteria or by other means, change eligibility for general assistance or change the amount of general assistance payments for individuals within the service area of such tribe who are otherwise deemed eligible for general assistance payments so long as such changes are applied in a consistent manner to individuals similarly situated and, that any savings realized by such changes shall be available for use in meeting other priorities of the tribes and, that any net increase in costs to the Federal Government which result solely from tribally increased payment levels for general assistance shall be met exclusively from funds available to the tribe from within its tribal priority allocation: *Provided further*, That any forestry funds allocated to a tribe which remain unobligated as of September 30, 2000, may be transferred during fiscal year 2001 to an Indian forest land assistance account established for the benefit of such tribe within the tribe's trust fund account: *Provided further*, That any such unobligated balances not so transferred shall expire on September 30, 2001: *Provided further*, That hereafter tribes may use tribal priority allocations funds for the replacement and repair of school facilities in compliance with 25 U.S.C. 2005(a), so long as such replacement or repair is approved by the Secretary and completed with non-Federal tribal and/or tribal priority allocation funds.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, repair, improvement, and maintenance of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities, including architectural and engineering services by contract; acquisition of lands, and interests in lands; and preparation of lands for farming, and for construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project pursuant to Public Law 87-483, $121,695,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be available for

the construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 6 percent of contract authority available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Federal Highway Trust Fund may be used to cover the road program management costs of the Bureau: *Provided further*, That any funds provided for the Safety of Dams program pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 13 shall be made available on a nonreimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 1999, in implementing new construction or facilities improvement and repair project grants in excess of $100,000 that are provided to tribally controlled grant schools under Public Law 100-297, as amended, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the Administrative and Audit Requirements and Cost Principles for Assistance Programs contained in 43 CFR part 12 as the regulatory requirements: *Provided further*, That such grants shall not be subject to section 12.61 of 43 CFR; the Secretary and the grantee shall negotiate and determine a schedule of payments for the work to be performed: *Provided further*, That in considering applications, the Secretary shall consider whether the Indian tribe or tribal organization would be deficient in assuring that the construction projects conform to applicable building standards and codes and Federal, tribal, or State health and safety standards as required by 25 U.S.C. 2005(a), with respect to organizational and financial management capabilities: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary declines an application, the Secretary shall follow the requirements contained in 25 U.S.C. 2505(f): *Provided further*, That any disputes between the Secretary and any grantee concerning a grant shall be subject to the disputes provision in 25 U.S.C. 2508(e): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in Public Law 105-18, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the repair of irrigation projects damaged in the severe winter conditions and ensuing flooding, are available on a nonreimbursable basis.

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

For miscellaneous payments to Indian tribes and individuals and for necessary administrative expenses, $28,396,000, to remain available until expended; of which $27,530,000 shall be available for implementation of enacted Indian land and water claim settlements pursuant to Public Laws 101-618 and 102-575, and for implementation of other enacted water rights settlements; and of which $866,000 shall be available pursuant to Public Laws 99-264, and 100-580: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, the Secretary is directed to sell land and interests in land, other than surface water rights, acquired in conformance with section 2 of the Truckee River Water Quality Settlement Agreement, the receipts of which shall be deposited to the Lahontan Valley and Pyramid Lake Fish and Wildlife Fund, and be available for the purposes of section 2 of such agreement, without regard to the limitation on the distribution of benefits in the second sentence of paragraph 206(f)(2) of Public Law 101-618.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $4,501,000, as authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $34,615,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan programs, $500,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs may carry out the operation of Indian programs by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts and grants, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations.

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans, the Indian loan guarantee and insurance fund, and the Indian Guaranteed Loan Program account) shall be available for expenses of exhibits, and purchase of not to exceed 229 passenger motor vehicles, of which not to exceed 187 shall be for replacement only.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for central office operations or pooled overhead general administration (except facilities operations and maintenance) shall be available for tribal contracts, grants, compacts, or cooperative agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-413).

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau, other than the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under 25 U.S.C. 452 et seq., shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Alaska.

Appropriations made available in this or any other Act for schools funded by the Bureau shall be available only to the schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996. No funds available to the Bureau shall be used to support expanded grades for any school or dormitory beyond the grade structure in place or approved by the Secretary of the Interior at each school in the Bureau school system as of October 1, 1995.

In the event any tribe returns appropriations made available by the Act to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for distribution to other tribes, this action will not diminish the Federal Government's trust responsibility to that tribe, or the government-to-government relationship between the United States and that tribe, or the tribe's right to future appropriations.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

INSULAR AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for assistance to territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, $66,175,000, of which: (1) $62,326,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance, including maintenance assistance, disaster assistance, insular management controls, and brown tree snake control and research; grants to the judiciary in American Samoa for compensation and expenses, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)); grants to the Government of American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for construction and support of governmental functions; grants to the Government of the Virgin Islands as authorized by law; grants to the Government of Guam, as authorized by law; and grants to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands as authorized by law (Public Law 94-241; 90 Stat. 272); and (2) $3,849,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Office of Insular Affairs: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or used by such governments, may be audited by the General Accounting Office, at its discretion, in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grant funding shall be provided according to those terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands approved by Public Law 99-396, or any subsequent legislation related to Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands grant funding: *Provided further*, That of the Covenant grant funding for the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands $5,000,000 shall be used for the construction of prison facilities and $500,000 shall be used for construction and equipping of a crime laboratory unless the Secretary determines that acceptable alternative financing for these projects is already in place: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided for technical assistance, sufficient funding shall be made available for a grant to the Close Up Foundation: *Provided further*, That the funds for the program of operations and maintenance improvement are appropriated to institutionalize routine operations and maintenance improvement of capital infrastructure in American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia through assessments of long-range operations maintenance needs, improved capability of local operations and maintenance institutions and agencies (including management and vocational education training), and project-specific maintenance (with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the individual territory's commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets): *Provided further*, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this heading in this Act or previous appropriations Acts may be used as non-Federal matching funds for the purpose of hazard mitigation grants provided pursuant to section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c).

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

For economic assistance and necessary expenses for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands as provided for in sections 122, 221, 223, 232, and 233 of the Compact of Free Association, and for economic assistance and necessary expenses for the Republic of Palau as provided for in sections 122, 221, 223, 232, and 233 of the Compact of Free Association, $20,545,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by Public Law 99-239 and Public Law 99-658.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior, $58,286,000, of which not to exceed $8,500 may be for official reception and representation expenses, and of which up to $1,000,000 shall be available for workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $37,304,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $24,499,000.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For operation of trust programs for Indians by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, $39,499,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds for trust management improvements may be transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs: *Provided further*, That funds made available to Tribes and Tribal organizations through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 1999, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the statute of limitations shall not commence to run on any claim, including any claim in litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, concerning losses to or mismanagement of trust funds, until the affected tribe or individual Indian has been furnished with an accounting of such funds from which the beneficiary can determine whether there has been a loss: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Secretary shall not be required to provide a periodic statement of performance pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 4011(b), nor to invest pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 161a, any Indian trust account managed by the Secretary that has not had activity for at least eighteen months and has a balance of $1.00 or less: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Secretary shall maintain a record of any such accounts and amounts in such accounts will remain available upon request to the accountholder.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

To conduct natural resource damage assessment activities by the Department of the Interior necessary to carry out the provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-380), and Public Law 101-337; $4,492,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That obligated and unexpended balances in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund account at the end of fiscal year 1998 shall be transferred to and made a part of the Departmental Offices, Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund account and shall remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from available resources within the Working Capital Fund, 15 aircraft, 10 of which shall be for replacement and which may be obtained by donation, purchase or through available excess surplus property: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft: *Provided further*, That no programs funded with appropriated funds in the "Departmental Management", "Office of the Solicitor", and "Office of Inspector General" may be augmented through the Working Capital Fund or the Consolidated Working Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted: *Provided further*, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated by Congress to be "emergency requirements" pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any no year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction; for emergency actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, storms, or other unavoidable causes; for contingency planning subsequent to actual oilspills; for response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to actual oilspills; for the prevention, suppression, and control of actual or potential grasshopper and Mormon cricket outbreaks on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, pursuant to the authority in section 1773(b) of Public Law 99-198 (99 Stat. 1658); for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95-87; and shall transfer, from any no year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such funds as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a primacy State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof: *Provided further*, That for emergency rehabilitation and wildfire suppression activities, no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds appropriated to "Wildland Fire Management" shall have been exhausted: *Provided further*, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated by Congress to be "emergency requirements" pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible: *Provided further*, That such replenishment funds shall be used to reimburse, on a pro rata basis, accounts from which emergency funds were transferred.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs and supplies, materials, equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed $500,000; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902 and D.C. Code 4-204).

SEC. 106. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for obligation in connection with contracts issued for services or rentals for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

SEC. 107. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the President's moratorium statement of June 26, 1990, in the areas of northern, central, and southern California; the North Atlantic; Washington and Oregon; and the eastern Gulf of Mexico south of 26 degrees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude.

SEC. 108. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities, on lands within the North Aleutian Basin planning area.

SEC. 109. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area for any lands located outside Sale 181, as identified in the final Outer Continental Shelf 5-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Program, 1997-2002.

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

SEC. 111. Advance payments made under this title to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and tribal consortia pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) may be invested by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consortium before such funds are expended for the purposes of the grant, compact, or annual funding agreement so long as such funds are—

(1) invested by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consortium only in obligations of the United States, or in obligations

or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States, or mutual (or other) funds registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and which only invest in obligations of the United States or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States; or

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

SEC. 112. (a) Employees of Helium Operations, Bureau of Land Management, entitled to severance pay under 5 U.S.C. 5595, may apply for, and the Secretary of the Interior may pay, the total amount of the severance pay to the employee in a lump sum. Employees paid severance pay in a lump sum and subsequently reemployed by the Federal Government shall be subject to the repayment provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5595(i)(2) and (3), except that any repayment shall be made to the Helium Fund.

(b) Helium Operations employees who elect to continue health benefits after separation shall be liable for not more than the required employee contribution under 5 U.S.C. 8905a(d)(1)(A). The Helium Fund shall pay for 18 months the remaining portion of required contributions.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior may provide for training to assist Helium Operations employees in the transition to other Federal or private sector jobs during the facility shut-down and disposition process and for up to 12 months following separation from Federal employment, including retraining and relocation incentives on the same terms and conditions as authorized for employees of the Department of Defense in section 348 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

(d) For purposes of the annual leave restoration provisions of 5 U.S.C. 6304(d)(1)(B), the cessation of helium production and sales, and other related Helium Program activities shall be deemed to create an exigency of public business under, and annual leave that is lost during leave years 1997 through 2001 because of, 5 U.S.C. 6304 (regardless of whether such leave was scheduled in advance) shall be restored to the employee and shall be credited and available in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 6304(d)(2). Annual leave so restored and remaining unused upon the transfer of a Helium Program employee to a position of the executive branch outside of the Helium Program shall be liquidated by payment to the employee of a lump sum from the Helium Fund for such leave.

(e) Benefits under this section shall be paid from the Helium Fund in accordance with section 4(c)(4) of the Helium Privatization Act of 1996. Funds may be made available to Helium Program employees who are or will be separated before October 1, 2002 because of the cessation of helium production and sales and other related activities. Retraining benefits, including retraining and relocation incentives, may be paid for retraining commencing on or before September 30, 2002.

SEC. 113. In fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, the Secretary may accept donations and bequests of money, services, or other personal property for the management and enhancement of the Department's Natural Resources Library. The Secretary may hold, use, and administer such donations until expended and without further appropriation.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, funds available under this title for Indian self-determination or self-governance contract or grant support costs may be expended only for costs directly attributable to contracts, grants and compacts pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act and no funds appropriated in this title shall be available for any contract support costs or indirect costs associated with any contract, grant, cooperative agreement, self-governance compact or funding agreement entered into between an Indian tribe or tribal organization and any entity other than an agency of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 115. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the National Park Service shall not develop or implement a reduced entrance fee program to accommodate non-local travel through a unit. The Secretary may provide for and regulate local non-recreational passage through units of the National Park System, allowing each unit to develop guidelines and permits for such activity appropriate to that unit.

SEC. 116. (a) Denver Service Center employees who voluntarily resign or retire from the National Park Service on or before December 31, 1998, shall receive, from the National Park Service, a lump sum voluntary separation incentive payment that shall be equal to the lesser of an amount equal to the amount the employee would be entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of title 5, United States Code, if the employee were entitled to payment under such section; or $25,000.

(1) The voluntary separation incentive payment—

(A) shall not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation of any other type of Government benefit; and

(B) shall be paid from appropriations or funds available for the payment of the basic pay of the employee.

(2) Employees receiving a voluntary separation incentive payment and accepting employment with the Federal Government within five years of the date of separation shall be required to repay the entire amount of the incentive payment to the National Park Service.

(3) The Secretary may, at the request of the head of an Executive branch agency, waive the repayment under paragraph (2) if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position.

(4) In addition to any other payment which it is required to make under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, the National Park Service shall remit to the Office of Personnel Management for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to 15 percent of the final basic pay of each employee of the National Park Service—

(A) who retires under section 8336(d)(2) of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) to whom a voluntary separation incentive payment has been or is to be paid under the provisions of this section.

(b) Employees of the Denver Service Center entitled to severance pay under 5 U.S.C. 5595, may apply for, and the National Park Service may pay, the total amount of severance pay to the employee in a lump sum. Employees paid severance pay in a lump sum and subsequently reemployed by the Federal Government shall be subject to the repayment provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5595(i) (2) and (3), except that any repayment shall be made to the National Park Service.

(c) Employees of the Denver Service Center who voluntarily resign on or before December 31, 1998, or who are separated in a reduction in force, shall be liable for not more than the required employee contribution under 5 U.S.C. 8905a(d)(1)(A) if they elect to continue health benefits after separation. The National Park Service shall pay for 12 months the remaining portion of required contributions.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to permit persons, firms or organizations engaged in commercial, cultural, educational, or recreational activities (as defined in section 612a of title 40, United States Code) not currently occupying such space to use courtyards, auditoriums, meeting rooms, and other space of the main and south Interior building complex, Washington, D.C., the maintenance, operation, and protection of which has been delegated to the Secretary from the Administrator of General Services pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and to assess reasonable charges therefore, subject to such procedures as the Secretary deems appropriate for such uses. Charges may be for the space, utilities, maintenance, repair, and other services. Charges for such space and services may be at rates equivalent to the prevailing commercial rate for comparable space and services devoted to a similar purpose in the vicinity of the main and south Interior building complex, Washington, D.C. for which charges are being assessed. The Secretary may without further appropriation hold, administer, and use such proceeds within the Departmental Management Working Capital Fund to offset the operation of the buildings under his jurisdiction, whether delegated or otherwise, and for related purposes, until expended.

SEC. 118. The 37 mile River Valley Trail from the town of Delaware Gap to the edge of the town of Milford, Pennsylvania located within the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area shall hereafter be referred to in any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States as the Joseph M. McDade Recreational Trail.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to the bill through page 55, line 14?

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

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 212, noes 213, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—212

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilman
Goode
Gordon
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sánchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thune
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—213

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kim
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Visclosky
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
White
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Dixon
Ford
Gonzalez
Harman
John
McNulty
Solomon
Stokes
Young (FL)

□ 1839

Messrs. WATKINS, MOAKLEY, LATHAM, SMITH of Michigan, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SKELTON and Mr. METCALF changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

□ 1840

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 185, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—241

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Carson
Chabot
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Gutierrez
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kolbe
LaFalce
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pombo
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Riggs
Rivers
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Velázquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—185

Aderholt
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Biliraki
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clement
Coburn
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Davis (VA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastert
Hilleary
Hobson
Holden
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kennelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Lazio
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Livingston
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Mascara
Matsui
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Ney
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Pelosi
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryun
Sabo
Sánchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Scott
Sessions
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stenholm
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Yates

NOT VOTING—8

Dixon
Ford
Gonzalez
Harman
John
McNulty
Moakley
Young (FL)

□ 1848

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

Messrs. McCOLLUM, SCHUMER and DICKS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MCGOVERN

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 221, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—203

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Biliraki
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burton
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Ehrlich
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fawell
Filner
Forbes
Fox
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilman
Goode
Graham
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Pitts
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez
Sanders
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tauscher
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—221

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fazio
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Dixon
Ford
Gonzalez
Harman
John
Kanjorski
McNulty
Moakley
Radanovich
Young (FL)

□ 1858

Mr. HASTERT and Mr. MINGE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1900

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy if I could do that, please.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield, yes, I will be happy to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for the opportunity to speak in support of resolving the Elwha River Restoration Project. I appreciate the committee's leadership over the past three years in helping secure funding toward the acquisition of Elwha and Glines dams. This project is something we have been trying to get started since 1995, and I am pleased that we are finally starting to move in the right direction.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the gentleman from Washington's leadership on this issue over the past 3 years. It is very clear that the gentleman is deeply committed to seeing this project through to the end. I hope we can continue to look for ways to build on the support for the Elwha project.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, I have been a strong proponent of providing funding for restoration efforts on the Elwha River in the Olympic Peninsula in Washington State. We spend about $435 million every year on the Columbia and Snake Rivers and do not have as much to show for it as we would like. In the case of the Elwha, a one-time payment of a much smaller amount will create a pristine river and perfect salmon habitat from glacier to salt water, and it is an investment well worth making.

For the past 3 years, I have been working with the gentleman, Senator GORTON, who is the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee on Appropriations, and my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) on this issue. When we started this process in 1995, there was not much interest in the Elwha project and Senator GORTON had strong reservations about moving forward.

But a lot has changed over the past 3 years. Through some blood, sweat, and tears, we have made considerable progress in securing funding for the Elwha project and moving a little closer to salmon restoration on the Elwha River. We started this process with authorizing language in the fiscal year 1997 Budget Resolution recognizing the environmental benefits of restoring this pristine and unique river system. Since 1995, we have been successful in securing $11 million in funding toward acquiring these dams.

As the gentleman may know, Mr. Chairman, during consideration of the Senate Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999, Senator GORTON included language authorizing acquisition of both the Elwha and Glines dams and authorized the removal of both dams subject to the availability of appropriations.

In the process, however, Senator GORTON made clear that the uses of the Federal hydroelectric facilities on the Columbia and Snake Rivers would not be affected by actions on the Elwha. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator's intention.

Senator GORTON and I have not always agreed on the details of this project. However, I am very pleased that he has indicated a willingness to make changes to his current position and will continue to encourage him to act sooner rather than later on the Elwha River project.

That is why today I introduced legislation that modifies the language that Senator GORTON included in the Senate Interior Appropriations bill. My legislation will authorize acquisition of both facilities and will authorize the removal of the lower Elwha dam subject to the availability of appropriations. My bill also includes an independent scientific review on the benefits of removal prior to removal of the upper Glines dam so that whatever decision we make is based on good, sound science.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly share Senator GORTON's concerns that the actions taken on the Elwha dam set absolutely no precedent on dam removal on the Columbia or Snake Rivers or their tributaries. For that reason, my bill specifically states that dam removal on the Elwha River will not set a precedent on the Columbia or Snake River systems. Finally, my bill provides that no hydroelectric facility can be removed or significantly modified structurally without congressional approval.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that, as we work out the final details on the Interior Appropriations bill that you will consider the bill I introduced today as a balanced solution to restoring salmon on the Elwha River.

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

Mr. WHITE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. I am familiar with it, and I certainly will look with interest at his suggestions and look forward to working with him in an effort to keep the Elwha project moving ahead.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the gentleman for all of his very successful work during his chairmanship to prioritize funding for the National Park Service, especially for the crown jewels of the service, our national parks.

Under the gentleman's leadership, the National Park System has continued to see increased funding that has helped to mitigate terrible backlogs in operations and maintenance in all of the National Park Service units.

As the gentleman knows, my congressional district is home to one of our oldest national parks, Mt. Rainier. In fact, Mt. Rainier will turn 100 years old in March of 1999 and has been the recipient of much-needed funds to take care of severe maintenance backlog and construction needs.

Unfortunately, it is far too difficult for the average park enthusiast to find out how much money his or her favorite park needs in any given year. Separating the funding of the national parks into its own category would make it much easier for the public to track the annual funding levels.

On January 7, 1997, I introduced the Crown Jewel National Parks Act to accomplish this common sense reform.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, however, the gentleman has the authority to require that the administration create a separate category for all project funding requests for our 54 national parks.

If I am correct, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the gentleman instruct the administration to make this change beginning in the next fiscal year. This change will give the public the ability to more clearly see how their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

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

Ms. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Yes, that is true. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior, I do have the authority to require that the administration separate national park funding from the other units under the National Park Service.

I am pleased that the gentlewoman from Washington brought this to my attention and agree that creating a separate category for the national parks will greatly benefit the ability of the public to understand what is happening. In addition, it will enable them to more easily discover that this Congress is committed to taking care of what we have in the public trust.

This year, we have again increased the operating budget of the National Park Service. Under this bill, the National Park Service will receive $99.3 million more than last year.

This subcommittee will continue to make every effort to spend the taxpayers' dollar wisely and exercise appropriate fiscal constraint in carrying out programs financed by the public. We will also continue to encourage the

administration to do the same as they compile and submit their budget to Congress.

The gentlewoman from Washington State has my assurance that I will make this request of the administration before the next budget cycle begins.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman and congratulate him on his fine work in increasing the budget of the National Park Service.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior in a colloquy regarding the language to encourage the U.S. Forest Service to continue the Pinhoti Trail into the Cohutta region of the Chattahoochee National Forest in the State of Georgia.

In the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995, I was successful in allocating funds for construction of the Pinhoti Trail in the Armuchee Division of the forest. As the population of Atlanta continues to grow, the Pinhoti Trail has become a high-use recreational area. This trail is now overused, so we really need to see that it is extended.

Does the committee encourage that the Pinhoti Trail be continued in the Cohutta region of the Chattahoochee National Forest?

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, let me say before responding that we have put substantial funding in the trails generally, and I am a strong proponent of trails.

As I mentioned earlier, we, this year, thanks to leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and past years, we are making the final payment on the Appalachian Trail, and I think it ends in Georgia, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. It either ends or begins, whichever way you look at it.

Mr. REGULA. That is, the glass is half full or half empty.

The gentleman understands that there are limited resources available to the committee. However, due to the increasing population growth in Georgia, we will encourage the U.S. Forest Service to consider extending the Pinhoti Trail into the Cohutta region of the Chattahoochee National Forest.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains an historic agreement that has been worked out over many months of negotiations that permanently eliminates the Purchaser Road Credit program that currently subsidizes timber companies to build logging roads in our national forests. As a result, I and others will oppose other amendments to this section this year.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman, a gentleman for whom I have the greatest admiration and respect, for his willingness to participate and carry this provision in this bill and I want to thank Members on both sides of this issue who have spent a great deal of time and effort, and most particularly their staff members who have done such a fine job in working this out.

Katharine Fisher of my staff spent many, many hours in negotiations, as did many others, to carefully craft this agreement. I believe that it is historic in its achievements, and I thank the chairman for his patience and willingness to help us enact it into law.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, am I correct that our intention in reaching this agreement on Forest Service roads in section 330 is to change who pays for the construction and reconstructions of roads necessary to access timber sales in our national forests by eliminating the Purchaser Credit Program?

No longer will it be the responsibility of U.S. taxpayers but rather the timber purchasers themselves will pay for the construction and reconstructions of roads needed to access their national forest timber sales?

Further, is it our intention that those roads constructed and reconstructed by timber purchasers will continue to comply with all environmental laws and minimize the impact on natural resource values, such as water quality?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, do we also intend that the Secretary may not require timber purchasers to pay for the construction and reconstruction of roads beyond those standards used for timber roads, such as for recreation or for frequent use, without compensating the timber purchaser?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations to enter into a colloquy to discuss legislation of particular importance to me and many of my colleagues, the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be very pleased to join in a discussion with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman knows, the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act would provide safeguard for this Nation's precious and delicate migratory bird population. This program fosters nontraditional partnerships among the business community, nongovernmental organizations and Western Hemisphere nations.

Joining private enterprise with international environmental organizations combines their capital and know-how needed for a successful venture. Partnering these entities with local organizations in the targeted countries encourages and trains local people to carry out the preservation of habitat critical to migratory birds.

In the event that this legislation is enacted before the bill is conferenced with the Senate, I would like to request that consideration be given to funding by the conferees. However, if that is not the case, I would encourage the Department of Interior to consider the funding of this program a priority in its fiscal year 2000 budget.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the many challenges you face in balancing competing needs and projects in the Interior bill but I would like to emphasize the importance this program plays in arresting the decline of our Nation's neotropical migratory bird population.

□ 1915

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with this. I have martins that come visit us every summer, and, of course, they migrate to South America. So this kind of thing affects the bird population that moves back and forth between North and South America.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania points out, there are many competing demands on the limited funds in this bill, but I do recognize the importance of protecting the Neotropical migratory bird population. While we cannot meet every request, as evidenced by these three books with letters from Members, I assure the gentleman that I will work with the gentleman and the Department of Interior to ensure appropriate funding for the program once the legislation is enacted.

I might say I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) on making this effort. I think it is very important.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the commitment and support of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), who, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), have been two of the people who worked the hardest to try to bring their vision of reform to the National Forest system, to ensure sustainability, to ensure the fact that timber roads are built properly, that we have the highest environmental standards and that we improve these roads and protect our natural heritage.

I regret very much that the gentleman and I have not always seen eye to eye, but I regret the fact he is not going to be with us next year. I have enjoyed working with the gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me just thank my good friend from Washington (Mr. DICKS). Everyone in the country listening to the debate should understand that there is no one in the Congress of the United States that is responsible for cutting down more trees than the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. No, that is not true.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his phenomenal victory that he has been able to maintain over the course of the last many, many years in this body.

But, on a serious note, we ought to recognize a great warrior in politics, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) certainly fulfills that description. His defense of making certain that we do have proper forestry management in this country is something that I have come to understand better because of the debates that he has fostered on the House floor, and it is important for those of us who want to protect our Nation's forests to understand that our forests have to be managed.

But also it is important for us to make certain that we are not providing taxpayer subsidies to lumber companies that do not need them, lumber companies that have made tremendous profits as a result of the largess of the taxpayers and the people of our Nation and the national heritage of our country, which has the most phenomenal and beautiful forests of any country on the face of the Earth.

I recognize that we need to strike a balance in terms of the types of policies and recognize that it does take taxpayer revenues to support the management of our forests, and we ought to be honest and the Forest Service ought to be honest about what accounts they really need to have, and how much money they need to have, in order to properly manage our forests.

If there are roads that need to be improved, if there are damaged areas of our forest that need to be tended to, if there are fire roads that need to be built, we ought to build those roads, and we ought to put the money in the account that the Forest Service needs. But what we ought not to do is turn around and give subsidies to lumber companies that simply do not need them. Far too often in the past we have commingled those funds and had a complete misunderstanding about what actually we were paying for.

I believe that the administration's policy, which I know the chairman of the committee has now gone along with, as well as my friend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), which gets rid of the purchase-a-road credit program, which suspends the forest subsidies, the lumber subsidies we were giving to the timber companies, which recognizes that we ought to have and continue this moratorium into the future, until we get an honest accounting of what in fact the Forest Service needs and what they do not need.

I have never backed away from asking for taxpayer dollars for legitimate needs of the people of this country. Where there are legitimate needs of our forests, we ought to provide the funding. But we ought not to be mixing up and providing funding to lumber companies that are simply using subsidies that they do not need in order to make more and more profits.

I want to commend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) for the efforts they have made, and also want to say the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) has an amendment which is coming up which I believe will once again highlight some of the discrepancies and issues that need to be addressed further in order to clarify exactly what accounts we ought to be putting money in and what accounts we should not be putting money in.

I do want to thank my good friend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and recognize the great contribution he makes.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and compliment all the parties and the goodwill of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). We had a spirited debate on this issue last year, as we all know, and I think we have reached a reasonable compromise. I hope that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) will look at the numbers. I think we have done in the bill much of what the gentleman is suggesting there in terms of funding reconstruction of roads, trying to improve forest health, and making the forest a viable part of our Nation's recreation resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the forest is a viable part of our Nation's recreational resource, as well as a source of wood fiber under proper circumstances. Unfortunately, I will not be able to use my two-by-four as evidence this year, so I will point out, so I have not wasted all this time, that the price of a two-by-four eight feet long has gone in 10 years from $1.75 to $3.09, so that has an impact on the cost of housing.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to point out once again that that poor old piece of board that the gentleman is holding there that came from some lovely tree that was growing in one of our Nation's wonderful forests did not end up in fact costing a whole lot more. What ended up costing a lot more was the profits to the lumber company, was the profits to the guys that are cutting the trees, was the profits to the guys that are marketing that lumber, and none of it went to the taxpayer. But we could have this debate all over again, if the gentleman wants to get into it.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of points in the bill that we expect to get to in conference that I hoped I might be able to discuss with the chairman of the subcommittee.

In particular the bill already includes, Mr. Chairman, as you know, an increase in funding for the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System. I strongly support that increase, among other reasons because it is my understanding that such sites as the Rocky Mountain Arsenal Refuge and the Two Ponds Refuge, both located in the metropolitan Denver area, would be examples of the kind of refuges that would benefit from this increase. I hope the chairman can confirm my view in that respect.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The increase provides for addressing operational and maintenance backlog requirements for all the refuges.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments on that. I also anticipate that the gentleman's bill will pass and we will get to conference, and anticipate this is something that may come up when we do reach conference with the Senate. Section 118 of the Senate bill addresses funds transferred for activities aimed at the recovery of endangered fish species in the upper Colorado River Basin and the San Juan River Basin, and limits what is termed the overhead that can be charged against those funds.

I hope the chairman would review this matter when we do go to conference to see if a similar provision could be included in the final version of the bill, which I think would be a good idea.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, of course, the gentleman will be a conferee, and I think we will all be pleased to take a closer look at this provision in the conference.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's consideration, and thank him for the opportunity to have this conversation.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues, who I know are waiting patiently to offer further amendments to this bill, that I rise for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman, who a year ago at this time worked long and hard with me and other concerned Members of Congress on a bicameral and bipartisan basis to secure the congressional authorization and appropriation of $260 million to do a major forest land acquisition in my congressional district. The forest land in question includes the acreage known as the Headwaters Forest, one of the last if not the last unentered, unlogged stand of old growth redwood and Douglas fir forest land in private ownership.

We believed a year ago, as we believe today, that this is a very important land acquisition for the American people, worthy of Federal taxpayer support. The agreement also included participation by the State of California government and by State taxpayers to the tune of $130 million in order to consummate this particular acquisition.

Again, I want to emphasize to my colleagues how important the chairman's leadership was on this issue and how diligently and for many, many days we worked, again on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, to secure the necessary congressional approvals for this agreement.

In light of that, Mr. Chairman, I am very dismayed that the State government has not approved their share of the funding to date. In fact, as we meet and deliberate this annual spending bill, the State legislature and the Governor of California, Pete Wilson, continue in deliberations over the State budget for the fiscal year 1999 that was due on July 1st of this particular year.

Mr. Chairman, I want to confirm tonight through this colloquy my understanding that the Headwaters Forest, or this forest land acquisition, was, again, only agreed to after many, many weeks of negotiations among the gentleman's committee, the authorizing committees, the staff that worked very hard on this particular provision of last year's Interior appropriations spending bill, and the Clinton Administration, and that the terms and conditions of this proposed acquisition are fair to all parties, including the private landowners who are party to this agreement.

Mr. Chairman, is it your intention to change any of these conditions or deadlines that are called for in the agreement that was inserted into last year's Interior appropriations spending bill and, therefore, effectively codified into law?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague that these negotiations were very difficult, and, of course, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) played a major role in achieving an agreement. But, in the end, we struck an agreement that addressed the concerns of all parties.

Let me assure my colleague, I will not support any efforts by the administration or the Congress to change any of the deadlines that were negotiated as part of this very costly and very controversial acquisition.

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I know that we had to convince the chairman that this acquisition was worthwhile to get his personal support, and, again, Federal taxpayer funding in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

So I would ask the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) to again confirm my understanding: Before the Federal Government provides the $260 million that was authorized and appropriated for the Headwaters Forest acquisition, including $10 million in mitigation to the local government in Humbolt County, California, that the State of California is required to provide $130 million as its share of this acquisition.

As I mentioned, currently certain legislators, the Democratic leadership of the California State legislature, are holding up funding for Headwaters in an effort to obtain further environmental concessions beyond those agreed to by the Federal Government and the State of California Government, in conjunction with the property owner.

Therefore I am rising tonight, Mr. Chairman, to express that concern that these efforts will in fact kill the agreement that was worked out a year ago, and I would like to know if the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) shares these concerns?

□ 1930

Mr. REGULA. I agree with the gentleman that it would be a shame if this agreement falls apart after all the laborious negotiations because some people wish to make changes at the eleventh hour.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, once again I want to thank the gentleman for his help and his vision and his good counsel.

I will wrap up very briefly by saying I really believe this is our last best chance to see this particular forest land acquisition become a reality. I am concerned when I see newspaper headlines, and I intend to insert these articles in the RECORD under general leave, but I am concerned when I see newspaper headlines as recently published: "Activists' Demands Jeopardize Deal for Headwaters Forest;" "Headwaters Forest Plan Has Politicians at Loggerheads," again referring to the State budget deliberations in Sacramento.

[From the Press Democrat, June 29, 1998]

ACTIVISTS' DEMANDS JEOPARDIZE DEAL FOR HEADQUARTERS

(By Mike Geniella)

As recently as late February, negotiators trying to complete public purchase of the target tract of ancient redwoods in private ownership were patting themselves on the back, confident the North Coast's longest running environmental controversy had been resolved.

Four months later, a $380 million agreement to buy Headquarters Forest from Pacific Lumber Co. is on the verge of collapse, the result of the increased demands by environmental leaders who felt frozen out of the process and vanishing patience on the part of a tough Texas tycoon who owns the trees.

At stake is the future of 3,000 acres of old growth redwoods in southern Humboldt County that have become a national symbol of environmental problems and, for environmentalists, a harbinger of a "mass extinction" of plants and animals that some wildlife biologists say is already underway.

Originally destined to be turned into lumber Headwaters Forest helped galvanize antilogging protests in the early 90s and prompted Sen. Dianne Feinstein D-Calif., and the Clinton administration to make the controversy a personal challenge. After months of tough negotiations, Feinstein eventually brokered a purchase arrangement with Pacific Lumber that would create a 7,500-acre redwood preserve with Headwaters as it centerpiece.

But environmentalists, who were not privy to most of the negotiations, felt shut out of the process and now are demanding further review of the settlement.

Sierra Club representative Elyssa Rosen said because critical environmental provisions were negotiated behind closed doors,

"The loopholes in the deal are so big you could drive a logging truck through them.

Environmentalists have enlisted the support of Democrat state legislators, including Assemblywoman Virginia Strom-Martin of Duncans Mills, who are now holding up the state's $130 million share of the purchase price in hopes of increasing protections for 200,000 acres of other redwoods owned by Pacific Lumber.

"Proponents are saying adequate protections are there, but we really don't know that," said Strom-Martin.

To Pacific Lumber officials, criticism of the agreement is simply another example of a familiar political gambit in which environmentalists seek and get concessions, then up the ante again, knowing that in the meantime Headwaters trees are not being cut.

"They keep moving the goal posts," Charles Hurwitz, whose Maxxam Inc. owns Pacific Lumber, complained earlier this year.

Pilloried by environmentalists for not agreeing to more environmental safeguards, Hurwitz and Pacific Lumber are also coming under fire from their own industry for making too many concessions to state and federal agencies, which industry executives fear will become standard for all.

Meanwhile, Feinstein and other public officials who support the pact are increasingly frustrated, arguing that if it is not consummated soon, any practical chance of permanently protecting Headwaters may be lost.

"This is it. We're not going to get another chance," said Feinstein.

The senator, who presided over the Washington, D.C. talks on behalf of the Clinton administration, said last week that she's deeply concerned that the agreement might collapse if critics persist in their tactics.

"If this agreement fails at the state level, it will send a very strong signal to the federal government. I can assure you a $250 million congressional authorization to protect Headwaters won't happen again," said Feinstein.

Saying she's respectful of state lawmakers' concerns Feinstein said, "I truly hope we can find a way to work this out. But the bottom line is that time is marching on, and if we don't do this deal now, it will never be done."

Representatives of the Wilson administration say the same political stopwatch is running at the state level.

"If the Legislature doesn't include the state funding in this year's budget, the chances are virtually nil we can ever resolve this controversy," said state Resources Secretary Doug Wheeler.

Hurwitz representatives said last week they're done dealing.

"We've negotiated this deal over many, many months, and along the way won bipartisan support in Congress and approval from state and federal scientists. What more could anyone ask?" said Hurwitz spokesman Bob Irelan.

If the Headwaters deal falters, Pacific Lumber and Hurwitz vow to renew claims in federal court that the government, through regulatory constraints, has effectively confiscated its old-growth timberlands.

Critics argue that Hurwitz couldn't possibly win such a case—known in legal parlance as a "takings" argument—because he still can derive economic benefit from Pacific Lumber's remaining timberlands.

But legal experts suggest the issues are more complex.

"Frankly, there continues to be a state of confusion surrounding the 'takings' issue," said Jerold Kaplan, a Harvard University professor and former senior fellow at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy in Cambridge, Mass.

Based on recent court cases, including Supreme Court rulings, Kaplan said, "Government still has the upper hand, and has since the 1920s. But there has been a slight shift in the direction of granting further protections to property owners since 1987, although I must emphasize slight," said Kaplan.

Hurwitz has hired a high-profile Southern California attorney who specializes in takings cases, and he's more sanguine about Pacific Lumber's chances, saying the company could win $500 million or more in damages if its takings lawsuit is pursued.

"What the critics don't get is that we're not alleging the government is ?????? ing regulatory restraints on our operation," said lawyer Michael Berger of Santa Monica. "What's wrong is that government is protecting the environment at the expense of a private property owner."

"The real issue is, who's going to pay for that protection?"

Environmentalists, however, argue that the stakes are so high that the Headwaters agreement must be modified.

State Sen. Byron Sher, a Palo Alto Democrat, said if the public looks beyond "the hype over the deal to save the Headwaters Forest, you'll see that taxpayers may not be getting their money's worth."

Outlining his position in a recent opinion piece, Sher said he believes the proposed 7,500-acre Headwaters preserve alone is not worth the $380 million price tag.

Sher argued the price can only be justified "if the public can be assured that the side agreement—a giant string attached to the purchase known as a habitat conservation plan—won't imperil the future of endangered species on Pacific Lumber's 200,000 acres.

Because funding of the state's $130 million share of the Headwaters deal is dependent on a required two-thirds majority in the Legislature, Sher is confident critics can muster enough votes to block legislative approval.

But Feinstein and other proponents argue it's unfair for Sher and his supporters to try to renegotiate key provisions of an agreement that was reached only after more than 100 hours of intense, face-to-face negotiations among state, federal and Pacific Lumber Co., representatives in Washington, D.C.

Wheeler, Pete Wilson's chief negotiator during the Headwaters talks, said he finds it "troubling that at this late date a few members of the Legislature are attempting to substitute their judgment for that of state and federal scientists who have negotiated very stringent requirements."

According to Wheeler, the choice is clear.

"Either legislators seize the opportunity now, or lose it for all time to come," he said.

Ultimately, for environmentalists, the question may be whether no deal is better than a bad deal.

"That's a tough call," said the Sierra Club's Rosen. "I think most parties would really like to see the agreement go forward. But the Sierra Club is going to have to see something better on the table before we can support state approval."

[From the San Jose Mercury News, July 18, 1998]

HEADWATERS FOREST PLAN HAS POLITICIANS AT LOGGERHEADS

SAYING IT'S NOT ENOUGH, SHER HOLDS UP AGREEMENT

(By Paul Rogers)

For the past 12 years, environmental activists have chained themselves to trees and hung off the Golden Gate Bridge trying to save the ancient redwoods of Northern California's Headwaters Forest from logging.

Yet in perhaps the most important showdown yet, the struggle has moved away from the TV cameras and the police in riot gear to a new arena: Gov. Pete Wilson's office.

And now it's crunch time.

A $380 million deal to buy 7,500 acres of the forest from Pacific Lumber Co. of Humboldt County is tangled up in negotiations this weekend among "The Big Five"—Wilson and the top Sacramento lawmakers haggling over the state's budget.

One person more than any other is responsible for holding up the redwood deal: state Sen. Byron Sher, D–Redwood City. And environmentalists couldn't be happier.

Congress already has approved $250 million for the deal. The remaining $130 million must come from Sacramento.

But the deal shortchanges taxpayers and doesn't go far enough to protect salmon streams or old-growth trees, Sher says. So, the 70-year-old Standford University law professor, widely viewed as the environmental dean of the Legislature, earlier this year succeeded in pulling the state's $130 million share out of the budget, where Wilson wanted it. Instead, Sher wrote a separate bill demanding tougher logging rules across the Pacific Lumber's remaining 200,000 acres as a condition of receiving the money.

But he has found himself caught in a powerful bipartisan squeeze from Wilson—California's most powerful Republican—and U.S. Sen. Dianne Feinstein—the state's most powerful Democrat—both of whom painstakingly negotiated the deal with Pacific Lumber owner Charles Hurwitz and now want to see it survive.

"It's high noon for this deal," said Carl Pope, national executive director of the Sierra Club. "Byron Sher is under a tremendous amount of pressure. I'm delighted he has been firm."

The question now is who will blink. The answer could come any day now. Wilson and the Republicans could go along with Sher and require the tougher standards. That could happen under a scenario where Wilson compromises on Headwaters to win from Democrats his top goal, a cut in the state's car licensing fees. But one risk is that Hurwitz will walk away from the table. Or top Democratic negotiators—Senate President Pro Tem John Burton, D-San Francisco, and Assembly Speaker Antonio Villaraigosa, D-Los Angeles—could abandon Sher, cutting a deal with Wilson that gives them what they want on issues such as education funding.

Environmental and timber lobbyists have spent weeks frenetically trying to sway lawmakers.

"Of course I'm nervous," said John Campbell, president of Pacific Lumber, based in Scotia, near Eureka. "We've spent over 10 years at this. And now at the 11th hour people are saying it's not enough."

Sher's bill, said Campbell "is too restrictive. The company could not remain economically viable."

Feinstein also says Sher is driving too hard a bargain.

"There have been at least 10 separate efforts to save Headwaters over the last 12 years," she said, describing herself as "incredulous." "Every one of them has failed. This saves virtually more redwood than any other effort I know of."

If Sher keeps pushing for a stricter deal, she said, that could endanger $250 million in federal money already approved by Congress and signed by President Clinton.

FUNDS COVETED

"There are murmurs back here from other senators about what they would like to do with the money instead," said Feinstein. "I can say 100 percent that if this doesn't go through, then the federal money is gone. I feel I've done everything I could over a long period of time to get the best I could. At some point people have to trust that and recognize that."

Headwaters Forest, 15 miles south of Eureka, is the world's largest privately owned old-growth redwood forest. It has been a flash point of national controversy since 1985, when Hurwitz, chairman of Houston-based Maxxam Inc., acquired Pacific Lumber in a hostile takeover, doubled the rate of logging and threatened to clear-cut Headwaters Grove.

After huge protests, Feinstein and other officials reached an agreement with Hurwitz in 1996 to buy 7,500 acres—about half of it old growth—for parkland.

The deal also requires Pacific Lumber to prepare a "habitat conservation plan" for managing its remaining 200,000 acres of forest during the next 50 years.

This week, details emerged in a 2,000-page document from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, negotiated with Pacific Lumber.

The plan calls for banning logging within 30 feet of endangered salmon streams. By contrast, Sher's bill calls for 170-foot buffer zones.

And although the plan would preserve 11 smaller old-growth groves, Sher wants another, Owl Creek.

He said he's not scuttling any deal, just representing the taxpayers of California.

"I know that Senator Feinstein has invested a lot in this," Sher said. "She deserves credit for getting the agreement. And she was instrumental in getting the appropriation.

"But I don't believe I was elected by my constituents to rubber-stamp a deal that was made behind closed doors in Washington. The Legislature had no influence over it, and then they say OK, give us $130 million."

If he were almost any other Senate member, Sher probably would have been steamrollered by now.

But on environmental topics, he carries considerable influence.

As an assemblyman in 1988, Sher wrote the state's Clean Air Act. In 1989 he wrote the law that required California cities and counties to reduce by 50 percent their trash, through recycling, by 2000. He also has written laws to toughen drinking water standards, monitor acid rain and put scenic rivers off limits to dams.

"We have a responsibility to see if this is a good deal for the state of California," said Sher. "And frankly it has serious flaws in it, particularly in protecting coho salmon."

So far, Sher appears to be winning.

In a key test on Thursday, Republican Cathie Wright of Simi Valley attempted to put the $130 million in Headwaters money back in the budget bill. She was rebuffed by budget conference committee Chairman Mike Thompson, D-Napa.

DEAL IS POSSIBLE

Thompson, who is running for Congress this November to represent the North Coast district that includes Headwaters Forest, signed on two weeks ago as a co-sponsor to Sher's bill.

"Senator Thompson thinks the Sher bill makes the agreement stronger," said Ed Matovcik, chief of staff for Thompson.

Meanwhile, Wilson's staff hinted on Friday that he may be willing to wheel and deal on Headwaters.

"It has been the administration's preference to pay for the Headwaters agreement out of the general fund," said Ron Low, a spokesman for the governor. "That's the governor's preference. But as to any deals, negotiations are ongoing."

To approve the funding in any form will require a two-thirds vote of the Legislature.

If the entire deal collapses, environmentalists will be in court fighting Hurwitz on each timber cutting plan. They say that would be better than the precedent-setting deal.

But the company says having the deal fall through would be a disaster.

"I just hope the issue is put to bed," said Campbell. "It's crucial to our 1,500 employees. It will finish a very divisive period on the North Coast. Otherwise, we're back to square one."

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman sharing my concerns and supporting me in entering into this colloquy so that hopefully, we can send a message to our counterparts in Sacramento that they need to get the job done and we should not miss this opportunity, because it is, in fact, our last best opportunity to make this forest land acquisition a reality.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington, the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, let me just say this to my friend from California. We had a major debate a few years ago on the Riggs amendment. I stood up and urged that the company develop a multi-specie habitat conservation plan.

Now, they negotiated for 2 years with the Federal Government. This is the most difficult negotiation that I can think of. I think the standards here are the highest in the entire country, including some of the standards that are developed in Washington State and are going to be imposed in this agreement.

So I think the company, the Pacific Lumber Company, has been acting in complete good faith, and I would just hope that the legislature in California would provide the resources that they have committed from the State in order to bring this together. If anybody thinks that the standards here of a multi-specie agency are not really high, they just do not understand what is required under the Endangered Species Act.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIGGS was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is almost miraculous that they made it, and I hope that we can put this together, because I think it is a good agreement.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time and finishing this colloquy, I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments and I appreciate him joining with me and the chairman in sending that bipartisan message to Sacramento.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, $197,444,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities, $156,167,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, and for administrative expenses associated with the management of funds provided under the headings "Forest and Rangeland Research", "State and Private Forestry", "National Forest System", "Wildland Fire Management", "Reconstruction and Construction", and "Land Acquisition", $1,231,421,000, to remain available until expended, which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, in accordance with section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 460l-6a(i)).

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and waters, $631,737,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes.

RECONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, $271,444,000, to remain available until expended for construction, reconstruction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities, and for construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532-538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided*, That up to $15,000,000 of the funds provided herein for road maintenance shall be available for the planned obliteration of roads which are no longer needed: *Provided further*, That the Forest Service may make an advance of up to $200,000 from the funds provided under this heading in this Act and up to $800,000 provided under this heading in Public Law 105-83 to the city of Colorado Springs, Colorado for the design and reconstruction of the Pikes Peak Summit House in accordance with terms and conditions agreed to.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C.

4601–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, $30,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, $1,069,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the sixteen Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94–579, as amended, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $92,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (1) purchase of not to exceed 177 passenger motor vehicles of which 22 will be used primarily for law enforcement purposes and of which 176 shall be for replacement; acquisition of 25 passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft, the purchase of not to exceed two for replacement only, and acquisition of sufficient aircraft from excess sources to maintain the operable fleet at 198 aircraft for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed $100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and (7) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

None of the funds made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended to abolish any region, to move or close any regional office for National Forest System administration of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture without the advance consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development and the Foreign Agricultural Service in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States and international organizations.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or 7 U.S.C. 147b unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report 105–163.

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the procedures contained in House Report 105–163.

No funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture without the approval of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be used to disseminate program information to private and public individuals and organizations through the use of nonmonetary items of nominal value and to provide nonmonetary awards of nominal value and to incur necessary expenses for the nonmonetary recognition of private individuals and organizations that make contributions to Forest Service programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter money collected, in advance or otherwise, by the Forest Service under authority of section 101 of Public Law 93–153 (30 U.S.C. 185(1)) as reimbursement of administrative and other costs incurred in processing pipeline right-of-way or permit applications and for costs incurred in monitoring the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of any pipeline and related facilities, may be used to reimburse the applicable appropriation to which such costs were originally charged.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be available to conduct a program of not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended by Public Law 93–408.

None of the funds available in this Act shall be used for timber sale preparation using clearcutting in hardwood stands in excess of 25 percent of the fiscal year 1989 harvested volume in the Wayne National Forest, Ohio: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to hardwood stands damaged by natural disaster: *Provided further*, That landscape architects shall be used to maintain a visually pleasing forest.

Any money collected from the States for fire suppression assistance rendered by the Forest Service on non-Federal lands not in the vicinity of National Forest System lands shall hereafter be used to reimburse the applicable appropriation and shall remain available until expended as the Secretary may direct in conducting activities authorized by 16 U.S.C. 2101 note, 2101–2110, 1606, and 2111.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, $1,500 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter the Forest Service is authorized to employ or otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay, as determined by the Service, to perform work occasioned by emergencies such as fires, storms, floods, earthquakes or any other unavoidable cause without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and the regular workweek.

To the greatest extent possible, and in accordance with the Final Amendment to the Shawnee National Forest Plan, none of the funds available in this Act shall be used for preparation of timber sales using clearcutting or other forms of even-aged management in hardwood stands in the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101–593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to $2,250,000 may be advanced in a lump sum as Federal financial assistance to the National Forest Foundation, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for administrative expenses or projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than $400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds: *Provided further*, That hereafter, the National Forest Foundation may hold Federal funds made available but not immediately disbursed and may use any interest or other investment income earned (before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act) on Federal funds to carry out the purposes of Public Law 101–593: *Provided further*, That such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98–244, up to $2,225,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service shall be available for matching funds to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3701–3709, and may be advanced in a lump sum as Federal financial assistance, without regard to when expenses are incurred, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least a one-for-one basis funds advanced by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a non-

Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities for sustainable rural development purposes.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 80 percent of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service in the "National Forest System" and "Reconstruction and Construction" accounts and planned to be allocated to activities under the "Jobs in the Woods" program for projects on National Forest land in the State of Washington may be granted directly to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife for accomplishment of planned projects. Twenty percent of said funds shall be retained by the Forest Service for planning and administering projects. Project selection and prioritization shall be accomplished by the Forest Service with such consultation with the State of Washington as the Forest Service deems appropriate.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to sections 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99-663.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as appropriate with the Pinchot Institute for Conservation, as well as with public and other private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals, to provide for the development, administration, maintenance, or restoration of land, facilities, or Forest Service programs, at the Grey Towers National Historic Landmark: *Provided*, That, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, any such public or private agency, organization, institution, or individual may solicit, accept, and administer private gifts of money and real or personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the activities and services at the Grey Towers National Historic Landmark: *Provided further*, That such gifts may be accepted notwithstanding the fact that a donor conducts business with the Department of Agriculture in any capacity.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available, as determined by the Secretary, for payments to Del Norte County, California, pursuant to sections 13(e) and 14 of the Smith River National Recreation Area Act (Public Law 101-612).

For purposes of the Southeast Alaska Economic Disaster Fund as set forth in section 101(c) of Public Law 104-134, the direct grants provided in subsection (c) shall be considered direct payments for purposes of all applicable law except that these direct grants may not be used for lobbying activities.

No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

The amount obligated during fiscal year 1999 from the Knutson-Vandenberg fund provided in section 3 of the Act of June 9, 1930 (commonly known as the Knutson-Vandenberg Act; 16 U.S.C. 576b), for indirect support activities (as defined in the Forest Service Handbook) may not exceed 25 percent of total amount obligated from such fund during such fiscal year.

The amount obligated during fiscal year 1999 from the timber salvage sale fund provided in section 14(h) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(h)) for indirect support activities (as defined in the Forest Service Handbook) may not exceed 25 percent of total amount obligated from such fund during such fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), performed under the minerals and materials science programs at the Albany Research Center in Oregon, $320,558,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas.

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PRODUCTION (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Moneys received as investment income on the principal amount in the Great Plains Project Trust at the Norwest Bank of North Dakota, in such sums as are earned as of October 1, 1998, shall be deposited in this account and immediately transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. Moneys received as revenue sharing from operation of the Great Plains Gasification Plant shall be immediately transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For necessary expenses in carrying out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, $14,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the requirements of 10 U.S.C. 7430(b)(2)(B) shall not apply to fiscal year 1999: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available pursuant to the first proviso under this head in Public Law 101-512 shall be immediately available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out energy conservation activities, $630,250,000, to remain available until expended, including, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the excess amount for fiscal year 1999 determined under the provisions of section 3003(d) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4502): *Provided*, That $150,000,000 shall be for use in energy conservation programs as defined in section 3008(3) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4507) and shall not be available until excess amounts are determined under the provisions of section 3003(d) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4502): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 3003(d)(2) of Public Law 99-509 such sums shall be allocated to the eligible programs as follows: $120,000,000 for weatherization assistance grants and $30,000,000 for State energy conservation grants.

ECONOMIC REGULATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, $1,801,000, to remain available until expended.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), $160,120,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, $68,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Appropriations under this Act for the current fiscal year shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; and reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services.

From appropriations under this Act, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

None of the funds made available to the Department of Energy under this Act shall be used to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriations Act.

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, private or foreign: *Provided*, That revenues and other moneys received by or for the account of the Department of Energy or otherwise generated by sale of products in connection with projects of the Department appropriated under this Act may be retained by the Secretary of Energy, to be available until expended, and used only for plant construction, operation, costs, and payments to cost-sharing entities as provided in appropriate cost-sharing contracts or agreements: *Provided further*, That the remainder of revenues after the making of such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That any contract, agreement, or provision thereof entered into by the Secretary pursuant to this authority shall not be executed prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full comprehensive report on such project, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

No funds provided in this Act may be expended by the Department of Energy to prepare, issue, or process procurement documents for programs or projects for which appropriations have not been made.

In addition to other authorities set forth in this Act, the Secretary may accept fees and contributions from public and private sources, to be deposited in a contributed funds account, and prosecute projects using such fees and contributions in cooperation with other Federal, State or private agencies or concerns.

The Secretary, in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, shall continue the process begun in fiscal year 1998 of accepting funds from other Federal agencies in return for assisting agencies in achieving energy efficiency in

Federal facilities and operations by the use of privately financed, energy savings performance contracts and other private financing mechanisms. The funds may be provided after agencies begin to realize energy cost savings; may be retained by the Secretary until expended; and may be used only for the purpose of assisting Federal agencies in achieving greater efficiency, water conservation and use of renewable energy by means of privately financed mechanisms, including energy savings performance contracts and utility incentive programs. These recovered funds will continue to be used to administer even greater energy efficiency, water conservation and use of renewable energy by means of privately financed mechanisms such as utility efficiency service contracts and energy savings performance contracts. The recoverable funds will be used for all necessary program expenses, including contractor support and resources needed, to achieve overall Federal energy management program objectives for greater energy savings. Any such privately financed contracts shall meet the provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, Public Law 102-486 regarding energy savings performance contracts and utility incentive programs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, $1,932,953,000, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That $12,000,000 shall remain available until expended, for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund: *Provided further*, That $377,363,000 for contract medical care shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, up to $17,000,000 may be used to carry out the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts and grants which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total obligation is recorded in the year for which the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act (exclusive of planning, design, or construction of new facilities): *Provided further*, That funding contained herein, and in any earlier appropriations Acts for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000: *Provided further*, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts provided herein, not to exceed $194,781,000 shall be for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs associated with contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements between the Indian Health Service and a tribe or tribal organization pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, prior to or during fiscal year 1999.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, $313,175,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction or renovation of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land for sites to construct, improve, or enlarge health or related facilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and for uniforms or allowances therefore as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: *Provided*, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651-2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86-121 (the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act) and Public Law 93-638, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title III of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title III of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law: *Provided further*, That funds made available in this Act are to be apportioned to the Indian Health Service as appropriated in this Act, and accounted for in the appropriation structure set forth in this Act: *Provided further*, That with respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities, on a reimbursable basis, including payment in advance with subsequent adjustment, and the reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to the same or subsequent appropriation account which provided the funding, said amounts to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, heretofore and hereafter and notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available to the Indian Health Service in this Act or any other Act for Indian self-determination or self-governance contract or grant support costs may be expended only for costs directly attributable to contracts, grants and compacts pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act and no funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be available for any contract support costs or indirect costs associated with any contract, grant, cooperative agreement, self-governance compact, or funding agreement entered into between an Indian tribe or tribal organization and any entity other than the Indian Health Service: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter any funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this or any other Act for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs for contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements with the Indian Health Service pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, shall be allocated and distributed to such contracts, grants, self-governance compacts and annual funding agreements each year on a pro-rata proportionate basis regardless of amounts allocated in any previous year to such contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements: *Provided further*, That reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by

the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance: *Provided further*, That the appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93-531, $13,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: *Provided further*, That no relocatee will be provided with more than one new or replacement home: *Provided further*, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d-10.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease (for terms not to exceed 30 years), and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; up to 5 replacement passenger vehicles; purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees; $346,449,000, of which not to exceed $48,076,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, Museum Support Center equipment and move, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum of the American Indian, the repatriation of skeletal remains program, research equipment, information management, and Latino programming shall remain available until expended, and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers and a total of $125,000 for the Council of American Overseas Research Centers: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, by contract or otherwise, $4,500,000, to remain available until expended.

REPAIR AND RESTORATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair and restoration of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $44,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $4,500,000 is for the Security System Modernization Program: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or restoration of buildings of the Smithsonian Institution may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for construction, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to initiate the planning or design of any expansion of current space or new facility without the advance approval of both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to prepare a historic structures report, or for any other purpose, involving the Holt House located at the National Zoological Park in Washington D.C.

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to pay any judgment resulting from a complaint filed by Geddes, Brecher, Qualls & Cunningham in the United States Court of Federal Claims regarding the National Museum of the American Indian Mall Museum.

The Smithsonian Institution shall not use Federal funds in excess of the amount specified in Public Law 101-185 for the construction of the National Museum of the American Indian.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, $57,938,000 of which not to exceed $3,026,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all functions and activities of the National Gallery of Art funded herein shall be subject to the requirements for a Federal entity under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 3).

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, as authorized, $6,311,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $12,187,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and rehabilitation of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,840,000.

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, $96,800,000, 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.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $13,900,000, to remain available until expended, of which $9,900,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(h): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of subsections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES

OFFICE OF MUSEUM SERVICES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out subtitle C of the Museum and Library Services Act of 1996, as amended, $23,405,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant

or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That funds from nonappropriated sources may be used as necessary for official reception and representation expenses.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), $898,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99-190 (20 U.S.C. 956(a)), as amended, $7,000,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Public Law 89-665, as amended), $2,800,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for compensation of level V of the Executive Schedule or higher positions.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,954,000: *Provided*, That all appointed members will be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Council, as authorized by Public Law 96-388 (36 U.S.C. 1401), as amended, $31,707,000, of which $1,575,000 for the museum's repair and rehabilitation program and $1,264,000 for the museum's exhibitions program shall remain available until expended.

PRESIDIO TRUST

PRESIDIO TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out Title I of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, $14,913,000 shall be available to the Presidio Trust, to remain available until expended. The Trust is authorized to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(d)(3) of the Act, in an amount not to exceed $25,000,000.

Mr. REGULA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 92, line 11 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENSIGN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENSIGN:

Page 56, line 2, after "$156,167,000" insert "(increased by $5,300,000)".

Page 40, line 14 after "$37,304,000" insert "(decreased by $5,300,000)".

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment because we need this extra money to go into this account so that we can bring this extra money to Lake Tahoe. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, which is a bistate agency, has said that we need $6 million for clarity improvement in Lake Tahoe.

First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recognize the efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee who has included $700,000 in the bill for erosion control around Lake Tahoe, and I know that the people of Nevada thank the chairman for doing this. However, I think that it is important to point out the dire situation Lake Tahoe is experiencing.

First let me say that I grew up at Lake Tahoe. It is a wonderful area and it is still. Even with the decrease in the quality of the clarity of the water, Lake Tahoe is still one of the jewels of the entire world. It is a place where people come from all over this country and literally around the world to see its magnificent beauty.

However, in the last 20 years the lake has lost 25 percent of its clarity. If one flies over Lake Tahoe, one used to be able to see so far down just from the naked eye from an airplane and be able to see huge boulders. There is a visible difference, just with the naked eye, where one can see the difference in the clarity in the last 20 years.

We are at a crossroads. Each sediment particle carries nutrients that spur algae growth in the lake, and this hurts the clarity. We all need to work together. Commitments have been made and it is time for Congress to step up to the plate in our efforts.

Lake Tahoe is an area rich in history and heritage, and we must protect the tranquility of not only the lake itself, but of the surrounding areas. Protection of environmentally sensitive lands and maintenance of water quality should be our highest priority.

The list of activities that are necessary to protect this natural pristine treasure is very long. Supporting this amendment and supplying this much-needed funding is the first step in our long journey to protect the lake.

Millions visit this Alpine community each year, while thousands of families call it home every day. Environmental groups and grassroots organizations have recognized the importance of immediate action to save Lake Tahoe, and just last year, the President and Vice President traveled to Lake Tahoe to personally listen to the challenges in protecting this national treasure.

Nevada, California, and the administration have made strong efforts to focus on the lake and take further actions, whatever actions are necessary for its preservation. It is time for the Members of this body to do the same and support this environmental initiative to save our beloved treasure before it is too late.

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

Mr. ENSIGN. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and commend him for his leadership role in helping to preserve Lake Tahoe and the environment surrounding it. The gentleman has been a leader on this issue during his term in the United States Congress and certainly all of us appreciate that.

There is no doubt that Lake Tahoe is a national treasure. In fact, over 130 years ago, Mark Twain, when he first crossed the Sierras and set gaze upon the Lake Tahoe Basin, said that Lake Tahoe was the fairest land in all the world, and that remains so today.

However, today the health of the lake is at risk. As my colleagues have heard, algae growth is reducing the visibility by more than 30 feet today in the lake. Algae growth is primarily due and responsible from erosional runoff. It is the health of the forest that is responsible for that algae growth due to runoff.

Today, one out of every three trees is either dead, dying or decayed, which sets up a rare fuel environment for wildland fire, which will have a catastrophic effect on not only the human loss of life in the area, but also property loss, as well as increasing the erosional runoff by an enormous proportion.

The resulting massive erosion will only add to the problems of the lake clarity. This money will go to improving the health of that forest, which will ultimately help the health of the lake as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I thank the gentleman from Nevada for his leadership on this issue.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the efforts of the gentlemen, both gentlemen from Nevada, to protect Lake Tahoe. In fact, it is in large part due to their efforts that the $700,000 appropriated in this bill for erosion control is the largest amount of money ever dedicated to this effort.

While I regret that I cannot support the gentleman's amendment, if he would agree to withdraw the amendment, I will work with him in conference to address his concerns.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the chairman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ENSIGN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, let me just close by saying that Lake Tahoe, let us not forget, is a place where people come from all over the world and

they think it is incredible beauty when they look at the lake. But those of us who grew up there and have been there for any length of time can see with our visible eye the decreasing clarity in the lake, and this is a treasure we cannot afford to lose. It is too important.

So I appreciate the work that the chairman is going to do on behalf of Lake Tahoe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. REGULA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ENSIGN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me briefly, I was interested in both of the gentleman's comments about apparently unification taking place in the lake. Is it caused by runoff from the surrounding national forests bringing nutrients in?

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, there are several causes for the increase in the clarity. The nutrients that are coming in due to erosion is probably one of the biggest parts. There is also, unfortunately, from northern California the air pollution coming over the Sierras is also causing the nitrogen to get down, which is food for the algae. So there are two problems that are really kind of almost exacerbating each other and decreasing clarity is the result.

So we need to work on this. Erosion control is a very important part, but we also need it in other places.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this time to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. FURSE

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. FURSE:

Page 56, line 18, insert before the period at the end the following: : *Provided*, That, of the funds made available in this paragraph, $130,176,000 shall be for timber sales management, $87,654,000 shall be for watershed improvements, and $168,018,000 shall be for recreation management.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do is tell my colleagues what this amendment does.

This amendment takes $80.5 million from the timber management line item and the National Forest Service section of the Interior Appropriations bill and it reallocates that money to watershed improvement and recreational management.

Let me also say what it does not do. It does not cut money for road maintenance; it does not eliminate the Federal commercial timber program; it does not affect forest stewardship or personal use sales, and it does not prevent Americans from obtaining fire wood and Christmas trees.

How did I arrive at the $80.5 million? That number is derived from adding together the money lost, lost, I repeat, on commercial timber sales in individual forests in all nine Forest Service regions. I added them together and we have a total of $80.5 million. It allocates that money to some things that will really improve our forests.

What does it do? It allocates money to restoration, to restoration of watershed. Why do we do that? Because not only are watersheds vital to drinking water supply, they are critical to the survival and restoration of healthy fish populations in the West and in other parts of the country.

It puts money to recreation management; $20 million is sent to recreational management, because recreation is going to be more and more the use of our national forests, and we need to get our Forest Service ready and able to deal with that. Recreation is a huge contributor. It contributes over $105 billion to the GDP, or nearly 85 percent of the total forest system contribution. It results in over 2.7 million jobs.

Mr. Chairman, a study by the American Sports Fishing Association says that angling in the national forests generates $8.1 billion. Fishing and other wildlife activities generate more than $200,000 of full-time equivalent jobs in the United States.

So my amendment is sensible; it is environmentally sensible, and it is economically sensible.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell my colleagues why I am not alone in thinking that. I have here over 40, 40 editorials from national newspapers across the country supporting the Furse amendment. Organizations and groups have worked together to support this amendment.

Now, I believe that the national forest is getting on the right track. I believe that it is going that way. However, I think that we need to go a little further.

Now, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, sometimes circumstances, circumstances make having the right thing happen impossible, despite goodwill and good intentions. When I joined this Congress, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) said to me, he said, "You know, Elizabeth, victory comes not to the pretty, but to the persistent."

Well, under these circumstances I think it is wise to be persistent and patient, although I will continue, I hope, to be pretty. Eventually the outcome is what I am striving for: Better forests, better forest management.

My mentor, my personal mentor and hero, Nelson Mandela, President of South Africa, knew that it was important to be persistent. He added 2 years, stayed in jail 2 years longer in order to achieve what he thought was the best thing for South Africa, for his beloved South Africa.

□ 1945

And so although it is very difficult for me because of the heroic work of the environmental movement and the activists, I have decided today in order to protect my beloved forests that they can better get the overwhelming support that they need and deserve in another area. Because we already have a very good agreement in this bill, I think that it is important for me to announce my intention to withdraw my amendment so that another time it will get a majority of support.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that people will not forget that these forests do not belong to the timber companies or to the forest agencies or even to Members of Congress

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FURSE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just want to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) for offering her amendment. Persistence is a word that we will long identify with her in this effort. The gentlewoman from Oregon and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), who was here earlier, have been two very, very persistent people who have started off in amendments that received very few votes. The gentlewoman did it on the rider. The gentleman from Massachusetts has done it on forest roads.

We saw this Congress arrive at a point where both of those policies have been discredited. They have been dramatically changed. And as was pointed out, we are headed in a direction now for the first time with this agreement that recognizes what I believe is the reality of the forests, the reality of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Ms. FURSE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, that reality is that our populations, along with the national populations, seek to have these forests properly managed, not there just for a single purpose.

Many of our colleagues on the other side and many on our side have talked about multiple use. For the first time we are talking about real multiple use that recognizes the watershed value of these forests, that recognizes the timber value of these forests, that recognizes the habitat value of these forests,

that recognizes the recreational value of these forests.

Many of the problems that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the members of the committee are having to deal with and spend money on are having to make up for very bad forest policy in the past, where we have huge scars on our landscape and huge scars on our waterscape. Now we are spending billions of dollars to go back and try to restore these forests, to reclaim these forests, to replant these forests. And it is much more expensive to do it this way than to do it right the first time, the kind of policy that has been articulated on behalf of our forests in the past by the gentlewoman.

This amendment that the gentlewoman is offering to move these monies toward those priorities, recognizing the need, recognizing the urgency, I do not have to tell the gentlewoman as a resident of the Northwest, or myself as a resident of California, we are on an urgency timetable here if we are, in fact, going to salvage some of these species that are at risk in terms of the fisheries and in terms of that habitat.

So, I also want to recognize the gentlewoman's very serious and pragmatic judgment about the withdrawal of this amendment because of the agreement that is in place. But that agreement is in place because of her persistence over the years, along with others, on these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, it was lonely in the beginning, but it turned out to be the majority position, and I think clearly recognizes in the agreement in this bill that this is the majority position of this Congress.

I think we have further to go. I think we have more to do. And we do really in fact have to make these multiple use lands so they recognize all of the competing values for these forest lands. It is not just the value of timber, as important as that is.

So, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon, one, for offering the amendment; two, for her decision here; but thirdly, for her service in Congress and especially on these issues where I have had a chance to work with her. For really being a voice of reason and a voice of change with respect to forest policy in this country, I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is a great joy to have worked with the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). I think that we send today a message that the United States is a trustee. It is a trustee and has a legal duty, an enforceable legal duty to manage the public resources in the most responsible manner. And that means getting the best value for our resources.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope next year, and I feel very confident that this issue will come again. I will not be in this Congress next year. I will be watching from the sidelines. But I think that next year we will move our forests to the way that it was supposed to be, for public use, not for private use.

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

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the decision of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) to withdraw this amendment. I think that the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Washington, the gentlewoman from Oregon, we all share a common goal, and that is a sustainable forest policy.

Mr. Chairman, I held the first watershed restoration conference in the Pacific Northwest, the Vice President attended, to try and help work with the administration as they spent $1.2 billion over 5 years to try and not only implement Option 9, but to help the communities in this region that had been hurt by the decision to dramatically reduce.

I can remember, as can the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, when we harvested around 4 billion board feet. That is now down to less than a billion board feet. That I think is about a 75 or 80 percent reduction. The National Timber Program has been reduced from 10 billion board feet down to 3.5 billion board feet. So I think there has been a recognition on the part of the Congress that what we were doing was not sustainable.

Now we have the job, the daunting challenge to deal with some of the problems, one of which the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture laid on us this year, that we need to do road maintenance repair work of about $10 billion.

So, we have got serious problems out there. And I compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon for her persistence and her judgment. We have not always agreed on every single issue, but we have agreed on many. And I think that my hope here is that we can work together, that we can end an era of confrontation and bring people together, work out reasonable solutions from the grassroots up and restore these ecosystems, restore these watersheds, restore these salmon runs. That should be our goal. And the gentlewoman's support for the fish has been probably the hallmark of her career, and that is something that we all agree upon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might use this time to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, for a number of years the Members of this House, including the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), have advocated for the elimination of Federal funding for the Purchaser Road Credit program, a program which used Federal funds to subsidize timber companies for the roads they built. I would like to say that I respect the long-standing commitment of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Massachusetts to this issue.

It is my understanding that the bill before the House does not include any funding for this particular program. Is that the Chairman's understanding?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would yield, that is correct.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, as part of the agreement on the Purchaser Road Credit that has been struck, I understand that several Members who would otherwise have supported this amendment are been forced to vote against my amendment. And so although 40 editorials across the country is a good beginning in educating the public and the House on the taxpayer losses associated with the commercial program, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) may revisit this issue next year.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage the House to support fiscally and environmentally responsible forest management reform.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I thank her for her comments and I would say that that is it what we attempted to do the bill.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, is it the gentleman's intention that once the Interior Appropriations bill reaches the conference committee, that he will advocate to maintain the House's position with respect to eliminating the funding for the Purchaser Road Credit?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, yes, that is correct. It is my intention to strongly advocate the House position on this and all other matters when this bill reaches the conference committee.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). As we see this movement towards responsible management, it is absolutely necessary that the forest be better managed for wildlife, for recreation, and for public good.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment proposed by Representative FURSE to cut funding for the federal timber sales program. This amendment attempts to force the Forest Service into a "zero-cut" policy, which would be disastrous for many rural communities as well as the health of our national forests.

The federal timber sales program is a critical component of the Forest Service's active management of our national forests. Lacking reasonable harvesting of timber and scientific

management practices, our forests become vulnerable to a host of health threats. In fact, Missouri's State Forester and the President of the National Association of State Foresters, Marvin Brown, recently wrote in a letter to Agriculture Chairman BOB SMITH that, "Timber sales are being used to accomplish many goals, including reducing vulnerability to wildlife, eliminating pests, and improving fish and wildlife habitat." The essential point here is that timber sales are consistent with achieving our environmental goals for our forests.

It is also important to note that logging activities in our national forests are not at all excessive, as some members of the extremist environmental community would have us believe. The fact of the matter is that there will be 18 Billion Board Feet of NEW growth in our national forests this year, while the Forest Service proposes to harvest less than ¼ of that, approximately 4 Billion Board Feet.

Finally, I urge the House to consider the damaging economic consequences of this amendment. The timber industry in the state of Missouri accounts for approximately 20,000 jobs and $3 billion in economic activity. These are family-owned businesses, hard-working folks. Their work is an important part of our local economies in Southern Missouri and a key element in the wise management of our National Forests. If the Furse amendment were to pass, the lives and livelihoods of good people would be disregarded in favor of an extremist agenda. I urge a strong NO vote on this amendment.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to an amendment that will be offered during consideration of the Fiscal Year 1999 Interior Appropriations bill by the gentlewoman from Oregon, Ms. FURSE.

This amendment would decimate the U.S. Forest Service timber sale program by reducing the budget for forest management.

Over the last few years, we have endured contentious debate on the floor of the House regarding the Forest Service's Purchaser Road Credit Program.

Last year, a commitment was made by several Members of Congress on both sides of the debate to reach a compromise that would eliminate the program, while still providing funding for road maintenance.

After many months of discussion, a good faith agreement was reached that removed the Purchaser Road Credit program from this year's Forest Service budget with the understanding that no further amendments would be offered on this issue.

It is imperative that we allow this compromise to move forward unchanged.

Too often, Members with divergent points of view have difficulty coming together to find solutions to problems pitting rural America against those advocating stricter public land use policies. Today, we have an opportunity to defend a compromise that clears this hurdle.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Furse Amendment. The hard work that went into crafting this delicate compromise should not be wiped out by arbitrary cuts to important forest management activities.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Furse amendment. We have heard many arguments today on both sides of this issue about topics like the environment and the economics of the timber program.

While these are certainly important issues, I am afraid that lost in this debate is the impact this amendment would have on working families and rural communities.

In my district in northern Michigan, and in districts like mine across the Nation, our national forests are a vital part of our economy and livelihood.

Timber is one of the largest industries in northern Michigan, especially in the Upper Peninsula, and is an integral part of its economic base.

With three national forests in my district, thousands of working families literally rely on these forests and the timber program to put food on the table.

Many people think of the timber industry as giant businesses that slash and clear cut forests simply for profit.

The truth is, however, that the majority of people in the timber industry are family businesses—"mom and pop" operations that are struggling to make ends meet and that truly care about the forests and the environment.

The timber program has already been reduced by 70 percent since 1991. The Furse amendment would only serve to further hurt these family-run businesses.

In addition, the Furse amendment would severely impact rural communities across this nation.

By law, counties with national forest lands receive payments equaling 25 percent of federal timber revenues. These communities rely on these payments to provide funding for schools, roads, and emergency services.

In FY 1997, local governments received $220 million for these important programs. Because of this, the National Association of Counties strongly opposes this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is bad for working families, bad for rural communities, and bad for schools. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Furse amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the recently withdrawn amendment certainly should have been withdrawn, because the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. Furse), my friend, had this amendment exactly correct. There will be room with her amendment, should her amendment have passed, to harvest firewood and Christmas trees. That will be the end of any harvest practically on the public forests.

We know that there are more than 40 million acres, Mr. Chairman, that are in jeopardy of catastrophic fire in this country. We also have followed Chief Dombeck's suggestion that unless we manage forests, quote, manage forests, we indeed will lose our public forests.

The most effective tool we have, obviously, to fight catastrophic fire or to eliminate insect disease, is a timber sale program and managing forests. The amendment would have basically eliminated all U.S. timber sales and that, indeed, threatens the health of our forests.

I want to quote Chief Dombeck because he is right on point on this issue.

> We are hearing calls increasingly for a zero-cut policy for the National Forests. I am opposed to this position. Both science and common sense support active management of National Forests.

And he is right.

Now, this idea went so far that it should have been withdrawn, but it also indeed threatens the health of our forests. It is not only economically unreasonable; it jeopardizes jobs throughout the United States nationwide. It places economic and social stability problems within communities, and it interferes with public education floor funds. It is an extreme, extreme position. It is a Sierra Club position. That is what it is.

I point to the charts to indicate to my colleagues what has occurred here since 1982, but specifically since 1997 and 1998. As my colleagues can see, the timber program has dramatically decreased, and with the Furse amendment in 1999, we can see the yellow would be almost in half. And then in the year 2000, almost no harvest in our public forests.

So, what has happened? What has happened is obvious to everyone. What has happened in this country is our imports have dramatically increased. Obviously, we need the wood. The demand for wood is there. So here go the imports up to almost 12 billion board feet and timber sold, as reported in 1996, almost 3.5 billion in the United States. Almost 12 billion imported, 3.5 billion from our forests. Beyond that it has placed greater pressure, of course, upon private timber lands and our State lands.

Yes, every forest lost money. Well, if we eliminate 85 percent of the harvest, they are going to lose money. What else lost money? The wildlife and fisheries program lost money. The forest fire suppression program lost money. The wilderness program lost money. Every Forest Service program lost money. They are below cost. Maybe we ought to eliminate the whole thing. That is the theory. Should we eliminate the management of forests in America because we have reduced, of course, the impact of harvest? Therefore, they are all below cost. Obviously, that is the wrong way to go, of course.

This amendment is about eliminating the timber sale completely. Zero-cut is not protecting our national forests, it is wasting them.

The national forests are growing over 16 billion board feet every year, plus another 6 billion of timber that dies from insects and disease every year. Yet in 1997 we harvested only 3.3 billion board feet and again we may lose many millions of acres to fire. Certainly we

would if an amendment like this were ever adopted.

The zero-cut policy, as I have indicated, would shift production to other countries, cost Americans jobs, hurt communities, injure the forests, and is certainly no benefit to anyone, even those who believe that the wildlife and the environment are the most cherished parts of our national heritage. This amendment would destroy even those cherished items.

□ 2000

It is a good idea for her to withdraw this amendment, and it is a bad idea for it to be brought up ever again.

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

Mr. Chairman, it has come to my understanding that after debating this issue the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) is going to pull her amendment without allowing it to go for a vote. I understand why the gentlewoman is not going to let this come to a vote. She clearly does not have the votes in the House to support this extreme radical measure.

For years we have argued and debated over possible corporate welfare within the Forest Service road credit purchaser program. As of this year, this program no longer exists. Now we learn the argument was really not over the road credit purchaser program but was really over the extremist agenda of advocating zero cut on our national forests, a euphemism for which is below-cost timber sales.

This policy strips the Forest Service of its single most effective tool for maintaining forest health and reducing the risk of catastrophic fire. The Forest Service estimates that more than 40 million acres of our national forests are threatened with destruction by catastrophic wildfire. With a full range of management options, the Forest Service can reduce this threat of catastrophic fire.

I would like to ask my colleagues which of these two forests that we have pictures of would they want for their children? On the left we see a forest that is not managed.

Now, I might mention that I represent a district in northern California that has 11 national forests in it. I have examples of both of these forests within my district. Again, the picture on the left is an unmanaged forest. We know a lot about all the rain we have been receiving, at least in California, this year. What we do not remember, sometimes we forget that of the last 12 years, 7 of those 12 years have been drought years.

California, unlike so much of the rest of the Nation, is a desert during the summertime, and when there is this competition for moisture, what we see is this unnatural type of state that we see on the left. Without the ability to be able to go in and thin these forests out and remove the dead and dying timber, what we will see, rather than the forest on the right, which is a managed forest, where we remove dead and dying timbers, what we see is a situation like this.

In 1994, in the United States, we had 5 million acres of timber that burned; that were catastrophic; where there is nothing left. In 1996 we had 6 million acres burned. So it is really up to us. Are we going to manage our forests in a prudent way or are we going to allow them to burn, as we see in this picture to my left?

I am very pleased, again, that the gentlewoman from Oregon has removed this very ill thought out amendment of hers, but I believe it is time that we begin to bring balance to the management of our forests and not allow the extreme environmentalists to run it by politics.

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

Mr. Chairman, what the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) was trying to do in bringing her amendment before the House was to give us the opportunity to talk about the future direction of the Forest Service. Specifically, we need to determine what its priorities are; that is to say, what the Forest Service priorities should be in managing the national forests and how the Forest Service should spend the money allocated to it.

Historically, the Forest Service has brought a great emphasis on timber production. The gentlewoman from Oregon was not saying in her amendment that timber production should be shut down entirely, as some have inferred, that is not the case, but that it should be put in context among the other purposes of the Forest Service. Commercial timber harvests should pay their own way and should not receive direct or indirect subsidies from the taxpayer.

Here are a few principles that we support: The national forests are owned by all the American people and should serve the diverse interests the American people have in the forests. Those diverse interests include watershed protection, recreational use, wildlife habitat, as well as timber production.

Watershed protection probably serves the greatest number of people today. According to the Forest Service, the greatest number of direct forest users are recreational users, and recreational users produce the greatest amount of forest revenues. These facts should be taken into account in planning the Forest Service budget.

According to the Forest Service's own recent report, it lost $88.6 million on below-cost timber sales last year alone, where the costs of arranging these sales exceeded by that amount the revenue derived from those sales. We should face facts: Below-cost sales are subsidized. We have been giving away our jointly-owned resources.

There are cases where a below-cost sale may clearly support a public good, such as improving a watershed. But more often it is simply a giveaway of public resources to a private interest; what has been called corporate welfare. We have heard a lot of rhetoric about how people should stand on their own and not get help from the government. We have heard a lot of talk about how efficient private industry is in creating jobs. We have heard lots of rhetoric about the futility of propping up uneconomical activities and how we should let the market rule. Well, it is time to apply all of that rhetoric to resource extraction. It is time to say that if a timber operation is not economical and cannot survive without free or cheap public timber, maybe it needs to change.

We are pleased to see the plan to end purchaser road credits. We hope it holds and we hope that all the people who pledge to support it will pledge to keep it in the conference version of this bill, but we do need to go beyond that. We have to modernize the Forest Service and modernize its budget to take into account what we have learned about forests, to take into account and give a much more prominent role to the other purposes of forests that more and more Americans care about, and to stop giving trees away just to keep the machine running or just because that is the way we have always done it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a minute to just direct the attention of the House to the fact that we have been able to work out a very thorny issue here in the House; namely, this whole business of the road credits.

As my colleagues know, there was a debate on this floor, I think, for a period of about 3 years, with people really lined up against themselves and 180 degrees apart. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) deserves an awful lot of credit for the effort to try to bring people together. He met with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), people who were in direct opposition to him and, through a long process of negotiation and talk, we have essentially been able to reach an agreement that will give us a more market-oriented approach to the way in which we, in fact, do these timber roads.

Now, not everybody is thoroughly happy with the solution, but I have to tell my colleagues that this is one of those times when we fought for 2 or 3 years and I happen to believe that the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) is the guy that deserves the most amount of credit because he said we ought not to keep fighting on this. The other side has some legitimate points, we have some legitimate points, and let us try to work it out.

For those environmentalists who have been worried about the road building, if, in fact, it is true that there are subsidies, there will be fewer roads built. They will only be built where it makes economic sense. At the same time, for those who are concerned that we not shut down all appropriate road building, it also will make economic sense to those whenever they move forward, and to those who are worried about saving some money and not providing subsidies to anybody, we have been able to deal with that.

So I think this is a win, win, win. For one of the few times in this House on a very tough environmental issue, I think we have had successful regulation. I want to praise the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) for agreeing not to pursue her amendment. That would not be the wise thing to do. My understanding is she has withdrawn her amendment, will not have a vote on it, which is entirely appropriate, and maybe this is the model that we can use to resolve a number of environmental issues where people of good heart all feel the same way.

I would like to say one other thing about the gentleman from California. He feels very strongly about the fact that sometimes those on the other side do not understand that there is actually some destruction done in the name of environmental protection when, in fact, he has a view that there are things that we can do to make the environment more secure. He has been able to lead the way and stand in the breach, at times under very emotional issues on the environment, and to be a real leader. So I want to compliment him.

I am very happy that I was in the middle of this for the period of the last 3 years, and I think this is a very good success, and I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the great Member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), for his outstanding work.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I wish to thank the chairman for his kindness, and also I do believe, although we disagree, that the first amendment had merit. Obviously, I would have supported it, but I hope we can recognize that even though the amendment was not put to the floor for a vote, that there are issues that we should all discuss about saving our forests and our trees and hope that we will continue this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, my only concern, and I would like to yield to the gentleman as we rise, we are still continuing in title II for tomorrow as we resume; is that my understanding?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's understanding is correct.

I would also add that I think we have an agreement among many people that the forests have a multipurpose potential for the public. It is a matter of how we achieve that in the best possible way.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's kindness and I think we can continue to go forward and work these issues out.

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. HASTINGS of Washington) 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. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EDUCATION SAVINGS AND SCHOOL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1998—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States.

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2646, the "Education Savings and School Excellence Act of 1998."

As I have said before, we must prepare our children for the 21st century by providing them with the best education in the world. To help meet this goal, I have sent the Congress a comprehensive agenda for strengthening our public schools, which enroll almost 90 percent of our students. My plan calls for raising standards, strengthening accountability, and promoting charter schools and other forms of public school choice. It calls for reducing class size in the early grades, so our students get a solid foundation in the basic skills, modernizing our schools for the 21st century, and linking them with the Internet. And we must strengthen teaching and provide students who need additional help with tutoring, mentoring, and after-school programs. We must take these steps now.

By sending me this bill, the Congress has instead chosen to weaken public education and shortchange our children. The modifications to the Education IRAs that the bill would authorize are bad education policy and bad tax policy. The bill would divert limited Federal resources away from public schools by spending more than $3 billion on tax benefits that would do virtually nothing for average families and would disproportionately benefit the most affluent families. More than 70 percent of the benefits would flow to families in the top 20 percent of income distribution, and families struggling to make ends meet would never see a penny of the benefits. Moreover, the bill would not create a meaningful incentive for families to increase their savings for educational purposes; it would instead reward families, particularly those with substantial incomes, for what they already do.

The way to improve education for all our children is to increase standards, accountability, and choice within the public schools. Just as we have an obligation to repair our Nation's roads and bridges and invest in the infrastructure of our transportation system, we also have an obligation to invest in the infrastructure needs of our public schools. I urge the Congress to meet that obligation and to send me instead the legislation I have proposed to reduce class size; improve the quality of teaching; modernize our schools; end social promotions; raise academic standards; and hold school districts, schools, and staff accountable for results.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 21, 1998.*

□ 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President, together with the accompanying bill, H.R. 2646, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules if a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or if the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such a rollcall vote, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

SECURITIES LITIGATION UNIFORM STANDARDS ACT OF 1998

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1689) to amend the Securities Act

of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to limit the conduct of securities class actions under State law, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1689

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998".

TITLE I—SECURITIES LITIGATION UNIFORM STANDARDS

SEC. 101. LIMITATION ON REMEDIES.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 16 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77p) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. ADDITIONAL REMEDIES; LIMITATION ON REMEDIES.

"(a) REMEDIES ADDITIONAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the rights and remedies provided by this title shall be in addition to any and all other rights and remedies that may exist at law or in equity.

"(b) CLASS ACTION LIMITATIONS.—No covered class action based upon the statutory or common law of any State or subdivision thereof may be maintained in any State or Federal court by any private party alleging—

"(1) an untrue statement or omission of a material fact in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security; or

"(2) that the defendant used or employed any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security.

"(c) REMOVAL OF COVERED CLASS ACTIONS.—Any covered class action brought in any State court involving a covered security, as set forth in subsection (b), shall be removable to the Federal district court for the district in which the action is pending, and shall be subject to subsection (b).

"(d) PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN ACTIONS.—

"(1) ACTIONS UNDER STATE LAW OF STATE OF INCORPORATION.—

"(A) ACTIONS PRESERVED.—Notwithstanding subsection (b) or (c), a covered class action described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph that is based upon the statutory or common law of the State in which the issuer is incorporated (in the case of a corporation) or organized (in the case of any other entity) may be maintained in a State or Federal court by a private party.

"(B) PERMISSIBLE ACTIONS.—A covered class action is described in this subparagraph if it involves—

"(i) the purchase or sale of securities by the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer exclusively from or to holders of equity securities of the issuer; or

"(ii) any recommendation, position, or other communication with respect to the sale of securities of the issuer that—

"(I) is made by or on behalf of the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer to holders of equity securities of the issuer; and

"(II) concerns decisions of those equity holders with respect to voting their securities, acting in response to a tender or exchange offer, or exercising dissenters' or appraisal rights.

"(2) STATE ACTIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, nothing in this section may be construed to preclude a State or political subdivision thereof or a State pension plan from bringing an action involving a covered security on its own behalf, or as a member of a class comprised solely of other States, political subdivisions, or State pension plans that are named plaintiffs, and that have authorized participation, in such action.

"(B) STATE PENSION PLAN DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State pension plan' means a pension plan established and maintained for its employees by the government of the State or political subdivision thereof, or by any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(3) ACTIONS UNDER CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN ISSUERS AND INDENTURE TRUSTEES.—Notwithstanding subsection (b) or (c), a covered class action that seeks to enforce a contractual agreement between an issuer and an indenture trustee may be maintained in a State or Federal court by a party to the agreement or a successor to such party.

"(4) REMAND OF REMOVED ACTIONS.—In an action that has been removed from a State court pursuant to subsection (c), if the Federal court determines that the action may be maintained in State court pursuant to this subsection, the Federal court shall remand such action to such State court.

"(e) PRESERVATION OF STATE JURISDICTION.—The securities commission (or any agency or office performing like functions) of any State shall retain jurisdiction under the laws of such State to investigate and bring enforcement actions.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

"(1) AFFILIATE OF THE ISSUER.—The term 'affiliate of the issuer' means a person that directly or indirectly, through 1 or more intermediaries, controls or is controlled by or is under common control with, the issuer.

"(2) COVERED CLASS ACTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered class action' means—

"(i) any single lawsuit in which—

"(I) damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons or prospective class members, and questions of law or fact common to those persons or members of the prospective class, without reference to issues of individualized reliance on an alleged misstatement or omission, predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons or members; or

"(II) 1 or more named parties seek to recover damages on a representative basis on behalf of themselves and other unnamed parties similarly situated, and questions of law or fact common to those persons or members of the prospective class predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons or members; or

"(ii) any group of lawsuits filed in or pending in the same court and involving common questions of law or fact, in which—

"(I) damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons; and

"(II) the lawsuits are joined, consolidated, or otherwise proceed as a single action for any purpose.

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR DERIVATIVE ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the term 'covered class action' does not include an exclusively derivative action brought by 1 or more shareholders on behalf of a corporation.

"(C) COUNTING OF CERTAIN CLASS MEMBERS.—For purposes of this paragraph, a corporation, investment company, pension plan, partnership, or other entity, shall be treated as 1 person or prospective class member, but only if the entity is not established for the purpose of participating in the action.

"(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the discretion of a State court in determining whether actions filed in such court should be joined, consolidated, or otherwise allowed to proceed as a single action.

"(3) COVERED SECURITY.—The term 'covered security' means a security that satisfies the standards for a covered security specified in section 18(b)(1) at the time during which it is alleged that the misrepresentation, omission, or manipulative or deceptive conduct occurred, except that such term shall not include any debt security that is exempt from registration under this title pursuant to rules issued by the Commission under section 4(2) of this title.".

(2) CIRCUMVENTION OF STAY OF DISCOVERY.—Section 27(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77z-1(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) CIRCUMVENTION OF STAY OF DISCOVERY.—Upon a proper showing, a court may stay discovery proceedings in any private action in a State court as necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments, in an action subject to a stay of discovery pursuant to this subsection.".

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 22(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77v(a)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "except as provided in section 16 with respect to covered class actions," after "Territorial courts,"; and

(B) by striking "No case" and inserting "Except as provided in section 16(c), no case".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 28 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78bb) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "The rights and remedies" and inserting "Except as provided in subsection (f), the rights and remedies"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) LIMITATIONS ON REMEDIES.—

"(1) CLASS ACTION LIMITATIONS.—No covered class action based upon the statutory or common law of any State or subdivision thereof may be maintained in any State or Federal court by any private party alleging—

"(A) a misrepresentation or omission of a material fact in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security; or

"(B) that the defendant used or employed any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security.

"(2) REMOVAL OF COVERED CLASS ACTIONS.—Any covered class action brought in any State court involving a covered security, as set forth in paragraph (1), shall be removable to the Federal district court for the district in which the action is pending, and shall be subject to paragraph (1).

"(3) PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN ACTIONS.—

"(A) ACTIONS UNDER STATE LAW OF STATE OF INCORPORATION.—

"(i) ACTIONS PRESERVED.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or (2), a covered class action described in clause (ii) of this subparagraph that is based upon the statutory or common law of the State in which the issuer is incorporated (in the case of a corporation) or organized (in the case of any other entity) may be maintained in a State or Federal court by a private party.

"(ii) PERMISSIBLE ACTIONS.—A covered class action is described in this clause if it involves—

"(I) the purchase or sale of securities by the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer exclusively from or to holders of equity securities of the issuer; or

"(II) any recommendation, position, or other communication with respect to the sale of securities of an issuer that—

"(aa) is made by or on behalf of the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer to holders of equity securities of the issuer; and

"(bb) concerns decisions of such equity holders with respect to voting their securities, acting in response to a tender or exchange offer, or exercising dissenters' or appraisal rights.

"(B) STATE ACTIONS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, nothing in this subsection may be construed to preclude a State or political subdivision thereof or a State pension plan from bringing an action involving a covered security on its own behalf, or as a member of a class comprised solely of other States, political subdivisions, or State pension plans that are named plaintiffs, and that have authorized participation, in such action.

"(ii) STATE PENSION PLAN DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'State pension plan' means a pension plan established and maintained for its employees by the government of a State or political subdivision thereof, or by any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(C) ACTIONS UNDER CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN ISSUERS AND INDENTURE TRUSTEES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or (2), a covered class action that seeks to enforce a contractual agreement between an issuer and an indenture trustee may be maintained in a State or Federal court by a party to the agreement or a successor to such party.

"(D) REMAND OF REMOVED ACTIONS.—In an action that has been removed from a State court pursuant to paragraph (2), if the Federal court determines that the action may be maintained in State court pursuant to this subsection, the Federal court shall remand such action to such State court.

"(4) PRESERVATION OF STATE JURISDICTION.—The securities commission (or any agency or office performing like functions) of any State shall retain jurisdiction under the laws of such State to investigate and bring enforcement actions.

"(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the following definitions shall apply:

"(A) AFFILIATE OF THE ISSUER.—The term 'affiliate of the issuer' means a person that directly or indirectly, through 1 or more intermediaries, controls or is controlled by or is under common control with, the issuer.

"(B) COVERED CLASS ACTION.—The term 'covered class action' means—

"(i) any single lawsuit in which—

"(I) damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons or prospective class members, and questions of law or fact common to those persons or members of the prospective class, without reference to issues of individualized reliance on an alleged misstatement or omission, predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons or members; or

"(II) 1 or more named parties seek to recover damages on a representative basis on behalf of themselves and other unnamed parties similarly situated, and questions of law or fact common to those persons or members of the prospective class predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons or members; or

"(ii) any group of lawsuits filed in or pending in the same court and involving common questions of law or fact, in which—

"(I) damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons; and

"(II) the lawsuits are joined, consolidated, or otherwise proceed as a single action for any purpose.

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR DERIVATIVE ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the term 'covered class action' does not include an exclusively derivative action brought by 1 or more shareholders on behalf of a corporation.

"(D) COUNTING OF CERTAIN CLASS MEMBERS.—For purposes of this paragraph, a corporation, investment company, pension plan, partnership, or other entity, shall be treated as 1 person or prospective class member, but only if the entity is not established for the purpose of participating in the action.

"(E) COVERED SECURITY.—The term 'covered security' means a security that satisfies the standards for a covered security specified in section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933, at the time during which it is alleged that the misrepresentation, omission, or manipulative or deceptive conduct occurred, except that such term shall not include any debt security that is exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to rules issued by the Commission under section 4(2) of such Act.

"(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the discretion of a State court in determining whether actions filed in such court should be joined, consolidated, or otherwise allowed to proceed as a single action.".

(2) CIRCUMVENTION OF STAY OF DISCOVERY.—Section 21D(b)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-4(b)(3)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) CIRCUMVENTION OF STAY OF DISCOVERY.—Upon a proper showing, a court may stay discovery proceedings in any private action in a State court as necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments, in an action subject to a stay of discovery pursuant to this paragraph.".

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall not affect or apply to any action commenced before and pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. PROMOTION OF RECIPROCAL SUBPOENA ENFORCEMENT.

(a) COMMISSION ACTION.—The Securities and Exchange Commission, in consultation with State securities commissions, shall seek to encourage the adoption of State laws providing for reciprocal enforcement by State securities commissions of subpoenas issued by another State securities commission seeking to compel persons to attend, testify in, or produce documents or records in connection with an action or investigation by a State securities commission of an alleged violation of State securities laws.

(b) REPORT.—Within 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress—

(1) identifying the States that have adopted laws described in subsection (a);

(2) describing the actions undertaken by the Commission and State securities commissions to promote the adoption of such laws; and

(3) identifying any further actions the Commission recommends for such purposes.

SEC. 103. REPORT ON CONSEQUENCES.

The Securities and Exchange Commission shall include in each of its first 3 annual reports submitted after the date of enactment of this Act a report regarding—

(1) the nature and the extent of the class action cases that are preempted by, or removed pursuant to, the amendments made by section 101 of this title;

(2) the extent to which that preemption or removal either promotes or adversely affects the protection of securities investors or the public interest; and

(3) if adverse effects are found, alternatives to, or revisions of, such preemption or removal that—

(A) would not have such adverse effects;

(B) would further promote the protection of investors and the public interest; and

(C) would still substantially reduce the risk of abusive securities litigation.

TITLE II—REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 35 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78kk) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other funds authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Commission $351,280,000 for fiscal year 1999.

"(b) MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.—Funds appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to be expended—

"(1) not to exceed $3,000 per fiscal year, for official reception and representation expenses;

"(2) not to exceed $10,000 per fiscal year, for funding a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions; and

"(3) not to exceed $100,000 per fiscal year, for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations, appropriate representatives, and staff to exchange views concerning developments relating to securities matters, for development and implementation of cooperation agreements concerning securities matters and provision of technical assistance for the development of foreign securities markets, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance at such consultations and meetings, including—

"(A) such incidental expenses as meals taken in the course of such attendance;

"(B) any travel or transportation to or from such meetings; and

"(C) any other related lodging or subsistence.".

SEC. 202. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE EDGAR SYSTEM.

Section 35A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ll) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e); and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation;

(B) by striking "; and" at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3).

TITLE III—CLERICAL AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 301. CLERICAL AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2(a)(15)(i) (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(15)(i)) is amended by striking "section 2(13) of the

Act" and inserting "paragraph (13) of this subsection".

(2) Section 11(f)(2)(A) (15 U.S.C. 77k(f)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "section 38" and inserting "section 21D(f)".

(3) Section 13 (15 U.S.C. 77m) is amended—

(A) by striking "section 12(2)" each place it appears and inserting "section 12(a)(2)"; and

(B) by striking "section 12(1)" each place it appears and inserting "section 12(a)(1)".

(4) Section 18 (15 U.S.C. 77r) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by inserting ", or authorized for listing," after "Exchange, or listed";

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i), by striking "Capital Markets Efficiency Act of 1996" and inserting "National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996";

(C) in subsection (c)(2)(C)(i), by striking "Market" and inserting "Markets";

(D) in subsection (d)(1)(A)—

(i) by striking "section 2(10)" and inserting "section 2(a)(10)"; and

(ii) by striking "subparagraphs (A) and (B)" and inserting "subparagraphs (a) and (b)";

(E) in subsection (d)(2), by striking "Securities Amendments Act of 1996" and inserting "National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996"; and

(F) in subsection (d)(4), by striking "For purposes of this paragraph, the" and inserting "The".

(5) Sections 27, 27A, and 28 (15 U.S.C. 77z–1, 77z–2, 77z–3) are transferred to appear after section 26.

(6) Paragraph (28) of schedule A of such Act (15 U.S.C. 77aa(28)) is amended by striking "identic" and inserting "identical".

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3(a)(10) (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(10)) is amended by striking "deposit, for" and inserting "deposit for".

(2) Section 3(a)(12)(A) (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(12)(A)) is amended by moving clause (vi) two em spaces to the left.

(3) Section 3(a)(22)(A) (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(22)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking "section 3(h)" and inserting "section 3"; and

(B) by striking "section 3(t)" and inserting "such section 3".

(4) Section 3(a)(39)(B)(i) (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(39)(B)(i)) is amended by striking "an order to the Commission" and inserting "an order of the Commission".

(5) The following sections are each amended by striking "Federal Reserve Board" and inserting "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System": subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 (15 U.S.C. 78g(a), (b)); section 17(g) (15 U.S.C. 78q(g)); and section 26 (15 U.S.C. 78z).

(6) The heading of subsection (d) of section 7 (15 U.S.C. 78g(d)) is amended by striking "EXCEPTION" and inserting "EXCEPTIONS".

(7) Section 14(g)(4) (15 U.S.C. 78n(g)(4)) is amended by striking "consolidation sale," and inserting "consolidation, sale,".

(8) Section 15 (15 U.S.C. 78o) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by moving paragraph (8) two em spaces to the left;

(B) in subsection (h)(2), by striking "affecting" and inserting "effecting";

(C) in subsection (h)(3)(A)(i)(II)(bb), by inserting "or" after the semicolon;

(D) in subsection (h)(3)(A)(ii)(I), by striking "maintains" and inserting "maintained";

(E) in subsection (h)(3)(B)(ii), by striking "association" and inserting "associated".

(9) Section 15B(c)(4) (15 U.S.C. 78o–4(c)(4)) is amended by striking "convicted by any offense" and inserting "convicted of any offense".

(10) Section 15C(f)(5) (15 U.S.C. 78o–5(f)(5)) is amended by striking "any person or class or persons" and inserting "any person or class of persons".

(11) Section 19(c) (15 U.S.C. 78s(c)) is amended by moving paragraph (5) two em spaces to the right.

(12) Section 20 (15 U.S.C. 78t) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(13) Section 21D (15 U.S.C. 78u–4) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f); and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)(i) of such subsection, by striking "paragraph (1)" and inserting "subparagraph (A)".

(14) Section 31(a) (15 U.S.C. 78ee(a)) is amended by striking "this subsection" and inserting "this section".

(c) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–1 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2(a)(8) (15 U.S.C. 80a–2(a)(8)) is amended by striking "Unitde" and inserting "United".

(2) Section 3(b) (15 U.S.C. 80a–3(b)) is amended by striking "paragraph (3) of subsection (a)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(C) of subsection (a)".

(3) Section 12(d)(1)(G)(i)(III)(bb) (15 U.S.C. 80a–12(d)(1)(G)(i)(III)(bb)), by striking "the acquired fund" and inserting "the acquired company".

(4) Section 18(e)(2) (15 U.S.C. 80a–18(e)(2)) is amended by striking "subsection (e)(2)" and inserting "paragraph (1) of this subsection".

(5) Section 30 (15 U.S.C. 80a–29) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of subsection (b)(1);

(B) in subsection (e), by striking "semi-annually" and inserting "semiannually"; and

(C) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as added by section 508(g) of the National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996 as subsections (i) and (j), respectively.

(6) Section 31(f) (15 U.S.C. 80a–30(f)) is amended by striking "subsection (c)" and inserting "subsection (e)".

(d) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 203(e)(8)(B) (15 U.S.C. 80b–3(e)(8)(B)) is amended by inserting "or" after the semicolon.

(2) Section 222(b)(2) of (15 U.S.C. 80b–18a(b)(2)) is amended by striking "principle" and inserting "principal".

(e) TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939.—The Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 77aaa et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 303 (15 U.S.C. 77ccc) is amended by striking "section 2" each place it appears in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting "section 2(a)".

(2) Section 304(a)(4)(A) (15 U.S.C. 77ddd(a)(4)(A)) is amended by striking "(14) of subsection" and inserting "(13) of section".

(3) Section 313(a) (15 U.S.C. 77mmm(a)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "any change to" after the paragraph designation at the beginning of paragraph (4); and

(B) by striking "any change to" in paragraph (6).

(4) Section 319(b) (15 U.S.C. 77sss(b)) is amended by striking "the Federal Register Act" and inserting "chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code,".

SEC. 302. EXEMPTION OF SECURITIES ISSUED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN STATE HEARINGS.

Section 18(b)(4)(C) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)(C)) is amended by striking "paragraph (4) or (11)" and inserting "paragraph (4), (10), or (11)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1689 and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1689, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998. This legislation has been carefully constructed and refined throughout the legislative process on a bipartisan basis. We now have a bill that is ready to be considered by this Congress that will protect our Nation's investors and shareholders from needless expenses companies incur from meritless lawsuits.

Congress thought we would stop the flow of frivolous securities lawsuits with the enactment of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. The number of cases in Federal court has declined, but the explosion of cases being brought in state courts since the Reform Act demonstrates that the problem has not been eliminated, it has just changed venue.

It is unfortunate that additional legislation is needed to plug a loophole that undermines the intentions of Congress. Nevertheless, it is our job to ensure that the laws we pass work in the manner we intended. Based on the number of cosponsors of this legislation, I think it is safe to say that the law is not working the way it was intended.

The Uniform Standards Act will permit meritorious claims to continue to be filed while preventing the migration of baseless class actions to state courts. The standard provided in this legislation builds on the simple nature of our capital markets. If the alleged violation is national and it is filed on behalf of a class, then the case should be brought in Federal court. If the case is of a local nature, then it is more appropriately handled at the state level.

This legislation will put a stop to the inappropriate use of state courts to circumvent the protections that Congress

deemed appropriate in 1995. H.R. 1689 will not prevent individual claims from being filed in state courts but will simply set a standard to determine when the Reform Act of 1995 is applied.

The legislation also includes a title to reauthorize the Securities and Exchange Commission for Fiscal 1999. This language is substantially similar to H.R. 1262, the SEC Reauthorization Act of 1997, which passed the House unanimously last session.

At the suggestion of the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), technical changes were included to this title to eliminate provisions in the Securities Exchange Act that have been identified as an impediment to the possibility of future privatization of the EDGAR system. I commend the gentleman for his efforts and suggestions in the pursuit of good government and a more efficient, more cost-effective EDGAR system.

I would also like to commend the original author of the legislation the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE). His tireless work and pursuit of good public policy has improved this legislation from day one. I also would like to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for all of her efforts as a leading proponent of this legislation.

Many of the changes that have improved this legislation so significantly are a result of the work and compromise of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial and Hazardous Materials. I commend him for his leadership and skill in developing these important refinements.

Some of the changes included were at the suggestion of the ranking member the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) of the Committee on Commerce. Notwithstanding his opposition to the legislation, his continued pursuant of good public policy has improved the bill.

I would also commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANTON) the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Material, whom I am very distressed to see has announced his retirement from this body, for his cooperation and support. At his suggestion, the Committee on Commerce included a provision to provide the SEC with nationwide enforceability of subpoenas served in our districts. Unfortunately, the concerns by the Committee on the Judiciary about this provision have not been worked out and it is not included in H.R. 1689. I would tell the gentleman from New York that I will work with him to see that the provision makes it into the final legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1689.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may cosume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill before us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, Congress passed the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, that changed all the rules for the investors like people who invest in today's stock market. Now proponents of this legislation want to extend an untested federal system upon all the states.

If we pass this bill, Congress will place all investors into a largely untested, untried new federal system that will make it very difficult for investors to prove fraud. Many of the proponents of this bill claim that it corrects an oversight from the Private Securities Litigation Act of the last Congress. This claim is disingenuous and false. These same Members claim that during the debate over the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act that investors would continue and would always have available to them the protection afforded by the state courts.

The prime sponsor of the previous legislation explicitly stated that state courts would continue to be an avenue for defrauded investors to recoup their losses. Now these Members are seeking to preempt these state laws.

If this legislation passes, it will overrule, do away, with the aiding and abetting statutes in 49 states. It will do away with 33 statute of limitations provisions that we are now telling states that forget about their own statute of limitations to protect their investors, they will now have to protect their citizens with an untried, untested federal system. The Federal Government will now tell them what protections states can afford their citizens.

It is important to remember throughout this debate tonight that the blue sky laws predated the existence of federal securities law. When Congress wrote the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, they did not impose liability on aiders and abettors or insert an adequate statute of limitation. They declined to take these steps because Congress felt that it was necessary to allow states to decide these issues at the state level. But yet, tonight, if we vote for this bill, we will take away from these investors protections they have enjoyed for over 60 years under state law.

Chairman Arthur Levitt of the Securities Exchange Commission, consumer groups, municipal officers all supported maintaining these two simple provisions, extending the statute of limitations and maintaining the states' aiding and abetting statutes, but they were denied that request by the supporters of this bill.

As we look at the market today, we see record numbers of small investors are entrusting their life savings to the stock market. There are a number of proposals to allow the Social Security Trust Fund to be invested in the stock market. Now more than ever, these small investors need to be protected from fraudulent securities transactions. 28 million Americans over the age of 65 depend on investment income to meet part of their expenses.

The proponents of this bill claim its passage will actually benefit these investors. I am flabbergasted by this statement because consumer groups, institutional investors, state pension boards, retirement plan administrators, county officials and many other groups oppose this legislation.

This federal preemption is not necessary. Proponents argue that this bill is necessary because there has been an increase in the number of suits in state courts since the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act 2 years ago. Yet in 1997 there was a decrease in private securities as compared to levels before the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act in 1995.

Nationwide, private security litigation state filings account for less than 100th of 1 percent of state filings nationwide. I believe that it is irresponsible and unnecessary to supersede the law of all 50 states. The joint system of state and federal causes of action have existed for over 60 years. At a time when a market has joined its bullish run, I do not believe that we need now to preempt the 50 state laws with an untried, untested federal system.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill will make it easier for charlatans and ripoff artists to defraud investors, especially senior citizens. I truly hope that I am wrong. But before we pass this bill, I ask all Members to contemplate whether or not they want to make it easier for their constituents to become victims of fraud. I urge them to vote against this bill and protect our investors.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD letters from the Consumer Federation of America and the Government Finance Officers Association in opposition to this bill.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
July 20, 1998.

Hon. BART STUPAK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

OPPOSE H.R. 1689, SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM BILL

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STUPAK: It is our understanding that the full House of Representatives will vote as early as today or tomorrow on H.R. 1689, the "Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act." I am writing on behalf of the Consumer Federation of America (CFA) to express our strong opposition to this legislation and to urge you to oppose it.

CFA shares the view expressed by state and federal securities regulators that the current federal law, as articulated in the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (PSLRA), tilts the balance too far in favor of securities fraud defendants and threatens the ability of defrauded investors to recover their losses. For this reason, we strongly oppose extending that standard to lawsuits

currently being brought in state court. Even those who are more optimistic about the effects of the federal law, however, must acknowledge that this preemption legislation would deprive investors of important protections, such as aiding and abetting liability and longer statutes of limitation, that are available only under state law.

Because it is fundamentally unjustified, would further undermine defrauded investors' access to justice, and could leave defrauded investors with no effective means of recovering their losses, CFA strongly opposes H.R. 1689 and urges you to vote against it.

Sincerely,

BARBARA L.N. ROPER,
Director of Investor Protection,
Consumer Federation of America.

JULY 20, 1998.

Re H.R. 1689, Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998.

MEMBER OF CONGRESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The state and local government organizations listed above write in opposition to H.R. 1689, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998, as reported by the House Committee on Commerce, which is scheduled to be considered by the full House early this week. Our most significant concerns are the following:

Despite the preservation of the right of state and local governments and their pension plans to pursue class actions in state courts which is included in H.R. 1689, the limitation on this right that those in the class must be named plaintiffs and authorize such participation will severely limit the ability of the most vulnerable public entities to recover their losses. State and local governments support the underlying provision to preserve the fundamental right of a state or local government or public pension plan to bring a class action in state court. However, we believe that the limitation placed on that right in H.R. 1689 will effectively exclude the most vulnerable public entities, such as small pension plans. These fraud victims are the least likely to be aware of a pending class action and may be unable to initiate a suit on their own. These parties potentially have the most to lose in case of fraud, yet this provision virtually eliminates their ability to recover their losses.

H.R. 1689 fails to reinstate liability for secondary wrongdoers who aid and abet securities fraud. Despite two opportunities to do so since the Supreme Court struck down for private actions aiding and abetting liability for wrongdoers who assist in perpetrating securities fraud, Congress appears to be on the verge of not only failing to reinstate such liability but extending it to the states.

H.R. 1689 fails to reinstate more a reasonable statute of limitations for defrauded investors to file a claim. As in the case of aiding and abetting, Congress has now had two opportunities to reinstate a longer, more reasonable statute of limitations for defrauded investors to bring suit. Many frauds are not discovered within this shortened time period, but this bill misses the opportunity to make wronged investors whole by not including this provision in H.R. 1689 and by extending the existing unreasonably narrow time period in which suits may be brought to the states.

The definition of "class action" contained in H.R. 1689 is overly broad. We believe that the definition of class action in H.R. 1689 would allow single suits filed by individual plaintiffs to be rolled into a larger class action that was never contemplated or desired by individual plaintiffs and have it removed to federal court. Claims by the bill's proponents that individual plaintiffs would still be able to bring suit in federal court are undercut by this provision. We believe that no showing has been made of the need for a securities law definition of class action which differs from that of other types of class actions under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

There have been few state securities class actions filed since the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PSLRA) was passed. Despite the claims of the bill's proponents, tracking by the Price Waterhouse accounting firm shows that only 44 securities class actions were filed in state court for all of 1997, compared with 67 in 1994 and 52 in 1995. Most of these cases were filed in California, indicating that, if there is a problem in that state, it is one which should be dealt with at the state level. Citizens of the other 49 states should not be penalized as a result of a unique situation in a single state.

The PSLRA was opposed by state and local governments because the legislation did not strike an appropriate balance, and this legislation extends that mistake to state courts. As both issuers of debt and investors of public funds, state and local governments seek to not only reduce frivolous lawsuits but to protect their investors who are defrauded in securities transactions. The full impact of that statute on investor rights and remedies remains unsettled because even now many parts of the PSLRA have not been fully litigated; however, this untested law would now be extended to state courts.

The above organizations believe that states must be able to protect state and local government funds and their taxpayers and that H.R. 1689 inhibits these protections. We urge you to oppose preemption efforts which interfere with the ability of states to protect their public investors and to maintain investor protections for both public investors and their citizens.

Government Finance Officers Association; Municipal Treasurers' Association; National Association of Counties; National Association of County Treasurers and Finance Officers; National Association of State Retirement Administrators; National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems; National League of Cities.

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE) an instrumental force in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding me the time and also for his patience and wonderful leadership in bringing this bill to the point where it is today. It is a real testament to his leadership in our committee.

Mr. Speaker, we spend a lot of time in this House complaining about lawyers. And as a former lawyer, I would have to say that sometimes our complaints are justified. But when we pass a bill that intelligent lawyers can use to a purpose other than what we intended, it is not the lawyers' fault; it is our fault.

□ 2030

Frankly that is what this bill, H.R. 1689, is all about. In 1995, two-thirds of this House, in fact more than two-thirds of this House voted for the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. We passed it over President Clinton's veto. The whole idea of this legislation was to let good suits go forward but to try to slow down frivolous lawsuits so they did not cause too much harm in our economy, especially to the smaller companies that are the provider of so many jobs and so many innovations in our economy. But as luck would have it, we left a few loopholes in that bill. One thing we discovered is that suits that were formerly brought in Federal court under the old days were now being brought in State court as a way of getting around the statute that we passed. Not only were these suits being brought in State court, it was clear from the testimony of lawyers who testified in our committee that they had to advise their clients to bring these suits in State court because it was a more favorable environment.

H.R. 1689 is simply designed to fix that particular problem. Now, we will hear some things today as some potential problems that people have with H.R. 1689. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is quite logical that people who did not support the law that we passed in 1995 are not going to support this law, either. This law is designed to perfect what we did in 1995, to make it work right. But this is a limited bill designed to accomplish a very good purpose.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, this bill only applies to national lawsuits. It only applies to securities that are traded on the three national exchanges in our country. It only applies to class actions. State lawsuits will still be permitted under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for this bill and finish the job that we started in 1995 so that we can bring some order and responsibility to shareholder lawsuits in our country.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK).

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, back in 1995 the Committee on Commerce developed and this Congress passed and approved over a presidential veto the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act which put strict limits on Federal investor class action lawsuits. At the time we were being told by our friends who argued in favor of that that these victims would still have State redress. They could go to the State courts. Well, here we go again. From on high in Washington, D.C., dictating back to the States, "You can't do this."

I did not dream that my Republican colleagues would ever want to start

telling the State courts what they could and could not do. My question is, what next do we tell them? That you cannot hear tobacco suits? That you cannot hear real estate suits? This comes at a time when an increased number of unsophisticated investors are getting into the stock market. An increased number of unsophisticated investors are getting into all marketplaces. We fear that these unsophisticated investors, many of them our constituents, might be victimized and not have redress at the Federal level and now being told by this Congress they would not have redress at the State level.

Now, there appears to be no explosion of State securities class actions. I do not see any need for this bill. I would point to last year when there were only 44 cases throughout this entire Nation, the lowest number in 5 years. We have a situation back in Pennsylvania where not exactly unsophisticated investors, many school districts, were taken for a ride by a company called Devon Capital Management. They defrauded 100 municipal clients in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. Those clients included 75 school districts, mostly in western and central Pennsylvania. Are these unsophisticated investors? I do not think so. Many of these municipal governments, school districts included, will be lucky if they can get 10 cents on the dollar. A few may get lucky enough to get 50 cents on the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill and I would suggest that the Members of this Congress vote against it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and those that worked with him to bring this bill to the floor. As many of my colleagues know, the securities litigation reform bill was first filed way back in 1992. It was a bill that we crafted, in fact I was the lead sponsor of it then, to put an end to strike lawsuits in this country of which 94 percent were settled out of court at 10 cents on the dollar. When lawsuits are filed and settled at that rate, 94 percent of them, at 10 cents on the dollar, it paints the picture that I think in a bipartisan way this Congress responded to in 1995. It paints a picture of strike lawsuits, frivolous lawsuits that do not have value except to force the people who have been sued to divvy up, to pay up 10 cents on the dollar just to end the lawsuit, to end the abusive lawsuits.

When were they filed? They were filed immediately when any stock prices changed up or down. They were filed in cookie cutter fashion, very often with the same plaintiffs on the front of the class action lawsuits, very often by the same set of lawyers in America, a unique set of lawyers who constantly brought these strike lawsuits aimed at the directors of corporations, aimed at the corporations themselves, aimed at the accountants and the law firms that represented those corporations, aimed at as many people as they could gather in a lawsuit so at 10 cents on the dollar the lawyers can make a killing.

Did the shareholders who supposedly were defrauded do well in these lawsuits? Absolutely not. We found out that the shareholders got as little as four cents of the claims, four cents of the supposedly defrauded amounts. The truth was that the law before 1995 existed for the benefit of a few lawyers who literally were abusing the system with these strike suits. And abusing who? The corporations, their investors, their pension fund investors, all of us who invested in these corporations thinking that we were making a legitimate investment in a corporation that was going to go out and try to earn a profit for their American stockholders. Instead these corporations were having to pay tribute time after time at 10 cents on the dollar for these strike suits aimed at the heart of corporate America and aimed at the heart of all of us who invest, from the poorest American who invests through their pension funds to the richest who invest in Wall Street directly.

The bottom line was that in 1995, this Congress in a bipartisan fashion not only passed that bill but overrode a presidential veto, a bill that had the support then of the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. But what did we find out after passing the bill even over a presidential veto with such a huge bipartisan majority of over two-thirds? We found out that the same lawyers attempted in the State of California to overcome that Federal law and set up a regime in California to file all the same lawsuits simply in State court in California. We found that time and again the same lawyers were filing the same cookie cutter lawsuits in State courts around America. In short, they were avoiding the reforms we passed over a presidential veto in Congress by using other jurisdictions to accomplish it.

So we are here tonight to perfect that law, to say you cannot use the State courts to do the same illicit, abusive strike suits that you were formerly doing in Federal court.

Have we taken away any legitimate rights of people who have been harmed? No. Lawsuits brought on fraud charges both in State and Federal courts can go forward. They simply go forward under the reforms we passed both on the Federal law and now conforming that Federal law to the 50 States. In short, this bill perfects the work of the 104th Congress in 1995. I urge the passage of this bill and the end of these abusive lawsuits.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the Government Finance Officers Association, Municipal Treasurers' Association, National Association of Counties, National Association of County Treasurers and Finance Officers, National Association of State Retirement Administrators, National Conference of Public Employee Retirement Systems, and National League of Cities, all signed this letter in opposition to this legislation.

The text of the letter is as follows:

GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, MUNICIPAL TREASURERS' ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY TREASURERS AND FINANCE OFFICERS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE RETIREMENT ADMINISTRATORS, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT SYSTEMS, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

July 20, 1998.

MEMBER OF CONGRESS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

RE: H.R. 1689, Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The state and local government organizations listed above write in opposition to H.R. 1689, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998, as reported by the House Committee on Commerce, which is scheduled to be considered by the full House early this week. Our most significant concerns are the following:

Despite the preservation of the right of state and local governments to their pension plans to pursue class actions in state courts which is included in H.R. 1689, the limitation on this right that those in the class must be named plaintiffs and authorize such participation will severely limit the ability of the most vulnerable public entities to recover their losses. State and local governments support the underlying provision to preserve the fundamental right of a state or local government or public pension plan to bring a class action in state court. However, we believe that the limitation placed on that right in H.R. 1689 will effectively exclude the most vulnerable public entities, such as small pension plans. These fraud victims are the least likely to be aware of a pending class action and may be unable to initiate a suit on their own. These parties potentially have the most to lose in case of fraud, yet this provision virtually eliminates their ability to recover their losses.

H.R. 1689 fails to reinstate liability for secondary wrongdoers who aid and abet securities fraud. Despite two opportunities to do so since the Supreme Court struck down for private actions aiding and abetting liability for wrongdoers who assist in perpetrating securities fraud, Congress appears to be on the verge of not only failing to reinstate such liability but extending it to the states.

H.R. 1689 fails to reinstate more a reasonable statute of limitations for defrauded investors to file a claim. As in the case of aiding and abetting, Congress has now had two opportunities to reinstate a longer, more reasonable statute of limitations for defrauded investors to bring suit. Many frauds are not discovered within this shortened time period, but this bill misses the opportunity to make wronged investors whole by not including this provision in H.R. 1689 and

by extending the existing unreasonably narrow time period in which suits may be brought to the states.

The definition of "class action" contained in H.R. 1689 is overly broad. We believe that the definition of class action in H.R. 1689 would allow single suits filed by individual plaintiffs to be rolled into a larger class action that was never contemplated or desired by individual plaintiffs and have it removed to federal court. Claims by the bill's proponents that individual plaintiffs would still be able to bring suit in federal court are undercut by this provision. We believe that no showing has been made of the need for a securities law definition of class action which differs from that of other types of class actions under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

There have been few state securities class actions filed since the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PSLRA) was passed. Despite the claims of the bill's proponents, tracking by the Price Waterhouse accounting firm shows that only 44 securities class actions were filed in state court for all of 1997, compared with 67 in 1994 and 52 in 1995. Most of these cases were filed in California, indicating that, if there is a problem in that state, it is one which should be dealt with at the state level. Citizens of the other 49 states should not be penalized as a result of a unique situation in a single state.

The PSLRA was opposed by state and local governments because the legislation did not strike an appropriate balance, and this legislation extends that mistake to state courts. As both issuers of debt and investors of public funds, state and local governments seek to not only reduce frivolous lawsuits but to protect their investors who are defrauded in securities transactions. The full impact of that statute on investor rights and remedies remains unsettled because even now many parts of the PSLRA have not been fully litigated; however, this untested law would now be extended to state courts.

The above organizations believe that states must be able to protect state and local government funds and their taxpayers and that H.R. 1689 inhibits these protections. We urge you to oppose preemption efforts which interfere with the ability of states to protect their public investors and to maintain investor protections for both public investors and their citizens.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1689, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act. I too believe that strike suits can be a problem, but I believe more importantly that defrauded investors who cannot recover their losses is a greater problem, and furthermore the way we are superseding long established State laws is a problem as well.

I am concerned like everyone else that many of these lawsuits are being pursued by a very small number of attorneys who are only looking to make money for themselves at the expense of newly emerging high tech firms. These lawsuits can cost a company millions. The issue needs to be addressed. But frankly the issue to this date has been quite limited.

Both proponents and opponents of the bill agree that the number of suits have actually declined in the last year. I believe we would be setting a dangerous precedent by going in and blatantly preempting State securities laws, many of which were passed before the Federal Securities Act of 1933, and many of these States which have long established bodies of blue sky laws and securities cases in their own States.

I have significant federalism concerns about this bill. I think anybody on either side of the aisle who cares about States rights ought to have significant federalism concerns. This is an issue which is important but it is also an issue that is limited in its impact to date and it is an issue where if we pass legislation today, we will severely restrict State laws that protect investors and protect small investors most importantly. For that reason, I urge rejection of this bill. It is premature, and we need to find out a way that States can pass appropriate laws without having them be preempted by Federal law.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) who has been most helpful in this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation which I am very proud to have been the chief Democratic sponsor of, H.R. 1689. This is a narrowly focused bipartisan bill that closes a loophole in the 1995 Private Securities Litigation Reform Act that allowed for, or created really, a circumvention to State courts.

The migration to State courts is not a minor problem. It represents an undermining of the core reforms that this Congress implemented in 1995 because the reform act relied on uniform application and enforcement of the law in order to be effective. The bill is needed because as long as frivolous strike suits are threatening high growth companies, they will be held hostage. Consumers are hurt because the companies will not use the safe harbor provision in the 1995 law.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very limited amount of time, one minute, to try to summarize a year and a half's work, and so I want to spend the remaining seconds to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANTON), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY). I also want to thank my very effective partner the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE). It has been a pleasure to work with him and all that have been a part of this. I urge adoption of this legislation. I think the 105th Congress will distinguish itself by doing so.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible bill. I mean really a bad one, a stinker. Write it down, top 10 this year, Bad Bills.

When I was reviewing the legislation, I was reminded of a poem that I once learned as a child:

As I was going up the stair
I met a man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today;
Oh, how I wish that he'd stay away.

□ 2045

The proponents of this bill would have you believe that a man has appeared on the stair in the form of investors flocking from Federal to State courts pursuing frivolous class action suits against honest corporate chieftains.

But the fact is that the number of class actions filed in the States is lower this year than it was last year. In fact, it is lower this year than it was in the year before this Congress passed their Federal Securities Litigation Reform Act in 1995. Fewer State class actions, this year. So there is no increase in State class action suits. People are not looking for that as a loophole around the Federal class action law. It is just not happening.

In fact, what is happening is the loophole that is being closed is the one that the authors of this bill in 1995 told us would still be open, which is that they were not going to touch the State securities laws, that we should not complain, because people can still go to their own home States.

That is the loophole. The loophole is that people who do not want ordinary citizens to be able to ban together in order to protect themselves against fraud are going to have that final door shut in their face with a much-heightened standard, making it much more difficult than ever before for individuals banding together to go in if they have been defrauded.

And believe me, when the market goes up 4,000 or 5,000 points in 3 or 4 years, the bad stocks and the fraudulent stocks go up with the good stocks. You do not find out which ones were the fraudulent ones until the market goes down. Believe me, Newton's law of gravity will take hold here, working in combination with Adam Smith in the future. We will find out that that is the case.

But what do they do? They say, if you find out that you have been defrauded, you cannot any longer rely upon your State's laws for how much time you have. In Massachusetts right now, my home State, by the way, there have only been three class action suits brought in Massachusetts in the last 3 years. Three in 3 years, none of them against high-tech companies. What an epidemic. Three in 3 years. None against high-tech companies.

There are 65 in California. If they have got a problem in California, go to Sacramento. That is why we have State legislatures. Devolution, have

you heard about it? It is a big movement in the 1990s. Go to the State legislatures. If you have got a problem, go there.

We should be voting on this. The assembly? The Senate? California? Big debate? Have you heard about it? No, I have not. They come to Washington. I do not get it.

We do not have a problem in Massachusetts. By the way, none in Pennsylvania, Virginia, Louisiana, across most of the country, no suits. What are we doing here? We should be in Sacramento. It is cooler. It is 95 degrees here in Washington. We should be watching the California State legislature in California debating this great crisis.

No, there is no man on the stair except for those who are trying to cut away those rights and privileges that for 60 years have been given to all investors across this country.

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

STATE BY STATE COMPARISON OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND AIDING AND ABETTING LIABILITY

Locality	Statute of Limitations	Aiding and Abetting
Federal	1 year after discovery/3 years from sale.	No.
Alabama	2 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Alaska	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
Arizona	2 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Arkansas	5 years after discovery	Yes.
California	1 year after discovery/4 years from sale.	Yes.
Colorado	3 years after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
Connecticut	1 year after discovery/3 years from sale.	Yes.
Delaware	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
D.C.	2 years from the transaction upon which it is based.	Yes.
Florida	2 years after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
Georgia	2 years from the transaction upon which it is based.	Yes.
Hawaii	2 years after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
Idaho	3 years from the contract of sale	Yes.
Illinois	3 years after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
Indiana	3 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Iowa	2 years after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
Kansas	3 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Kentucky	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
Louisiana	2 years from the transaction upon which it is based.	Yes.
Maine	2 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Maryland	1 year after discovery/3 years from sale.	Yes.
Massachusetts	4 years after discovery	Yes.
Michigan	2 years after discovery/4 years from sale.	Yes.
Minnesota	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
Mississippi	2 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Missouri	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
Montana	2 years after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
Nebraska	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
Nevada	1 year after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
New Hampshire	6 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
New Jersey	2 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
New Mexico	2 years after discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
New York	6 years after sale	Yes.
North Carolina	2 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
North Dakota	5 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Ohio	2 years after discovery/4 years from sale.	Yes.
Oklahoma	2 years after discovery/3 years from sale.	Yes.

STATE BY STATE COMPARISON OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND AIDING AND ABETTING LIABILITY—Continued

Locality	Statute of Limitations	Aiding and Abetting
Oregon	2 years after discovery/3 years from sale.	Yes.
Pennsylvania	1 year after discovery/4 years from sale.	Yes.
Rhode Island	1 year after discovery/3 years from sale.	Yes.
South Carolina	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
South Dakota	2 years after discovery/3 years from sale.	Yes.
Tennessee	1 year after discovery/2 years from sale.	Yes.
Texas	3 years from discovery/5 years from sale.	Yes.
Utah	2 years after discovery/4 years from sale.	Yes.
Vermont	6 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
Virginia	2 years from the transaction upon which it is based.	Yes.
Washington	3 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
West Virginia	3 years from the contract for sale	Yes.
Wisconsin	3 years after discovery of the facts.	Yes.
Wyoming	2 years from the transaction	Yes.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) has 7¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, too, my colleague's remarks. I have not heard that poem for a while, even though I have little kids age 5 and 4. But I do think of Little Red Riding Hood. Do you remember when the wolf is licking his chops and so on? Here, it is not the investors that the wolf is worried about. The wolf wants to eat the investors.

The stockholders here are being taken advantage of by lawyers who bring lawsuits for their own benefit, and that is what the 1995 Private Securities Litigation Reform Act was all about.

There are a lot of these suits. There have been a lot of these suits. Over half of the top 150 companies in Silicon Valley alone were hit by such suits that were regulated by the 1995 Private Securities Regulation Reform Act.

The enormous price that investors had to pay in these suits, according to one study, amounted on average to $9 million for each settlement. That comes out of the company, out of the investors' hides. But it goes to the lawyers. The plaintiffs, the supposed beneficiaries of this system, on average, received from these $9 million, on average, settlements between 6 cents and 14 cents on the dollar.

That is why such a strong bipartisan majority of the House and the Senate have acted first to bring us the 1995 Private Securities Litigation Reform Act and now to bring us this very, very worthy legislation, the White-Eshoo Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998.

I want to join in congratulating my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for their tireless efforts on behalf of this legislation as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for their leadership in bringing to us this point.

In addition, finally, I want to highlight a provision added in the committee by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) that gets directly to the point raised by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and that is giving States the opportunity themselves to handle the implementation of their own laws.

The continued viability of the section 3(a)(10) of the Securities Act of 1933 is unwritten in this legislation, as well as it should be, and I thank my colleagues for doing such good and worthy work.

A strong bipartisan majority of the House and Senate acted in 1995 to reorient federal securities litigation to encourage investors to bring meritorious claims while protecting innocent employers from meritless extortion suits. We acted to protect the millions of innocent investors who were bearing the cost of meritless lawsuits while gaining little or no recompense for genuine fraud.

In 1996, strong bipartisan majorities of the House and Senate again turned to the issue of securities law, this time addressing the appropriate division of labor between state and federal securities regulators. In that historic bill we determined that "covered securities"—basically, those traded on national exchanges—would be subject to federal regulation, while non-covered securities would be regulated by the states.

Today we are going to continue our work in this field of law by protecting the gains we made in the 1995 Reform Act from circumvention by entrepreneurial trial lawyers, and by harmonizing the 1995 Reform Act and the 1996 National Markets legislation.

Trial lawyers have sought to get around our 1995 reforms by bringing their suits in state courts, where those reforms do not apply. Yet as our capital markets are national, and thus investors may live in any of the 50 states, bringing a suit in one state unfairly imposes a financial burden on residents of another state. To address this inequity and assert that national markets require nationally applied rules, this legislation will make federal courts the exclusive venue for large-scale securities fraud lawsuits involving securities subject to federal regulation under the 1996 National Markets Act.

Because questions have been raised about the 1995 Reform Act both in Committee and in the other body, I would like to take this opportunity—as a principal proponent of the Act—to discuss what Congress did, and did not, do in 1995.

First, with respect to scienter under the 1934 Act: In *Ernst & Ernst* v. *Hochfelder*, the Supreme Court made clear that, as a necessary element of a cause of action under Rule 10b–5, a plaintiff must show that the defendant acted with "scienter," which the Court described as "a mental state embracing intent

to deceive, manipulate, or defraud." [425 U.S. 185 (1976)] The Court in *Hochfelder* expressly left open the question whether extreme recklessness could ever supply this necessary intent element, although subsequent judicial decisions have noted that the language and structure of the Act "evidenced a purpose to proscribe knowing or intentional misconduct." [*Aaron* v. *SEC*, 680, 691 (1980)]

Many Members of Congress and of the Conference Committee that considered the Reform Act believed then, and believe today, that recklessness—the oxymoronic "unintentional fraud"—is not an appropriate or workable basis for Rule 10b–5 liability. In practice, it has proven difficult to distinguish from certain forms of negligence, and has resulted in little uniformity of treatment among even courts that purport to follow the same standard of scienter.

However, other House and Senate Members felt differently, and the Act as enacted left to the courts the determination of the scienter standard on the basis of the pre-existing, unamended 1934 Act. I, for one, believe that the Supreme Court will ultimately determine that the text, structure, and legislative history of the 1934 Act clearly require intentional conduct to impose liability.

With respect to the pleading standard in the 1995 Act, here again the legislative intent is quite clear that we intended to codify a pleading standard higher than that of the Second Circuit, and that we did not intend to codify or incorporate by reference the Second Circuit's caselaw interpreting that caselaw. As explained in the Statement of Managers, "The Conference Committee language is based in part on the pleading standard of the Second Circuit . . . Because the Conference Committee intends to strengthen existing pleading requirements, it does not intend to codify the Second Circuit's caselaw interpreting this pleading standard." And we went on to specifically explain that this was the reason why we dropped the so-called Specter Amendment on motive, opportunity, and recklessness—because we wanted a standard higher than the Second Circuit's, not because the Specter language was implicit in our own Act's language.

The President was certainly quite clear about our Conference Report language: In his December 20, 1995 veto message, he wrote, and I am quoting:

> I am prepared to support the high pleading standard of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit—the highest pleading standard of any Federal circuit court. But the conferees make crystal clear in the Statement of Managers their intent to raise the standard even beyond that level. I am not prepared to accept that. The conferees deleted an amendment offered by Senator Specter and adopted by the Senate that specifically incorporated Second Circuit case law with respect to pleading a claim of fraud. Then they specifically indicated that they were not adopting Second Circuit case law but instead intended to "strengthen" the existing pleading requirements of the Second Circuit. All this shows that the conferees meant to erect a higher barrier to bringing suit than any now existing . . .

The President correctly described the 1995 Reform Act's intent though not its effect. It's ironic that he and other Members of his party, having failed to kill reform openly in 1995, now seek to rewrite the history of the battle they lost.

In addition, I want to again highlight a provision added in the Committee by Chairman BLILEY that makes a technical correction to the 1996 Fields bill. This correction restores the viability of Section 3(a)(10) of the Securities Act of 1933, which provides a voluntary state-law alternative to federal securities registration. This provision—which has been an unamended part of the 1933 Act since the enactment of that legislation, exempts from federal registration securities issued in exchange for other securities, claims, or property interests, if the terms and conditions of the issuance and exchange have been approved as fair by state authorities. It is purely voluntary; issuers may still seek federal registration if they wish. Although the 1996 Act does not amend Section 3(a)(10), it inadvertently impeded its operation. I appreciate the Chairman's consideration in including a curative technical amendment endorsed by the California securities regulatory authority in the manager's amendment.

I look forward to the House's passage of this legislation, and I thank the Chairman and my colleagues for their tireless efforts on behalf of this legislation. Together we have protected investors from frivolous lawsuits in the past, and today we shall ensure that this stands in the future.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, 1995 is a part of Speaker GINGRICH's Contract With America as Congress passed a bill that was called the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act.

The net result of it was that the only way that a person who intentionally defrauded hard working Americans or retirees of their pension funds can be convicted of doing so would be to walk into a courtroom and say "I stole from you." Just a handful of us voted against it. The President vetoed it. Then a handful of us voted against it again.

Some people who care about working people who do not hang out at the Republican National Committee fund-raising headquarters or the Democratic National Committee fund-raising headquarters but actually care about working people have discovered there is still one chance to keep these people from defrauding working people; and that is if we take them to State court.

Now they want to take even that away because they do not want to protect them because there is no big money in it. The big money is in defrauding people. Ask Michael Milliken. This is a horrible bill. It hurts people that live in my district. It hurts people that live in your district.

They count on us to protect them. They count on us to protect them. They do not have any money. They cannot write us $1,000 checks for our campaign. But they count on us to pass laws that are going to look out for them because they are too busy making a living to do it themselves. So if you want to defraud them of their pension, vote for it. But if you do not, vote against it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox).

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a colloquy with the gentlewoman from California, the principal Democratic sponsor of H.R. 1689.

I note that some question was raised during consideration of her legislation about the 1995 Reform Act's effect on standards of liability under the Exchange Act.

Is it the gentlewoman's understanding that, in adopting her legislation today, Congress does not intend to alter standards of liability under the Exchange Act?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, it is my clear understanding that, adopting this legislation, Congress does not intend to alter standards of liability under the Exchange Act.

I would further like to ask the gentleman from California, who was author of the '95 Reform Act, whether it is his understanding that Congress did not, in adopting the Reform Act, intend to alter standards of liability under the Exchange Act?

Mr. COX of California. The gentlewoman is correct. It is my clear understanding that Congress did not, in adopting the Reform Act, intend to alter standards of liability under the Exchange Act.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Berra said, this is deja vu all over again. In 1995, my Republican colleagues came up with a splendid idea that we should close the courthouse door to innocent investors who had been wronged by scoundrels, rogues and rascals. They found that there was a loophole, however. That loophole is that, guess what, could investors still go to the State courts. But that was exactly what the citizens were told they could do when we passed that earlier legislation.

Now we are closing that loophole and we are going to nail shut the courthouse doors of the State courts so a citizen wronged cannot now go to a State court.

The 1995 act imposed extraordinary pleading standards, a stay of discovery so that special facts necessary to meet those heightened pleading standards could not be reached, and an unreasonably short time limit or statute of limitations for filing a fraud claim, and no

ability existed under that law to fully recover from professionals such as accountants and lawyers who aided and abetted in stealing funds from innocent investors.

Those same standards are now extended to State courts by fiat of the Federal Government.

I am curious why it is my colleagues on the Republican side, who talk about States rights, are so diligently imposing this kind of mandate on investors and upon the States.

There may be no real ability now, if this passes, for innocent investors to procure the relief that they are entitled to, and. The Chairman of the SEC wrote that: "it is too early to assess with any confidence the important effects of the Reform Act and, therefore, on this basis, it is premature to propose legislative changes."

The assessment of what we did in 1995 is going to take a long time, but it is very clear that now Federal courts are ruling so restrictively that they threaten almost all private enforcement.

The SEC has filed complaints with the courts pointing out in amicus curiae briefs the evils of this situation. What are we doing today? Nailing shut the State court doors, and we are fixing it so that no little investor can expect much relief in State courts any more than he can in Federal courts.

We do this at a time when the market is at an all time high. We also do it at a time when securities fraud is up, way up. The New York Attorney General has reported that investor complaints have risen 40 percent per year in the last 2 years. The U.S. Attorney in New York City has stated that she has witnessed an explosion of securities fraud; and organized crime has now infiltrated Wall Street.

Why then are we passing legislation to give immunity baths to wrongdoers and also to aiders and abetters?

Finally, I note that Members have not had adequate time to review the committee report. I want to commend my good friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for their part in this. We narrowly avoided a train wreck over the last 2 days because there was an effort made to insert language into the committee report that would have made the plight of investors totally hopeless, and I do commend my friend, the chairman of the committee and of the subcommittee, and the bill's sponsors for blocking that effort.

During the hearing before the subcommittee, the SEC expressed clear concern about District Court cases interpreting the 1995 pleading standards. All 10 Courts of Appeals have considered that question and held that recklessness gives rise to liability.

I note that the legislative history for H.R. 1689 will not seek to alter the standard of liability under the Exchange Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include copies of important letters from the White House, the SEC, the leadership of the Senate Banking Committee on this matter, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 28, 1998.

Hon. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. PHIL GRAMM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Securities, U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Securities, U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN D'AMATO, CHAIRMAN GRAMM, AND SENATOR DODD: We understand that you have had productive discussions with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) about S. 1260, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1997. The Administration applauds the constructive approach that you have taken to resolve the SEC's concerns.

We support the amendments to clarify that the bill will not preempt certain corporate governance claims and to narrow the definition of class action. More importantly, we are pleased to see your commitment, by letter dated March 24, 1998, to Chairman Levitt and members of the Commission, to restate in S. 1260's legislative history, and in the expected debate on the Senate floor, that the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 did not, and was not intended to, alter the scienter standard for securities fraud actions.

As you know, uncertainty about the impact of the Reform Act on the scienter standard was one of the President's greatest concerns. The legislative history and floor statements that you have promised the SEC and will accompany S. 1260 should reduce confusion in the courts about the proper interpretation of the Reform Act. Since the uniform standards provided by S. 1260 will provide that class actions generally can be brought only in federal court, where they will be governed by federal law, it is particularly important to the President that you be clear that the federal law to be applied includes recklessness as a basis for pleading and liability in securities fraud class actions.

So long as the amendments designed to address the SEC's concerns are added to the legislation and the appropriate legislative history and floor statements on the subject of legislative intent are included in the legislative record, the Administration would support enactment of S. 1260.

Sincerely,

BRUCE LINDSEY,
Assistant to the President and Deputy Counsel.
GENE SPERLING,
Assistant to the President for Economic Policy.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1998.

Hon. ARTHUR LEVITT,
Chairman, Securities & Exchange Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEVITT AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION: We are writing to request your views on S. 1260, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1997. As you know, our staff has been working closely with the Commission to resolve a number of technical issues that more properly focus the scope of the legislation as introduced. We attach for your review the amendments to the legislation that we intend to incorporate into the bill at the Banking Committee mark-up.

On a separate but related issue, we are aware of the Commission's long-standing concern with respect to the potential scienter requirements under a national standard for litigation. We understand that this concern arises out of certain district courts' interpretation of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. In that regard, we emphasize that our clear intent in 1995—and our understanding today—was that the PSLRA did not in any way alter the scienter standard in federal securities fraud suits. It was our intent, as we expressly stated during the legislative debate in 1995, particularly during the debate on overriding the President's veto, that the PSLRA adopt the pleading standard applied in the Second Circuit. Indeed, the express language of the statute itself carefully provides that plaintiffs must "state with particularity facts giving rise to a strong inference that the defendant acted with the required state of mind"; the law makes no attempt to define the state of mind. We intend to restate these facts about the '95 Act in both the legislative history and the floor debate that will accompany S. 1260, should it be favorably reported by the Banking Committee.

Sincerely,

ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs.
PHIL GRAMM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Securities.
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Securities.

U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, DC, March 24, 1998.

Hon. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Office Building Washington, DC.

Hon. PHIL GRAMM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Securities, U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Securities, United States Senate, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN D'AMATO, CHAIRMAN GRAMM, AND SENATOR DODD: You have requested our views on S. 1260, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1997, and amendments to the legislation which you intend to offer when the bill is marked-up by the Banking Committee. This letter will present the Commission's position on the bill and proposed amendments. (We understand that Commissioner Johnson will write separately to express his differing views. Commissioner Carey is not participating.)

The purpose of the bill is to help ensure that securities fraud class actions involving certain securities traded on national markets are governed by a single set of uniform standards. While preserving the right of individual investors to bring securities lawsuits wherever they choose, the bill generally provides that class actions can be brought only in federal court where they will be governed by federal law.

As you know, when the Commission testified before the Securities Subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee in October 1997, we identified several concerns about S. 1260. In particular, we stated that a uniform standard for securities fraud class actions that did not permit investors to recover losses attributable to reckless misconduct would jeopardize the integrity of the securities markets. In light of this profound concern, we were gratified by the language in your letter of today agreeing to restate in S. 1260's legislative history, and in the expected debate on the Senate floor, that the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 did not, and was not intended to, alter the well-recognized and critically important scienter standard.

Our October 1997 testimony also pointed out that S. 1260 could be interpreted to preempt certain state corporate governance claims, a consequence that we believed was neither intended nor desirable. In addition, we expressed concern that S. 1260's definition of class action appeared to be unnecessarily broad. We are grateful for your responsiveness to these concerns and believe that the amendments you propose to offer at the Banking Committee mark-up, as attached to your letter, will successfully resolve these issues.

The ongoing dialogue between our staffs has been constructive. The result of this dialogue, we believe, is an improved bill with legislative history that makes clear, by reference to the legislative debate in 1995, that Congress did not alter in any way the recklessness standard when it enacted the Reform Act. This will help to diminish confusion in the courts about the proper interpretation of that Act and add important assurances that the uniform standards provided by S. 1260 will contain this vital investor protection.

We support enactment of S. 1260 with these changes and with this important legislative history.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the legislation, and of course remain committed to working with the Committee as S. 1260 moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR LEVITT,
Chairman.
ISSAC C. HUNT, JR.,
Commissioner.
LAURA S. UNGER,
Commissioner.

U.S. SECURITIES
AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1998.

Hon. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. PHIL GRAMM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Securities, U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Securities, U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN D'AMATO, CHAIRMAN GRAMM, AND SENATOR DODD: It is with regret that I find myself unable to join in the views expressed by my esteemed colleagues in their letter of today's date. For that reason I feel compelled to write separately to express my own differing views.

Consistent with the opinion the Commission and its staff have repeatedly taken, I believe that there has been inadequate time to determine the overall effects of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, and that the proponents of further litigation reform have not demonstrated the need for preemption of state remedies or causes of action at this time.

In the last few years, we have experienced a sustained bull market virtually unmatched at any time during this nation's history. I therefore question the necessity of the displacement of state law in favor of a single set of uniform federal standards for securities class action litigation. The Commission is the federal agency charged with protecting the rights of investors. In my opinion, S. 1260, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1997, does not promote investors' rights. I share in the views of 27 of this country's most respected securities and corporate law scholars who have urged you and your colleagues not to support S. 1260 or any other legislation that would deny investors their right to sue for securities fraud under state law.

In addition, data amassed by the Commission's staff, compiled in unbiased external studies, indicate that the number of state securities class actions has declined during the last year to pre-Reform Act levels. Indeed, a report by the National Economic Research Associates concluded that the number of state court filings in 1996 was "transient." Under these circumstances, S. 1260 seems premature at the least.

This country has a distinguished history of concurrent federal and state securities regulation that dates back well over 60 years. Given that history, as well as the strong federalism concerns that S. 1260 raises, I believe that much more conclusive evidence than currently exists should be required before state courthouse doors are closed to small investors through the preclusion of state class actions for securities fraud.

Sincerely,

NORMAN S. JOHNSON,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this is an outrageously bad bill. The Wall Street and our financial markets do not run on money. They run on public confidence. When you take away the public confidence, no one makes money. If you allow the people of this country to have confidence in their investments and in the marketplace, the market will produce a lot of money for everyone.

This bill strikes at one of the most fundamental rights that the people of this country have, the ability to sue to protect themselves from wrongdoing and to collect damages from wrongdoing and from wrongdoers. I would observe that this bill takes away that right.

It also attacks public confidence in the securities market, something which is going to cost this country dearly. I urge a no vote on the outrageous legislation.

□ 2100

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANTON), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 30 seconds, to the gentleman from New York, in appreciation for the time the gentleman has served in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The gentleman from New York (Mr. MANTON) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support for the legislation before the House. While I support the underlying goals of the measure to bring greater uniformity to the rules governing securities fraud class action suits, I am concerned that in our rush to bring this bill to the floor for consideration, we are not following the normal legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important and complicated piece of legislation which will have far-reaching effects. The bill requires and deserves appropriate review by the House. However, both proponents and opponents of this legislation are being denied this opportunity because we are considering the legislation under suspension of the rules.

I am especially disappointed in the process we are following, because it will result in a provision I strongly support and believe brought much-needed balance to this measure being stripped from the bill as part of the motion to suspend. This provision would have granted nationwide service of process authority to the SEC, thus providing the Commission a greater ability to prosecute cases involving securities fraud.

Mr. Speaker, while we look at ways to create national uniform standards for securities fraud litigation, we should also certainly look at ways to give State and Federal securities regulators the means necessary to seek out and stop dishonest operators that perpetuate securities fraud across State lines. My language, a provision which was part of an overall agreement, a compromise, if you will, to move this legislation forward, would have addressed this very issue.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the decision to strike this provision rests primarily on jurisdictional grounds, not necessarily substantive ones. I hope we can work this out with our colleagues as the process moves along.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), a member of the committee.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to focus in on two issues that my colleagues raised. The first is that frivolous lawsuits have a cost. They have a cost for all Americans. They have a cost in access to capital, they have a cost in lack of job creation.

That is what this issue is really about. We have seen it, we have seen an actual cost. The strike lawsuits that still exist in this country that found a loophole that this legislation is trying

to correct have a terrible effect on the country, and the only way to prevent it is through this legislation.

The second thing I want to respond to is really some of the comments about the number of lawsuits, that it is a problem that does not exist. Let me be very clear about this, how you can use numbers and sort of play around with numbers.

In 1992, there were only four State cases that were brought on this issue. In 1993 there was one. In 1994 there was one. After we passed the legislation, there were 59 in 1995. In 1996, there were 40. So, yes, there was a decrease between 1995 and 1996, but the only reason we saw a 6,000 percent increase over 1995 levels and 4,000 percent increase over 1995 levels was because of the loophole that this legislation needs to be able to solve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its support.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the subcommittee, to close debate on our side.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to close the loophole that enables plaintiff's lawyers to continue to sue for what Judge Friendly called "blackmail settlements." Blackmail settlements occur, of course, when trial lawyers attempt to hold up very effective companies who have had particular problems with their stock and end up spending a great deal of money that could be used for more useful purposes, like research and development and creating jobs, aiding economic expansion. And who pays for that? Really investors do. The company's shareholders and employees lose every time that the company has to pay off a passel of lawyers just to settle a case based on nothing other than one fact, that the company's stock dropped in value, along with some vague nonspecific and baseless allegations of fraud.

The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act put into place protections against these types of claims, and, indeed, what we have seen over the last several months has been a deterioration of that, and, indeed, the loophole that the gentleman from Michigan pointed out has been widening as the days go by.

Since passage of that Reform Act, however, we have seen a dramatic change in that securities litigation. But like a teenager who cleans his room by putting everything under the bed, we have not really eliminated the problem, it just moved. In this case it moved to the State court.

The shift to State court means that investors, employees and the companies seeking capital are wasting valuable resources paying off lawyers, who continue to be successful in extracting blackmail settlements from companies who cannot afford to fight even baseless securities fraud claims.

This legislation before us today eliminates the State court loophole by creating a set of uniform standards for class action lawsuits and eliminates a lot of these fishing expeditions that take place as a result. It does this by granting Federal judges the power to quash discovery in State actions if that discovery conflicts with the order of the Federal court.

I want to thank particularly my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE), as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the lead Democrat sponsor, for their indefatigable efforts on the part of this legislation.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), for leading the committee to develop and improve this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay particular thanks to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANTON), the ranking member of my subcommittee, who has been very helpful in this area. Let me first of all say that we will all miss the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANTON) and his good work here, and we hope to have words later for him in honoring him. But let me say to my friend from New York that I pledge to work with him as we go to conference on the provision that the gentleman had inserted into this legislation. It is important, not only for the State of New York, but for the SEC and for states in general. We want to make certain. It is unfortunate because of a jurisdictional dispute that we had this.

This is good legislation that closes a major loophole. I am proud of the bipartisan support that this bill has engendered.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the debate by 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how is the time to be divided and why we are doing this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes that there is an equal division of the time, 1 minute on either side. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) will control 1 minute, and the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) will control 1 minute.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) is for the bill and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) is for the bill. They are going to share the time equally, half the time over there and half the time to the supporters on this side? I am curious, is that a fair ruling?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair heard no objection to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the proponents of the bill would like to insert a statement to put in as an addition to the debate. Instead of taking up 2 minutes, can we just do it by unanimous consent? That way we do not have to worry about division of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Colloquy must be spoken and not inserted in the record.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, and would ask the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) to begin the colloquy.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ESHOO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, the coauthor of the bill, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, earlier on the floor we had discussed our understanding, our clear understanding, that Congress did not, in adopting the Reform Act, intend to alter standards of liability under the Exchange Act. I would add, and I believe the gentlewoman is in agreement, that in Ernst and Ernst v. Hochfelder, the Supreme Court left open the question of whether conduct that was not intentional was sufficient for liability under the Federal securities laws. The Supreme Court has never answered that question. The court expressly reserved the question of whether reckless behavior is sufficient for civil liability under section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 in a subsequent case, Herman & Maclean v. Huddleston, where it stated, "We have explicitly left open the question of whether recklessness satisfies of the scienter requirement."

The Reform Act did not alter the standard for liability under the Exchange Act. The question was expressly left open by the Reform Act for resolution by the Supreme Court on the basis of the statutory language of the Exchange Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) has expired.

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I will just ask the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), if that is her understanding as well?

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. I thank everyone concerned for the additional time in the debate. This is important language supported by certainly the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and I think it will serve the House well.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1689, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act. This bipartisan initiative is narrowly tailored to address a problem which has arisen since enactment of the 1995 Private Securities Litigation Reform Act. While the 1995 Act was designed to help end abuses in Federal securities class actions, these reforms have been subverted through the use of State courts, undermining the potential benefits to investors, consumers, workers, and the overall economy.

This bill prevents plaintiffs from circumventing the reforms enacted in 1995 by creating a uniform standard for class action lawsuits involving nationally traded securities. The principle behind this legislation is simple. Nationally traded securities, which are primarily regulated by the Federal Government, should be subject to Federal securities law. By establishing fair and consistent rules, Congress not only will protect companies from abuses in class action lawsuits but also will improve the climate for greater forward-looking disclosures for investors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this common-sense legislation and reinforce the reforms that Congress passed by an overwhelming majority in 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1689, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISTS THREATENING TO DISRUPT MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—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, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On January 23, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12947, "Prohibiting Transactions with Terrorists Who Threaten To Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process" (the "Order") (60 Fed. Reg. 5079, January 25, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of 12 terrorist organizations that threaten the Middle East peace process as identified in an Annex to the Order. The Order also blocks the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons designated by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, who are found (1) to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process, or (2) to assist in, sponsor, or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence. In addition, the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, any other person designated pursuant to the Order (collectively "Specially Designated Terrorists" or "SDTs").

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDTs, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of such persons. This prohibition includes donations that are intended to relieve human suffering.

Designations of persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Secretary of State or her delegate, or the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the Federal Register, or upon prior actual notice.

Because terrorist activities continue to threaten the Middle East peace process and vital interests of the United States in the Middle East, on January 21, 1998, I continued for another year the national emergency declared on January 23, 1995, and the measures that took effect on January 24, 1995, to deal with that emergency. This action was taken in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)).

2. On January 25, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice listing persons blocked pursuant to Executive Order 12947 who have been designated by the President as terrorist organizations threatening the Middle East peace process or who have been found to be owned or controlled by, or to be acting for or on behalf of, these terrorist organizations (60 Fed. Reg. 5084, January 25, 1995). The notice identified 31 entities that act for or on behalf of the 12 Middle East terrorist organizations listed in the Annex to Executive Order 12947, as well as 18 individuals who are leaders or representatives of these groups. In addition, the notice provided 9 name variations or pseudonyms used by the 18 individuals identified. The list identifies blocked persons who have been found to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process or to have assisted in, sponsored, or provided financial, material or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence, or are owned or controlled by, or act for or on behalf of other blocked persons. The Department of the Treasury issued three additional notices adding the names of three individuals, as well as their pseudonyms, to the list of SDTs (60 Fed. Reg. 41152, August 11, 1995; 60 Fed. Reg. 44932, August 29, 1995; and 60 Fed. Reg. 58435, November 27, 1995).

3. On February 2, 1996, OFAC issued the Terrorism Sanctions Regulations (the "TSRs" or the "Regulations") (61 Fed. Reg. 3805, February 2, 1996). The TSRs implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against certain persons whose acts of violence have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process. There have been no amendments to the TSRs, 31 C.F.R. Part 595, administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury, since my report of January 28, 1998.

4. Since January 25, 1995, OFAC has issued six licenses pursuant to the Regulations. These licenses authorize payment of legal expenses and the disbursement of funds for normal expenditures for the maintenance of family members, the employment and payment of salary and educational expenses, payment for secure storage of tangible assets, and payment of certain administrative transactions, to or for individuals designated pursuant to Executive Order 12947.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 23 through July 22, 1998, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to organizations that disrupt the Middle East Peace process, are estimated at approximately $165,000. These data do not reflect certain costs of operations by the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

6. Executive Order 12947 provides this Administration with a tool for combating fundraising in this country on behalf of organizations that use terror to undermine the Middle East peace process. The Order makes it harder for such groups to finance these criminal activities by cutting off their access to sources of support in the United States and to U.S. financial facilities. It is also intended to reach charitable contributions to designated organizations and individuals to preclude diversion of such donations to terrorist activities.

Executive Order 12947 demonstrates the determination of the United States to confront and combat those who would seek to destroy the Middle East peace process, and our commitment to the global fight against terrorism. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against extremists seeking to destroy the hopes of peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Israelis as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 21, 1998.*

□ 2115

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). 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.

STARR'S CANDOR IN PLEDGING NOT TO LEAK INVESTIGATIVE INFORMATION IS CALLED INTO QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, according to media reports, a hearing was held this morning on the issue of leaks by the Office of Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr.

The issue of leaks by the Independent Counsel and his staff is not new. Last month, Mr. Starr acknowledged in an interview that he has talked to reporters on an "off the record basis," and that his chief deputy, Mr. Jackie Bennet, Jr., spends much of his time talking to the media.

The Independent Counsel argues that there is nothing improper about his contacts with the media because he did not disclose any information coming directly from the grand jury. According to him, there is nothing wrong with talking to the press about his investigation so long as the information he reveals has not yet come before the grand jury. I find that overly technical distinction to be unpersuasive.

In the past, Mr. Starr has flatly denied leaking to the press. In fact, his earlier public statements took a hard line on the issue. He has said the following about the release of confidential information by his office:

"The release of any investigative information by a member of this office or any other law enforcement agency would constitute a serious breach of confidentiality." Ken Starr, Washington Times, April 30, 1996.

"Consistent with its historical practice, the Department of Justice does not ordinarily disclose the evidence gathered during an investigation except through the mechanism of indictment and trial. *See* 28 CFR § 50.2." Annual Status Report to Congress By The Office of Independent Counsel Kenneth W. Starr, p. 13 (Aug. 9, 1997).

"[A]n independent counsel 'shall, except to the extent that to do so would be inconsistent with the purposes of the statute, comply with the written or other established policies of the Department of Justice respecting enforcement of the criminal laws.' 28 U.S.C. § 594(f)(1)." Annual Status Report to Congress By The Office of Independent Counsel Kenneth W. Starr, p. 13 (Aug. 9, 1997).

"As much as I understand the questions that you have, I am operating under constraints of confidentiality. It is simply inappropriate, it's simply improper for me to be addressing questions in the course of an investigation." Ken Starr Press Conference, Jan. 22, 1998.

"I'm not going to comment on the status of our negotiations [with Ms. Lewinsky's lawyers]. That again, if you ask specific facts, Linda, which you're entitled to do, I just hope you understand, especially when you ask a kind of question about the status of someone who might be a witness, that goes to the heart of the grand jury process." Ken Starr Press Conference, Feb. 5, 1998.

The obligation of laws, I cannot answer some of the questions that you understandably have. I'm sympathetic with that. But I am under a legal obligation not to talk about facts going before the grand jury. Ken Starr Press Conference, Feb. 5, 1998.

I believe in having testimony and evidence put before 23 men and women drawn at random. That's our system. That is government by the people. It's not government by prosecutors. It's putting evidence before a grand jury. That is our system. It's a sound system. It's centuries old. It was ordained at the founding of the American republic. Part of that is, guard the confidentiality of that. Ken Starr Press Conference, Feb. 5, 1998.

"In my service as Independent Counsel, particularly with regard to the secrecy of the grand jury, I have insisted on a high commitment to professional conduct. I have expressed this commitment to you repeatedly. From the beginning, I have made the prohibition of leaks a principal priority of the Office. It is a firing offense, as well as one that leads to criminal prosecution. In the case of each allegation of improper disclosure, we have thoroughly investigated the facts and reminded the staff that leaks are utterly intolerable." Letter from Ken Starr to David Kendall, February 6, 1998, at p.1.

"In light of the unclear press attributions in some examples cited in your letter, I have undertaken an investigation to determine whether, despite my persistent admonitions, someone in this Office may be culpable. I have no factual basis—as you likewise do not have—even to suspect anyone at this juncture." Letter from Ken Starr to David Kendall, February 6, 1998, at p.1.

Mr. Starr's earlier statements to the public appear inconsistent with his more recent admission that he and his deputy routinely talk to the press. The changing positions he has taken raise questions about whether he has been fully candid about the extent of his dealings with the media.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATION FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2 OF THE HOUSE RESOLUTION 477

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 477 to reflect $475,000,000 in additional new budget authority and $475,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999.

As reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, H.R. 4276, a bill making appropriations for Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999, includes $475,000,000 in budget authority and $475,000,000 in outlays for international arrearages.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment.

Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6–7270.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are times when issues impacting this country and the concerns of Americans and the concerns of our constituents, in this instance, my constituents in Houston and those in Texas, really grab hold of us. Frankly, I think the debate that we will have this week on the question of the Patients' Bill of Rights is one that really

goes directly to the heart of the matter. Frankly, it is no issue to take lightly; it is no issue to take frivolous sides, to be partisan and to not come to a resolution. It is a very serious discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the fact that we have now thrown the gauntlet down on the Republican legislation and the Patients' Bill of Rights. I say Republicans over here, and the Patients' Bill of Rights, because that legislation truly represents what the American people want. It is disappointing to me that this House would rise to do something as important as answering the concerns of so many Americans about the abuses of HMOs and to design legislation with absolutely no hearings. I am very gratified today, however, that Democrats saw fit to hold hearings so that testimony could be heard in this Congress on the tragedy of some of the abuses of HMOs.

I think it is important to emphasize the positive, and that is that the Patients' Bill of Rights is centered around a major concept, and that is the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship. So there is no intervener who comes in and says, you are denied service. There is no one who closes the door to an injured loved one when one comes to the emergency room. There is no one who says to you that this service is not going to be paid for.

So many tragedies have occurred because HMOs have taken upon themselves to emphasize business decisions and cost decisions which certainly have merit for more efficient medical care, but they have decided to do that over the needs of those who need the kind of care that is important in America.

We have had women who have been denied the use of an OB-GYN as a primary caretaker. We have had people who have been turned away from the emergency rooms. We have had doctors who have been intimidated by bureaucrats in some other State saying, no, that service is denied. We have had those doctors and nurses who want to give real quality care being refused the ability to serve their respective patients, and then we have had a very funny system: Well, if you do not like what the HMOs have done, why do you not just appeal? Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks at a time to take an appeal. The Patients' Bill of Rights gives a little extra clout to the patient.

Mr. Speaker, we stand on the side of those who are intimidated and who are denied the service by giving them the ability to sue the HMOs. Is that the anchor of our legislation? Absolutely not. But we do recognize that the health care in America is broken and it needs to be fixed.

Let me suggest to my colleagues why, because today Democrats took a real bold step and listened to those individuals who wanted to tell us what had happened to them with HMOs.

Sharon Crossley of Wallingford, Connecticut. In 1997, Sharon was diagnosed with breast cancer. Four days before her surgery was scheduled, the HMO medical review doctor denied that surgery. After making countless calls to her HMO, she was told by a customer service agent that if she did not agree with her medical review doctor's decision, she could follow the internal written appeals procedure. HMO members were not allowed to speak to the medical review doctor. Time was running out. Sharon was 3 weeks into biopsy, and after a biopsy is performed, there is only a 3 or 4 week window to take the next course of action. Sharon contacted a local Member of Congress who got her the surgery.

In 1989 Florence and Wayne Cocoran tragically lost their baby boy when Florence's managed care plan denied hospitalization over her obstetrician's objections during her eighth month of high-risk pregnancy. Florence was faced with a high-risk pregnancy; her obstetrician ordered her hospitalized, as she had been successfully in a previous high-risk pregnancy, which resulted in a healthy baby, yet her managed care company overruled her doctor and denied the hospitalization, even though they had a second opinion agreeing with the doctor's advice. Instead, Cocoran's insurer ordered home nursing for only 10 hours each day. During the last month of Cocoran's pregnancy, when no nurse was on duty, the baby went into distress and the baby died.

The Republican plan leaves out 100 million Americans who need medical insurance and medical coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say, let us pass a real Bill of Rights for the patients of America. Let us stand with those who count: Caretakers and patients and Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) until 2:30 p.m. today on account of illness.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Tuesday, July 21, on account of personal 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 Ms. DEGETTE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. TAUSCHER, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OXLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KASICH, 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 Ms. DEGETTE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BERMAN.
Ms. LEE.
Mr. KIND.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. ROTHMAN.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OXLEY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. PAUL.
Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mrs. EMERSON.
Mr. HANSEN.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. WHITE.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. BASS.
Mr. WALSH.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1439. An act to facilitate the sale of certain land in Tahoe National Forest in the State of Colorado to Placer County, California.

H.R. 1460. An act to allow for the election of the Delegate from Guam by other than separate ballot, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1779. An act to make a minor adjustment in the exterior boundary of the Devils Backbone Wilderness in the Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri, to exclude a small parcel of land containing improvements.

H.R. 2165. An act to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of FERC Project Number 3862 in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2217. An act to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of FERC Project Number 9248 in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2841. An act to extend the time required for the construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 2676. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restructure and reform the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2316. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a plan to ensure that all amounts accrued on the books of the United States Enrichment Corporation for the disposition of depleted uranium hexafluoride will be used to treat and recycle depleted uranium hexafluoride.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 22, 1998, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10102. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Louisiana [Docket No. 98-068-1] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10103. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300677; FRL-5797-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10104. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Gliocladium Catenulatum Strain J1446; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-300665; FRL-5794-3] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10105. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Myclobutanil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300678; FRL-5798-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10106. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's rule—Organization; Loan Policies and Operations; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in Systemwide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Other Financing Institutions (RIN: 3052-AB67) received July 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10107. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits [29 CFR Part 4044] received July 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10108. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Theft Data; Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard [Docket No. NHTSA-97-3125; Notice 02] (RIN: 2127-AH04) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10109. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Montana; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [MT-001-004a; FRL-6122-2] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10110. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Designation of Area for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of California; Redesignation of the San Francisco Bay Area to Nonattainment for Ozone [CA-008-BU, FRL-6120-4] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10111. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Underground Storage Tank Program: Approved State Program for Nevada [FRL—6118-1] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10112. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act ("Appliance Labeling Rule") [16 CFR Part 305] received July 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10113. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-380, "Assault on an Inspector or Investigator and Revitalization Corporation Amendment Act of 1998" received July 2, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

10114. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-382, "Official Dinosaur Act of 1998," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

10115. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Washington Sport Fishery [Docket No. 980225048-8059-02; I.D. 062398A] received July 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10116. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Amendment to Passenger Train Emergency Preparedness Docket; Safety Glazing Standards; Correction [FRA Docket No. PTEP-1, Notice No. 4] (RIN: 2130-AA96) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10117. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109C and A109K2 Helicopters [Docket No. 97-SW-65-AD; Amendment 39-10619; AD 98-13-28] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10118. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Model EC 135 Helicopters [Docket No. 98-SW-18-AD; Amendment 39-10632; AD 98-09-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10119. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 332C, L, and L1 Helicopters [Docket No. 97-SW-39-AD; Amendment 39-10630; AD 98-13-39] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10120. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS332C, L, and L1 and Model SA330F, G, and J Helicopters [Docket No. 98-SW-11-AD; Amendment 39-10633; AD 98-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10121. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA 330F, G, and J Helicopters [Docket No. 97-SW-06-AD; Amendment 39-10631; AD 98-13-40] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10122. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Youngstown Elser Metro Airport, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98-AGL-24] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10123. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Griffith, IN [Airspace Docket No. 98-AGL-22] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10124. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Fort Atkinson, WI [Airspace Docket No. 98-AGL-23] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10125. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of

Class E Airspace; Roxboro, NC [Airspace Docket No. 98-ASO-5] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10126. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directive; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-10629; AD 98-13-38] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10127. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A, SAAB 340B, and SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96-NM-212-AD; Amendment 39-10627; AD 98-13-36] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10128. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96-NM-203-AD; Amendment 39-10626; AD 98-13-35] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10129. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-145-AD; Amendment 39-10622; AD 98-13-31] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10130. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-329-AD; Amendment 39-10623; AD 98-13-32] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10131. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A300-600, and A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-10624; AD 98-13-33] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10132. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited, Aero Division-Bristol, S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 Series Turbojet Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-15-AD; Amendment 39-10612; AD 98-13-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10133. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 95-NM-78-AD; Amendment 39-10614; AD 98-13-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10134. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100) Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-83-AD; Amendment 39-10615; AD 98-13-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10135. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-89-AD; Amendment 39-10618; AD 98-13-27] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10136. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAC 1-11 200 and 400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-51-AD; Amendment 39-10617; AD 98-13-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10137. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-16-AD; Amendment 39-10616; AD 98-13-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10138. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited, Aero Division-Bristol, S.N.E.C.M.A., Olympus 593 Series Turbojet Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-12-AD; Amendment 39-10609; AD 98-13-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10139. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. 97-CE-86-AD; Amendment 39-10599; AD 98-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10140. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 and A321-100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-75-AD; Amendment 39-10606; AD 98-13-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10141. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-10607; AD 98-13-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10142. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica, S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-65-AD; Amendment 39-10604; AD 98-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10143. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AERMACCHI S.p.A. Models F.260, F.260B, F.260C, and F.260D Airplanes [Docket No. 97-CE-143-AD; Amendment 39-10597; AD 98-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10144. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-10602; AD 98-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10145. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-81-AD; Amendment 39-10628; AD 98-13-37] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10146. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Independence Day Celebration Fireworks, Wards Island, East River, New York [CGD01-98-070] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10147. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Election Not to Apply Look-Back Method in De Minimis Cases [TD 8775] (RIN: 1545-AV79) received July 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1689. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to limit the conduct of securities class actions under State law, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2281. Referral to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than July 22, 1998.

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 Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DAVIS of

Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DREIER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 4280. A bill to provide for greater access to child care services for Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 4281. A bill to repeal sections 1173(b) and 1177(a)(1) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FORD, and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 4282. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to police badges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SABO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska):

H.R. 4283. A bill to support sustainable and broad-based agricultural and rural development in sub-Saharan Africa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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 Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4284. A bill to authorize the Government of India to establish a memorial to honor Mahatma Gandhi in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CAMP, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. ENSIGN):

H.R. 4285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4286. A bill to amend the Federal Rules of Evidence to establish a parent-child privilege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 4287. A bill to make technical corrections and minor adjustments to the boundaries of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. EWING:

H.R. 4288. A bill to establish the negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the WTO Agreement on Agriculture, to establish criteria for the accession of state trading regimes to the WTO, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 4289. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior of the Wilcox ranch in Eastern Utah for management as wildlife habitat; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH):

H.R. 4290. A bill to assist State and local governments in conducting community gun buy back programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4291. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate, for alien battered spouses and children, certain restrictions rendering them ineligible to apply for adjustment of status, suspension of deportation, and cancellation of removal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. HORN, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 4292. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow attachment of certain property of foreign states in execution of judgements for acts of terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. HORN):

H.R. 4293. A bill to establish a cultural and training program for disadvantaged individuals from Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, 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 Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4294. A bill to amend the Elwha River Ecosystem and Fisheries Restoration Act to provide further for the acquisition and removal of the Elwha dam and acquisition of Glines Canyon dam and the restoration of the Elwha River ecosystem and native anadromous fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the culpability of Slobodan Milosevic for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in the former Yugoslavia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, and Mr. PARKER):

H. Res. 507. A resolution providing special investigative authority for the Committee on Education and the Workforce; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin introduced A bill (H.R. 4295) for the relief of Juan Antonio Manrique; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 457: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 612: Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 693: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 836: Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LEE, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 922: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 923: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 979: Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. BONO, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. PEASE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1134: Mr. FILNER and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1234: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1321: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1378: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1401: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2021: Mr. COBURN and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2070: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 2409: Mr. WISE and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2588: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2714: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2715: Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 2720: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 2840: Mr. MANZULLO and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 2896: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 2912: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 2949: Mr. SNOWBARGER.

H.R. 2955: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 2990: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2995: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3008: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 3048: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 3081: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. YATES, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STOKES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3125: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. DANNER, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3127: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 3159: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 3205: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 3230: Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3248: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 3279: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 3284: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 3464: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3500: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 3523: Mr. HILLIARD and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3571: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 3577: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 3598: Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3602: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 3608 Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 3636: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 3641: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 3659: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CANNON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3785: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 3803: Mr. REDMOND.

H.R. 3814: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. COOK, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3862: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 3865: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 3895: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 3925: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 4010: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 4016: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4070: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 4151: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 4181: Mr. POSHARD and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4204: Mr. HASTERT and Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 4213: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 4217: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 4219: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 4220: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4232: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 4235: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 4240: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 4250: Mr. COOKSEY and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 4251: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 4258: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. NUSSLE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. EVANS, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. LAMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mrs. BONO.

H. Con. Res. 126: Mr. BOYD, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. PALLONE.

H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 224: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. PAUL.

H. Con. Res. 286: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. RYUN.

H. Con. Res. 302: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 362: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 415: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 460: Mr. GREEN, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REYES, Mr. COOK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Ms. RIVERS.

H. Res. 479: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. NADLER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1891: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

68. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gregory D. Watson of Austin, Texas, relative to protesting the cost-of-living adjustment increase in the compensation of Members of Congress which took effect in January 1998; to the Committee on House Oversight.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. ENSIGN

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 56, line 2, after "$156,167,000" insert "(increased by $5,300,000)".

Page 40, line 14, after "$37,304,000" insert "(decreased by $5,300,000)".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. GILCHREST

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 122, beginning on line 24, strike section 337 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 337. (a) FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN STRUCTURES LOCATED IN COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM.—Section 6 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3505) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) PROVISION OF FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN STRUCTURES IN SYSTEM UNITS.—Section 5 shall not apply to financial assistance in the form of flood insurance coverage provided under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) for a structure referred to in paragraph (2) (A) or (B), if—

"(1) a completed application for flood insurance coverage under that Act for that structure is submitted within the 1-year period beginning on the effective date of this subsection; and

"(2) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency determines that construction of that structure was completed by not later than—

"(A) October 1, 1983, in the case of a structure located in System unit PO5, PO5A, P10, or P18; or

"(B) November 16, 1990, in the case of a structure located on lands added to System unit P11, P11A, or P25 on that date.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1321(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4028(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period the following: ", except that this sentence does not prohibit the provision of flood insurance coverage if section 5 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act does not apply to provision of that coverage by reason of section 6(e) of that Act.".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. GILCHREST

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 122, beginning on line 24, strike section 337.

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Page 12, line 20, insert "(decreased by $18,000,000)" after the dollar figure.

Page 17, line 4, insert "(decreased by $9,200,000)" after the first dollar figure.

Page 89, line 11, insert "(increased by $25,200,000)" after the dollar figure.

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 23: Page 57, line 6, insert "(decreased by $62,850,000)" after "$271,440,000".

Page 69, line 15, insert "(increased by $62,850,000)" after "$320,558,000".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 19, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $30,000,000)".

Page 70, line 17, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by $30,000,000)".

H.R. 4193

OFFERED BY: MR. REDMOND

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Insert after the final section the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount for "LAND ACQUISITION" under the heading "FOREST SERVICE" and reducing the amount for "GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION" under the heading "NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS", by $25,000,000.

H.R. 4194

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to implement Chapter 12B of the Administrative Code of San Francisco, California.

H.R. 4276

OFFERED BY: MR. BARTLETT OF MARYLAND

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 78, strike line 15, and all that follows through line 6 on page 79.

H.R. 4276

OFFERED BY: MR. FOX

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of State or the United States Information Agency to provide equipment, technical support, training, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation.