

□ 0945

# WALHALLA NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3546) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Walhalla National Fish Hatchery to the State of South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after line 2 insert:

TITLE I—WALHALLA NATIONAL FISH  
HATCHERY

Page 2, line 1, strike out "SECTION 1" and insert "SEC. 101".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "SEC. 2" and insert "SEC. 102".

Page 3, after line 7 insert:

TITLE II—CORRECTION OF COASTAL  
BARRIER RESOURCES MAP

## SEC. 201. CORRECTIONS OF MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall make such corrections to the set of maps described in subsection (b) as are necessary to move the southern-most boundary of Unit SC-01 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (known as the "Long Pond Unit") to exclude from the Unit the structures known as "Lands End", "Beachwalk", and "Courtyard Villas", including the land lying between the structures. The corrected southern boundary shall extend in a straight line, at the break in development, between the coast and the north boundary of the unit.

(b) MAPS.—The set of maps described in this subsection is the set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System" dated October 24, 1990, insofar as the maps relate to Unit SC-01 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

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

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 30 of this year, the House overwhelmingly adopted H.R. 3546, a bill introduced by our colleague, LINDSEY GRAHAM, to transfer the Walhalla National Fish Hatchery to the State of South Carolina.

This noncontroversial bill is nearly identical to measures the House has approved to transfer certain Federal fish hatcheries to non-Federal control.

This hatchery, which is about 78 acres, is currently being operated by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources under a long-term agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Without this agreement, the Service would have closed the hatchery because it is no longer an essential component of its nationwide stocking program.

The other body has now acted on H.R. 3546 and while they made no changes in the Walhalla provision, they

did add a new title which makes technical changes to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

In fact, they have specifically redrawn the boundaries of unit 01 in South Carolina to delete certain properties, known as Beachwalk, Courtyard Villas, and Lands End, from the System. It is my understanding that there were structures on these properties prior to the passage of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990. It is, therefore, appropriate to correct this mistake and to remove this property from the System because it does not satisfy the criteria for inclusion.

Finally, I would advise my colleagues that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated they support this modification to the Coastal Barrier Resource System. This is the second time we have removed property from the System this year. In each instance, we have done so without undermining the fundamental goals of this important environmental law.

I urge a vote in favor of this legislation and I compliment LINDSEY GRAHAM for his outstanding leadership on behalf of his South Carolina constituents.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we join in the support of this legislation on the Walhalla National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act. The committee did report out the legislation, and we think it does make sense to allow for the transfer of this hatchery. We have no objections to the legislation.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I have not further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3546.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate amendments to H.R. 3546.

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

There was no objection.

## NATIONAL UNDERGROUND RAILROAD FREEDOM CENTER

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4073) to authorize the National Park Service to coordinate programs with, provide technical assistance to, and enter into cooperative agreements with, the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, OH, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4073

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the story of the Underground Railroad, which links historical themes related to slavery, the desire for freedom, inter-racial cooperation, and the African-American experience, is unique and nationally significant;

(2) elements of the story of the Underground Railroad are not adequately represented and protected;

(3) an entity to interpret and preserve the story of the Underground Railroad is appropriate and necessary; and

(4) the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, has been established to commemorate historic themes related to slavery, the desire for freedom, inter-racial cooperation, and the African-American experience and to relate these themes to the ongoing struggle for freedom among men, women, and children around the world.

## SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to recognize the importance of the Underground Railroad, the sacrifices made by those in search of freedom from tyranny and oppression, and the sacrifices made by those who helped those individuals in search of freedom;

(2) to encourage and assist the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, in becoming a principal interpretive center of the Underground Railroad experience in the United States; and

(3) to provide a role for the Federal Government in enhancing public understanding and appreciation of the Underground Railroad and in preserving the many resources of the Underground Railroad.

## SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE; AFFILIATED STATUS.

(a) COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of the Interior may coordinate the Underground Railroad interpretive programs of the National Park Service with the interpretive activities of the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center (in this Act referred to as the "Center"), which is to be built in Cincinnati, Ohio, and is to be devoted to the story of the Underground Railroad.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to the Center in developing the interpretive programs of the Center.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.—The Secretary shall treat the Center as an affiliated area of the National Park System.

## SEC. 4. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS; PARTNERSHIP.

(a) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Ohio, the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, and other public or private entities to provide technical assistance to the Center.

(b) PARTNERSHIP.—The National Park Service may work in partnership with the Center in the efforts of the Center to disseminate information on the Underground Railroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4073, a bill introduced by our colleague, Mr. PORTMAN, to designate the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, OH as an affiliated area of the National Park System.

The Underground Railroad was perhaps the most dramatic protest action against slavery in U.S. history. It was a clandestine operation that began during the colonial period, later became part of organized abolitionist activity in the 19th century, and reached its peak in the period 1830-1865. The story of the Underground Railroad is one of individual sacrifice and heroism in the efforts of enslaved people to reach freedom from bondage.

In 1990, Congress passed Public Law 101-628 which directed the National Park Service to conduct a study of the Underground Railroad to determine methods for commemorating and interpreting the Underground Railroad. In February of this year, the administration transmitted their study to Congress. Among other things, the study concluded that a variety of partnership approaches would be most appropriate for the protection and interpretation of the Underground Railroad.

One of the main routes of the Underground Railroad went through western Tennessee, central Kentucky and Ohio and into Canada. Along this route, Cincinnati was a key stopover. A private foundation in Cincinnati has already raised substantial funds to develop an interpretive center. H.R. 4073 authorizes the National Park Service to provide technical assistance to the Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, as an affiliated area of the National Park Service, yet result in no increased expenditure.

This is a good bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. While the goals are laudable in terms of recognizing our historic and cultural experience with regards to slavery and emancipation, we do not know the role of Cincinnati, OH, and its role in that history.

In fact, this has been the subject of extensive studies by the National Park System, and the fact is while there are many areas that have been touched by this phenomena of the Underground Railroad and the emancipation of American minorities and the African-American in this Nation in that incident, there is, as far as I know, no fabric that exists in Cincinnati. There is no reason for this legislation at this point.

I think one of the major problems, with the legislation that is before us, Mr. Speaker, is that there have not been hearings, to my knowledge, on this subject in the House this session or in the past. This merely tries to build a center, construct a site, which would attract people.

I just do not understand the basis and rationale on which this legislation is before the House. I first learned of it on reading the suspension calendar today.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just mentioned a point. My understanding in this legislation is that this legislation was introduced just 2 weeks ago, and obviously we have not had hearings nor markups on this bill. Yet what we are doing is we are committing the resources of the National Park System to assist and to help operate what is an interpretive center in Cincinnati, and yet the center has not been built. We do not know the extent of those obligations, and we are creating something now called an affiliated area.

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle has very often spoken in the committee and on the floor about the continued spreading of the resources of the National Park Service, given their budgetary problems and the backlogs and all of the other issues they are confronted with, and here we are being asked to commit to something that for the moment does not exist, may never exist, but if it does exist, we do not know the extent of the commitment to which we are asking.

Mr. Speaker, I just think that the gentleman is correct in opposing this legislation, since we do not even quite yet understand what the center is going to do. We appreciate they want to be affiliated with the historical events of the underground railroad, which is a proud moment to a sad situation in this country, but to just take this shot in the dark and commit us and commit the National Park Service without any discussion of what this truly means I think would be a mistake, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1000

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his comments.

I understand that the study was completed in February 1996 but that it identified a number of Underground

Railroad sites in Ohio but did not identify Cincinnati. The point is that this is basically an open-end authorization for the Park Service to go in and agree to cooperate in a variety of ways, including construction, operation, and maintenance funding. This could result in obligations which would be in the tens of millions of dollars over a period of years, in fact, this legislation will result in facilitating this funding.

I think this issue, I am sure that there are many, whether Cincinnati should be the central nexus of where this takes place, or other areas would be, I think is an open question. We know of the Underground Railroad activities at a time in Pennsylvania and in many other of the central Eastern States. So I do not know the justification for this or the rationale.

I do not think we have had the benefit of reviewing the study in an open way in terms of questioning what is happening. I do not know the suitability, as I said, I do not know if there is any fabric. I regret I arrived on the floor late, but I do not know of any fabric that exists that would be accorded the type of recognition that guide the Park Service with regard to cultural and national resources.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes a very important point, and I hope our colleagues are listening, because this is, in theory, as the gentleman from Utah says, this is based upon a study that was done. But when we look at the study authorized by this Congress to discuss this issue, they come up with a list of high potential candidates for interpretation in association with the national parks.

They come up with Farmington, CT, the First Church of Christ; they come up with Sumatra, FL, which was Fort Gadsden; they come up with St. Augustine, FL, which was the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, they come up with the Levi Coffin House, which is in Fountain City, IN; the Bishop Paul Quinn House in Richmond, IN; Harriet Tubman's birthplace, which is Bucktown, MD; Harriet Tubman Home for the Aged in Auburn, NY; the John Rankin House in Ripley, Union Township, OH; the John Parker House in Ripley, OH; the Mother Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, PA; the Stono River Slave Rebellion site in Rantowles, SC; the Nat Turner Slave Revolt Historic District in Courtland, VA; the Rokeby House in Ferrisburg, VT.

Nowhere is Cincinnati, OH, suggested by this report, that this would be the proper place to deal with the interpretation aspects of commemorating the underground railroad or in association with the National Park Service.

I think we have got to take that into consideration, and that is why we

would have preferred that we had a hearing in the committee. We could discuss this. We could list this. If the gentleman wanted to, he could suggest Cincinnati, OH, and we could bounce that off of the Park Service. But the fact of the matter is, as one goes through this report, there is more evidence that Canton may have more to do with this or Oberlin, if you will but not Cincinnati at this point, or at least not in this report.

I would hope that the gentleman will withdraw bill before we head off in this direction and commit the National Park Service to this effort. Again, I would say to my colleagues, there were some 380 sites that were suggested, and then that was distilled down to 42 different sites. With all due respect, they are not in Cincinnati, OH.

If we are going to keep the historical integrity and respect to the fact that we went out and funded a very large and detailed study, and now we are going to decide on the day before we adjourn that we are just going to put this in Cincinnati, OH, without any hearings, it may become in Cincinnati. Maybe there is a case that can be made, maybe the missed something. But the fact of the matter is, it should not be done on suspension and should not be done without hearings.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for his opposition to this.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the ranking member yielding me time, and I want to give the others that are opposed to this some time.

I want to stipulate that I do not disagree with the goals in terms of recognition of the underground railroad, but we need to have a plan. We need to follow and use the information from the study.

I understand that the gentleman from California is talking about the historic fabric that is in place. It does not necessarily reflect what the role of Cincinnati was, and the issue here is that we need to know what the level of this commitment is and how we are going to relate to the other sites.

I think we need to provide the Park Service with more direction in this particular instance other than simply saying we are going to let you go and agree to an affiliated area in Ohio, which will not be part of the Park Service but could represent significant dollars and amounts that are invested in it.

We should be doing partnerships like this, but my suggestion is, if Cincinnati wants to go ahead and construct an interpretive center in this and do work in this, I commend them. I think that is great. They may have rich history in the underground railroad. But the history as far as I know, as represented by the gentleman from California, that there is not fabric there, we do not know what the nature is, how it will be tied together with the other elements.

We know there are many other competing proposals. To try to come in and

award Cincinnati the type of recognition that this bill would do and directing the Park Service in this way, I think is, to say the least, premature. To do it this late, without hearings or without understanding, I would hope that we would not do this at this time. Therefore, I oppose the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Again in the discussion of the historical sites, even in Ohio there is Toledo and Sandusky and Oberlin and Seville and Cleveland and Plainfield and Ashtabula and Jefferson and Wooster and Homeworth, Millersburg, Loudonville, McKay, Hayesville, Ashland, Savannah, Mt. Vernon, Utica, and Zanesville.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the issue here is one of suitability of this particular location as the visitor center that relates to all the other type of historic fabric and experience, in terms of our experience in terms of emancipation and the whole phenomenon that dealt with slavery.

I think that this is a very important topic, one that we should sit down and I think that we can come to agreement on. I am very pleased as a matter of fact to see that there is this type of interest on both sides of the aisle in terms of this issue. So it should not break down in this way. This is an issue where we can come to agreement.

But at this point I strongly oppose taking this action today and directing the Park Service to do this type of activity, and I would hope my colleagues would agree. This, as I said, could be tens of millions of dollars of commitment and the wrong direction for our policy.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time. I am a little surprised by the discussion. I wanted to come out and clarify a few points. I apologize I was not out here earlier. I did not know it was to be on the floor. I would hope that other supporters of this legislation, including the gentleman from Ohio, LOU STOKES, the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, the gentleman from Louisiana, BILL JEFFERSON, the Ohio delegation in its entirety and others, will be able to come out on the floor to talk on it also.

I want to go over, if I could, some of the background for the purposes of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Minnesota just to give them a little more understanding of where we are and how we got here, and they try to address some of the concerns raised by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

This is bipartisan. This does not require any Federal funds, as the gentle-

men know. It is an authorization simply for the Park Service to work with a private group that has been working with the Park Service in any case for the past couple of years.

This group has indeed moved forward in a very constructive way, bringing in all elements of our community, as well as the entire country in terms of underground railroad experience, to come up with an Underground Railroad Freedom Center, which would be an interpretive center. This would not be the kind of more traditional museum one might think of, but instead would commemorate the underground railroad experience across the country, at all the sites the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] mentioned, including the sites in the greater Cincinnati area that he mentioned.

The Ripley, OH, sites happen to be in my district that the gentleman mentioned, and Cincinnati does have a rich heritage with regard to the underground railroad.

I just am amazed this Congress would oppose this type of activity. We are not asking for any money or any commitment from this Congress in terms of the tens of millions of dollars Mr. VENTO talked about. We are talking about a wonderful partnership between the Park Service and the private sector to be able to move forward with this project, for which in the private sector has already been raised over \$400,000.

It is clearly the No. 1 project of this kind in the country. It is an event in our history that must be commemorated. I think it is an outrage it has not been commemorated. And I think it would be a slap in the face to these efforts and exactly the wrong way to go for us as a Congress now to say we are not even going to allow the Park Service to enjoy this affiliate status which requires no funding with this group that has done so much, because I think it would discourage them.

Let me say also that this is in Cincinnati for two important reasons. One is, frankly, Cincinnati is way out front on it; but, second, Cincinnati does have a rich history and tradition with regard to the underground railroad. In fact, slaves from as far away as New Orleans and so on equated Cincinnati with the word "freedom" because it was such a center for this. The Harriet Beecher Stowe Home, of course, is in Cincinnati. Harriet Beecher Stowe is from Cincinnati.

There is a lot of underground railroad archeological evidence in the Cincinnati area, including the sites, again, that Mr. MILLER talked about in Ripley, OH, the Rankin House, the John Parker House, and so on.

Let me also say that the Park Service has been working with us for over a year on this project. I know Mr. MILLER reads carefully all the correspondence he gets from the Park Service and the acknowledgment letter that came with the report that he mentioned earlier specifically talks about Cincinnati, and let me quote from it.

This is from the Park Service in February of this year, when they submitted the statutorily required report on the underground railroad.

We are especially encouraged to see that the private sector already has expressed a strong interest in these concepts, as evidenced by substantial progress in planning for an Underground Railroad freedom center to be developed by private, State and local funding sources in Cincinnati, Ohio. The Park Service foresees the possibility of collaborating with this organization in the future to implement some of the goals of this report.

This is signed by George Frampton, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Again, we have worked carefully with the Park Service, not only in terms of this development of the underground railroad freedom center in Cincinnati, we have raised over \$400,000 locally, all from private sources, not 1 Government dollar; and, importantly, we have worked closely with the National Park Service in coming up with this legislation.

So I do not know what more to say. I think it would be exactly the wrong thing for this Congress not to at least acknowledge the good work these folks have done. And these are people from all around the country. Their national advisory group includes people who are from all the areas, I think, that Mr. MILLER talked about. They have a lot of academic support from various places around the country.

Again, if we look at the cosponsorship of this, it includes people who have been involved in this issue in the past. I hope that the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, the gentleman from Ohio, LOU STOKES, and others will be able to come down to the floor; I happened to be in another meeting when I heard about this, to be able to also talk on behalf of this.

Mr. VENTO, I think maybe that answers some of your questions, I hope it does. But if the gentleman would like me to yield, maybe there are some other more specific ones.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his time, but I think the gentleman has not answered the question.

Our problem is that we cannot conduct a hearing on the House floor after we get no notification until we see this on the schedule this morning. That is where I am coming from.

After chairing and working on these subjects for years, after putting these studies in place to get the information back, I have no idea of the validity of whether or not the gentleman is relating to what is in the study. That is where we are.

It is not a question of the recognition of the underground railroad here. It is a question of why we are going to give this designation or symbolic recogni-

tion to this community. If there is no Federal money in it, they can go ahead and we can deal with this type of legislation later. In fact, I think the Park Service can give technical assistance without authorization.

But there is money in this bill. It is more than a symbolic act in terms of what is proposed to occur here. As I attributed it, as I said, I know there is not much fabric here. Obviously, I understand what the interpretive center is, but I do not know why this, of all locations, should be the location. I do not know that it is recommended in the study.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time just for a moment. The gentleman was involved in the study, and I commend him for that. I had thought that, perhaps, because he is in constant communication with the Park Service, that maybe he knew more about this. They have been working with us for at least a solid year, not only on the concepts of Cincinnati, where we have looked to them for guidance all along the way, but also this specific legislation.

Let me say that if this private sector group were to move forward without additional technical assistance and without additional guidance from the Park Service, then the very goals that are outlined in that report might not be followed as closely as the gentleman might like or I might like. I think this is a way, in fact, to bring to fruition the kinds of things that the gentleman has been supporting.

All it says is that there will be an affiliate status with the Park Service. There is no money in the bill. It is an authorization to allow the Park Service to enter into some sort of a technical assistance, some sort of a guidance relationship with this group in Cincinnati that has done so much work.

□ 1015

Again, it is a national group. If you look at the members of the board, they are a national advisory group. This is a group that was brought together, academic experts and so on. I think what is going to happen is they are going to go ahead. They are going to move ahead. They have already raised over \$400,000. They brought in the best experts from around the country to give them advice, did a feasibility study. They are going to move ahead.

Let us be sure they move ahead with the advice of the Park Service, since the Park Service, because of the gentleman's good work, put so much time and effort into this report. I, too, wish there could be a hearing. I would love if there could be a hearing. There cannot be at this point. Yet we have this group moving ahead.

I think this is the least we can do, to instead of slapping them and saying "We discourage what you are doing," is to encourage what they are up to. I apologize for not communicating better with the gentleman in advance. I

would have thought the Park Service would have done so. I hope that following this discussion we will be able to pass this legislation and then work more closely together.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if the funding could be limited to technical assistance, the issue here is that he is going to, he is suggesting that the Park Service may enter into an affiliated status with this. They may not. I think that is the wrong way to legislate.

We ought to have had hearings on this. It should not be anything that is controversial, but we have no idea right now. If the gentleman would limit his funding to merely technical assistance, but there is all sorts of coordination of program costs. The partnership issue, in other words, is implying that there are going to be construction dollars and other types of assistance that are provided.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything in the legislation that has anything to do with construction or anything beyond an affiliate status that can be worked out over time. Congress would always have the ability to come in an further fund this relationship.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, it provides cooperative agreements to operate it. It provides operating expenses.

Mr. PORTMAN. Reclaiming my time, it does not provide operating expenses.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in good faith, this is the problem: We once had a little tiny authorization for Steamtown and now we could not stop it with a gun. It is costing us millions and millions of dollars. It is a little bit of an operation.

Once this project is authorized, unfortunately, the history we have is that the best intentioned groups eventually want some Federal participation, subsidy, however you want to call it. This authorizes operating agreements. That is how we got the Kennedy Center. Pretty soon we were running the whole Kennedy Center, and it was supposed to be done by private individuals. The gentleman from Utah knows this is the history. We start out with a couple of sentences and we end up spending millions.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would love to hear from the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Utah, who have much more experience than I do, but it is very clear in this legislation, this involves no Federal funding. Congress could come back at a later date and decide that is appropriate.

This involves a lot of private sector activity from around the country to support this effort. We should be encouraging that. This is exactly the kind of creative partnership that I think Mr. MILLER and others who have

been involved with the National Park Service have been trying to encourage.

I would like to yield to the chairman and see how he would compare this to other projects. I think the analogies that have been made are not right. We are not asking for Federal funds. We encourage a private sector effort and allowing this report that Mr. VENTO and others worked so hard on to become implemented through an interpretive center which commemorates the Underground Railroad experience throughout the country.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT]. This is in his particular district.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to assist in the establishment of the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati. And I applaud my good friend, Mr. PORTMAN, for his outstanding work in helping to make this wonderful idea a reality.

Cincinnati is the ideal location for a center commemorating the Underground Railroad and the brave men and women who risked their lives for the cause of freedom. As a large city located at the boundary line between slave and free States before the Civil War, Cincinnati became a major depot of the Underground Railroad. For many, many men, women, and children fleeing the evil bonds of slavery, Cincinnati meant freedom.

As a life-long Cincinnati, I am tremendously proud that the Queen City served as a major center of organization for the abolitionist movement. The city was a hub of organizations working to end slavery and to assist the escape to freedom of former slaves. We have a great tradition in Cincinnati of standing up against tyranny and government oppression and fighting for individual liberty. Such notable figures as antislavery author Harriet Beecher Stowe, Liberty Party nominee James Birney, Republican Party organizer and later Supreme Court Justice Salmon P. Chase, and many other historic opponents of slavery made their homes in Cincinnati.

The people of Cincinnati enthusiastically support the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center. The community has mobilized behind this important project to create a center that honors the Underground Railroad, and that educates today's generations about the great failings and the great heroism of our past. H.R. 4073 is an important bill, and I am proud to join with my friend, Mr. PORTMAN, in urging its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], is recognized to control the remainder of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I understand that there is some misunderstanding with regard to what some of

the phrases in this legislation mean. As you go through it, on page 3, line 16, it talks about the National Park Service can work with and do interpretive activities. That is, of course, interpretive activities is what goes on at the site in terms of operating activities and expenses. That is how that will translate, that we can make a commitment to fund such activity.

Clearly, what happens in the appropriation process is dollars get placed into such sites, designated very often for some of these types of activities, for developing the various types of materials that might be at that site. I mean, in essence what are doing is taking and committing the Park Service to this type of activity. I just think it is worthy of a hearing. It is worthy of a better understanding of what is basically a very, very important topic. We should not be in the last day of the session bringing up legislation. Without a clear understanding of the consequences—we should look before we jump.

Whatever the intention or misunderstandings are, I was not aware of what was being presented here, and others were not on this side of the aisle aware.

I am not surprised that there are both Democrat and Republican sponsors to something of this nature, but the fact is I think some of us have to speak up to what is going to be the expansion and expenditure with regard to the Park Service. I see no limitations in this bill in terms of what the Park Service expenditures will be.

"Interpretive activities" is an open phrase. There is no limitation in terms of dollars in this bill. Technical assistance is another, interpretive programs: "The Secretary may provide technical assistance and interpretive programs to the center." These can cost literally millions of dollars.

We have a center at Harper's Ferry that has to develop some of those interpretive programs, some of those materials. This is a very expensive and worthwhile effort to do, but it is one that is very costly and undefined in the measure before us, the denial of cost is misleading.

The relationship, of course, we are giving the Park Service "Arrowhead" to this particular site in Cincinnati. That, too, I think is an important piece of symbolism that should not be given without proper consideration by the committee to this one site.

The fact is that the Secretary can deal with the technical assistance without this legislation. They can provide some of the technical help. They do not need authorization legislation for that. But to in fact designate this as an affiliated area, we have to look back in the statutes and see what that means. What that has come to mean is that operating expenditures can be made at those sites. We try to resist it, but the history is that operating expenditures can be made at such sites based on the contractual, cooperative language in this measure.

Again, of course, it talks about cooperative agreements with regard to technical assistance and to the function of the public or private entities. We do not even know who the entity is in this instance that we are going to deal with. In other words, I assume that there is a nonprofit group. I assume that it may be the city. But no one has stipulated that and the legislation is silent. But the fact is that we anticipate cooperative agreements. That will, of course, commit the Park Service to certain activities, as well as, I assume, those private parties.

This is something that is worthy of a much closer look. I do not see the urgency in terms of acting on this today. If they are going to go ahead with it, if it has the type of merit and follows the thematic lines and outline of the study that was presented to us in February 1996, I do not think that there is a problem in terms of this being refined and defined more exactly as to the NPS role.

We are talking about partnerships. We are talking about cooperative agreements. We are talking about technical assistance. We are talking about interpretive activities. We are talking about interpretive programs and affiliation and giving the recognition to this specific site. These are rather significant charges and direction that we are giving to the Park Service, at least on a discretionary basis. And, frankly, I do not think that we ought to do that without having a better idea of the parameters of what is being involved in terms of dollars and resource commitment. And most importantly how this fits with the topic and themes within the literature and other sites.

This is a very important topic. We have the benefit of the study. We ought to use it. We ought to have an open hearing on it. That has not occurred to date. Therefore, I resist and will oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me try to address the concerns once more and be very clear.

This does not involve Federal funding. If we look at this legislation very carefully, it is all discretionary. The Secretary may coordinate, may enter into cooperative agreements and may work in partnership. It is all discretionary.

It is ironic to me that we are going to sit here in Congress and oppose something that in fact will keep that good report from collecting dust on the shelf. This is something that will move the report forward.

Here you have a private sector group representing the entire country, working on a coordinated basis with sites around the country. They want to set up an interpretive center, not a museum, to commemorate this experience in America's history that should have been commemorated a long time ago.

All we are saying is, we want affiliated status to get the Park Service to work with us to provide technical support. It is ironic that we would be saying, no, we are going to stop this, it is not appropriate.

I think it is a real shame. I think it is the kind of thing we should be doing. It is a private-sector effort to work in partnership with Government, not involving taxpayer funds. If Congress determines down the line other areas maybe should get that affiliated status, that is fine, too. They do not want Federal funds. That is what is so great about this. It is noncontroversial.

I was led to believe that this was going to be noncontroversial in the committee, that we had minority-majority support. I was surprised to find out that that was not true. I just think it is exactly the kind of thing we ought to be promoting. I think it is a great effort. I think it is exactly the sort of thing that this Congress ought to be encouraging.

I am sorry that the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JOHN LEWIS, cosponsor of this legislation, was not aware of this; the gentleman from Ohio, LOU STOKES, and so many other Members of this Congress who are strongly supportive of this effort cannot be here to join with us today, to encourage this and to say that this is exactly the way we ought to be going in this Congress in terms of providing for strong public-private partnerships.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that is misunderstood here is while this may all be discretionary in the bill based on the status of the language, the fact is that the history of this has been that in the Committee on Appropriations they will place money into the appropriation designated for various sites. That is how we end up with hundreds of thousands of dollars and millions of dollars being spent on some of these sites which are not designated or are outside the authorizing gambit of the committee.

So it is the opportunity and responsibility of the authorizing committee, the Committee on Resources that has charged the Park Service to do these studies, to use the information and to come back and try to guide the policy path with regard to resources, culturally important issues, as the Underground Railroad. We cannot wrap this up and hide the fact that we are proposing today an open-ended expenditure from the Federal treasury and authorizing the appropriators to in fact appropriate money, and in fact providing under technical assistance, where there is an open dollar amount that is given each year for the Park Service to use. So there are Federal dollars that are going to flow—taxpayer fund and we should be guided by sound policy.

No question, this is an important topic and issue in our culture and history. That is why I am on my feet debating this policy path. I think that it

is a topic that the committee ought to have dealt with, rather than getting up here at the last minute and putting something on the table and, in fact, pushing dollars in a direction without a well defined policy.

I commend the folks in Cincinnati for their work, but there is no indication or case being made here as to the suitability of this site, as to the interpretation that is going to be taking place there as to the feasibility of this particular area. Many locations around the Nation may already be doing this activity or others may be better candidates.

We need to ask the same questions of affiliated areas that we would be asking of any type of park unit that is developed, in terms of operating expenses, technical assistance down the road. We do not have those answers today, only good intentions and misunderstandings.

This is basically an open-ended authority for the appropriators to put money into—a specific community. If my colleagues on the authorizing committee want to know how things get to be where they are, off track and out of sync, they just have to look at bills like this that are enacted open ended and out of control.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1030

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I listen to the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from California, and it amazes me how anyone on that side can oppose this great project the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] has brought to the floor, the underground railroad, part of our history. How can they protest against this? I cannot believe it when this is totally discretionary, totally discretionary. It is one of the few bills I have ever seen that really is so totally discretionary. It is up to the Secretary absolutely and not even the Congress. We just give him the authority to really do this job if he wishes to do so.

Now I am a little bit concerned because as my colleagues know, I heard some comments on this floor as if this is the first time this has ever happened? Please. The gentleman from Minnesota, when he was a chairman of the subcommittee, I saw this happen time after time, and all the great merits, open ended. I see bills open ended. I do not know how many hundreds of bills, under his leadership, passed were open ended.

One of the reasons, I would suggest respectfully, a lot of the areas were made into parks were open ended, and the cost to the taxpayer was tremendous. But this bill, and very frankly the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] has done a tremendous job,

actually gives so much discretion to the Secretary whether it should be or should not be done, whether the study should go forth.

And please do not insult the underground railroad and the activity in the Congress by opposing, for whatever reason I do not know. This is a good bill. I want to compliment the gentleman. He has done an excellent job.

Let us just go ahead and move it. We have spent 20 minutes on this. I came here a little late because of the great traffic around Washington, DC, and I began to listen to this, and what a charade and waste of time when this bill should have been up and passed out of this House.

Recognize the importance of this great historical moment; that is all I am asking. And if it was the first time, I might be a little more concerned. I see the staff talking to them now, whispering in their ear as they usually do. I love these staff whispering in their ear. They really made great strides.

This issue should be passed on. Let us go on to something more important.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would say that it is true; I have worked on hundreds of bills in the past, and I will tell my colleagues every one of those bills that I worked on had a hearing, and I did not act in those years that I did so on any affiliated area, none were designated and I tell my colleagues, I also acted to inform and be certain that the minority was aware of my actions and measures. They may not always have agreed, but they had reasonable notice of hearings and action on the issues. This bill has not had hearing. It is not the issue of the underground railroad, which my colleagues would like to make the issue; that is not the issue here.

The issue here is how we are going to deal with this extraordinarily important topic in a positive reasonable way and give it the type of recognition and status that it deserves in terms of hearings and a proper policy path for the park and the Park Service and the citizens of Cincinnati. They deserve that. They deserve that hearing. They did not get it.

Members of Congress should understand what the degree of involvement is going to be and how we are going to deal with this overall policy and issue rather than simply passing something here without necessarily a good understanding or a policy path as to where we are going. This is indeed the tail wagging the dog.

This is the wrong way to do business, but unfortunately it has characterized our committee too often during this 104th Congress.

I would just suggest that this bill because of that, not because of the topic, the topic is a wonderful topic that ought to be part of our cultural and is part of our cultural history and part of the Park Service and part of its cultural and historic preservation roles.

That is why we authorized the study. What we are asking the advocates to do, to use the information that we have available to us and pick the best policy path rather than one that simply happens to be expedient because we are in a hurry to be out of here at the end of the fiscal year.

This is wrong, and this bill should be defeated for that reason, certainly not because of the subject matter.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4073.

The question was taken.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4073, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

#### INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 544) providing for the concurrence by the House with an amendment in the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 3378.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 544

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 3378) to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to extend the demonstration program for direct billing of Medicare, Medicaid, and other third party payors, with the Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment thereto be, and the same are hereby, agreed to with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Indian Health Care Improvement Technical Corrections Act of 1996".

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

#### SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT.

(a) **DEFINITION OF HEALTH PROFESSION.**—Section 4(n) (25 U.S.C. 1603(n)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "allopathic medicine," before "family medicine"; and

(2) by striking "and allied health professions" and inserting "an allied health profession, or any other health profession".

(b) **INDIAN HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIPS.**—Section 204(b) of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting the following:

"(3)(A) The active duty service obligation under a written contract with the Secretary under section 338A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 2541) that an individual has entered into under that section shall, if that individual is a recipient of an Indian Health Scholarship, be met in full-time practice, by service—";

(ii) by striking "or" at the end of clause (iii); and

(iii) by striking the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting "; or";

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) At the request of any individual who has entered into a contract referred to in subparagraph (A) and who receives a degree in medicine (including osteopathic or allopathic medicine), dentistry, optometry, podiatry, or pharmacy, the Secretary shall defer the active duty service obligation of that individual under that contract, in order that such individual may complete any internship, residency, or other advanced clinical training that is required for the practice of that health profession, for an appropriate period (in years, as determined by the Secretary), subject to the following conditions:

"(i) No period of internship, residency, or other advanced clinical training shall be counted as satisfying any period of obligated service that is required under this section.

"(ii) The active duty service obligation of that individual shall commence not later than 90 days after the completion of that advanced clinical training (or by a date specified by the Secretary).

"(iii) The active duty service obligation will be served in the health profession of that individual, in a manner consistent with clauses (i) through (v) of subparagraph (A).";

(D) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, by striking "prescribed under section 338C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254m) by service in a program specified in subparagraph (A)" and inserting "described in subparagraph (A) by service in a program specified in that subparagraph"; and

(E) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking "Subject to subparagraph (B)," and inserting "Subject to subparagraph (C)."; and

(ii) by striking "prescribed under section 338C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254m)" and inserting "described in subparagraph (A)";

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting the following:

"(B) the period of obligated service described in paragraph (3)(A) shall be equal to the greater of—"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "(42 U.S.C. 254m(g)(1)(B))" and inserting "(42 U.S.C. 2541(g)(1)(B))"; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) Upon the death of an individual who received an Indian Health Scholarship, any obligation of that individual for service or payment that relates to that scholarship shall be canceled.

"(D) The Secretary shall provide for the partial or total waiver or suspension of any obligation of service or payment of a recipient of an Indian Health Scholarship if the Secretary determines that—

"(i) it is not possible for the recipient to meet that obligation or make that payment;

"(ii) requiring that recipient to meet that obligation or make that payment would result in extreme hardship to the recipient; or

"(iii) the enforcement of the requirement to meet the obligation or make the payment would be unconscionable.

"(E) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case of extreme hardship or for other good cause shown, the Secretary may waive, in whole or in part, the right of the United States to recover funds made available under this section.

"(F) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to a recipient of an Indian Health Scholarship, no obligation for payment may be released by a discharge in bankruptcy under title 11, United States Code, unless that discharge is granted after the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the initial date on which that payment is due, and only if the bankruptcy court finds that the nondischarge of the obligation would be unconscionable.".

(c) **CALIFORNIA CONTRACT HEALTH SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**—Section 211(g) (25 U.S.C. 1621j(g)) is amended by striking "1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997" and inserting "1996 through 2000".

(d) **EXTENSION OF CERTAIN DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**—Section 405(c)(2) (25 U.S.C. 1645(c)(2)) is amended by striking "September 30, 1996" and inserting "September 30, 1998".

(e) **GALLUP ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT CENTER.**—Section 706(d) (25 U.S.C. 1665e(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated, for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (b)."

(f) **SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNSELOR EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**—Section 711(h) (25 U.S.C. 1665j(h)) is amended by striking "1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997" and inserting "1996 through 2000".

(3) **HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED CARE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**—Section 821(i) (25 U.S.C. 1680k(i)) is amended by striking "1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997" and inserting "1996 through 2000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3378 was passed by the House earlier this year, sent to the other body, amended by the other body and sent