

reuse the pulp mill land in order to offset the job losses. Since the Federal reversionary interest clouds the ownership status of the land, the site cannot be put to productive use. H.R. 1948 takes care of this problem through a land exchange between the company and the United States.

Under the legislation, the Federal reverter interest in the pulp mill will be removed. In exchange, APC will convey to the United States a spectacular inholding it holds on Hood Bay, within Admiralty Island National Monument. The Hood Bay property is a prime parcel of land that the Forest Service seeks to acquire, and it will be incorporated into the wilderness.

Finally, the bill also conveys a portion of the mill site land to the city of Sitka, which currently has an easement on the property for its hydro project and water supply system.

The Committee on Resources held a hearing on this legislation during the August recess. Major concerns were raised and resolved. The result is a fair exchange which benefits Sitka as well as Admiralty Island National Monument.

The committee ordered H.R. 1948 reported with an amendment on September 10, 1997, by a unanimous voice vote. The bill is in the best interests of the Federal Government and of Sitka. I look forward to its passing.

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 Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1948.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor and joy to be here joining the gentleman from Alaska in putting additional lands into wilderness. It is only 54 acres, but hope springs eternal on this side of the aisle.

But the fact of the matter is that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the Alaska Pulp Corporation, and the Forest Service have worked out a land swap that is of benefit to the local area and also a benefit to the Nation's wilderness system.

Very often during these land exchanges I have asked whether or not these exchanges are of fair and equal value. In this case I am relying on the chief appraiser of the Forest Service, who has concluded the values of the property interests to be exchanged are equal.

In addition, my concerns about a NEPA waiver in the bill as introduced have been addressed with language to assure us that APC meets its clean-up obligations at the former mill site lands. By enacting this bill, we do not intend to alter APC's obligations to

pay for cleaning up pulp-mill-related pollution. So I think the gentleman in fact has brought again to the floor a bill that we can all support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. I am extremely pleased that hope springs eternal. Just do not be too hopeful. Fifty-four acres is a lot of land, in my mind. But it is a good bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman will yield, it would be a big deal in Delaware.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. And it would be a big deal in Rhode Island.

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 Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1948, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule 1 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### ALLOWING ELECTION OF DELEGATE FROM GUAM BY OTHER THAN SEPARATE BALLOT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1460) to allow for election of the Delegate from Guam by other than separate ballot, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1460

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

#### SECTION 1. BALLOT REQUIREMENT FOR DELEGATE.

Section 2(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives" approved April 10, 1972 (48 U.S.C. 1712(a)), is amended—

(1) by inserting "from the Virgin Islands" before "shall be elected at large"; and

(2) by inserting "The Delegate from Guam shall be elected at large and by a majority of the votes cast for the office of Delegate." before "If no candidate".

#### SEC. 2. PROGRAM EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITIES IN THE FORMER UNITED STATES TRUST TERRITORY.

Section 103(h)(2) of the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 (48 U.S.C. 1903(h)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking "ten" and inserting "fifteen"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subparagraph (B) the following: "The President shall en-

sure the assistance provided under these programs reflects the changes in the population since the inception of such programs."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will each 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.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this is a Democrat bill, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT]. I am sure the gentleman is going to ask for a vote, too.

The legislation by the delegate from Guam, H.R. 1460, will change existing Federal law to permit the Government of Guam to elect a delegate by other than separate ballot. The bill, as reported unanimously by the Committee on Resources, is being amended at my urging to continue a crucial program for certain small communities in the former Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which were affected by the United States nuclear testing. As the current authorization expires at the end of this fiscal year, it is essential to take action to permit the continuance of this necessary program.

As H.R. 1460 is consistent with increasing local self-government both in Guam and in the small atoll communities in the former U.S.-administered trust territory, and does not result in any adverse budgetary impact, I would urge my colleagues to adopt the measure. This is a good piece of legislation. I congratulate the gentleman from Guam for introducing the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1460 as amended by the Committee on Resources. Section 1 of the legislation would provide cost savings to the Government of Guam in its conduct of the election of the Guam Delegate to Congress.

This section has no opposition and has no impact on the Federal budget. The legislation would remove the much-dated single ballot requirement that has been in place in Guam since the inception of the Guam Delegate position. This would enable the ballot to be combined with those for other elective offices by the Guam Election Commission, and the Commission estimates a cost savings of more than \$10,000.

Section 2 of this legislation would extend the Eniwetok Food and Agricultural Program for an additional 5 years. Many of my colleagues should remember the nuclear testing that was conducted by the United States in the atolls of the Marshall Islands. Eniwetok Atoll, along with Bikini Atoll,

were the subjects of these nuclear tests.

These tests caused a release of radioactive contaminants on these atolls and into their atmosphere. The people of these islands were displaced and resettled on other atolls, and there was always a commitment by the United States that they would be resettled at a later time.

□ 1745

Although some of this has occurred 20 or more years later, the vast majority of the land, some 75 percent, is not suitable or available for food production.

The livelihood of the Eniwetok people has been advanced by this food and agricultural program. The program provides the Eniwetok people with safe imported food for consumption as well as nutritional and agricultural rehabilitation assistance. Also included in this legislation is language that would address the growth and the population of the Eniwetok people since the program was created more than 10 years ago.

We have a unique relationship with the Marshall Islands which needs support and understanding. The Marshalls is in free association with the U.S. Aside from the nuclear testing we have conducted in the Marshalls, we continue to use Kwajalein Atoll as part of a system of missile testing. We should be mindful of this unique and beneficial relationship when programs like the Eniwetok Food and Agricultural effort are reviewed. We must support the people of Eniwetok and indeed all of the Marshalls.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], if I may, if he would like to speak on our favored bill. He was not here. But if he wants to speak on something else, that is fine, too. After all, he is a senior Member of this House and I bow to his wisdom and maturity.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank and commend my dear friend, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], and I do want to note the fine work of the gentleman on the Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 and tell him what a great pleasure it was for me to work with him, what a good piece of legislation I think it is. And it brings back great memories that he and I shared of years past, when he used to work on the same kind of questions back when this business was done in the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, where the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] was a valuable member, as he is today a valuable member as the chair of the Committee on the Interior,

and I thank him, and I had a few remarks which I think would just help say nice things about him and others who have made possible a significant advance in terms of protection of a great national treasure, our refuge system.

Mr. Speaker, today we find ourselves in the very fortunate position of having agreed to legislation which almost everyone agrees will better protect species and habitat on our Nation's wildlife refuges. It does so while articulating an overall mission for the National Wildlife Refuge System and providing general management guidance that the System has sorely needed for too long.

Not only does this codify almost all of the administrative reforms signed by President Clinton last year, it makes very clear the important role that hunting, fishing, and other wildlife-dependent recreational uses play in the successful option of our refuge system.

I understand that the Senate adopted three minor changes that it deemed important to the continued vitality of the Refuge System. After reviewing these proposals, I agree. Those changes include making clear that compatible uses can include wildlife and non-wildlife dependent uses; requires the Secretary to monitor the status and trends of fish, wildlife and plants on refuges; and makes clear how periodic re-evaluation of secondary uses, such as electric utility rights-of-way, will be conducted consistent with the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as will soon be amended.

Mr. Speaker, many people deserve credit for bringing this legislation to a point where the President will sign it. I'd like to thank Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member MILLER, and Secretary Bruce Babbitt for their leadership in helping bring about passage of this most important legislation.

I might note in closing, Mr. Speaker, that these same people are all very interested in the future protection of wildlife and plants that are NOT on refuge lands but still in need of federal protection. There is much discussion in both chambers about how to reauthorize the *Endangered Species Act*. I understand that the other body had a hearing on a consensus, bipartisan bill introduced last week. While I understand that the Senate bill is not a perfect bill, I wish to take note of the fact that reauthorization of the *Endangered Species Act* is 5 years overdue. With the passage of the Refuge Bill, it is my hope that all of the Members and interests that have an interest in the *Endangered Species Act* will negotiate in good faith so we might bring about better, smarter protection of species on all of our lands across the nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the meantime we have before us a good bill that is the product of hard work, sensible compromise, and in the interest of our refuges' future. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1420.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands [Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN].

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R.

1460, which was introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I also want to take this time to commend the gentleman for his hard work in getting Congress to address not only the provisions of this bill, but the many issues faced by the people of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, next year marks the 100th anniversary of Guam's becoming a member of the American family at the end of the Spanish-American War. It would be a deserving tribute to the people of Guam if this House, in recognition of the loyalty and support that Guam has shown for this Nation during those 100 years, could pass H.R. 100, the Guam Commonwealth Act, before this 100th anniversary ends.

Mr. Speaker, the Guam Election Commission has requested that Congress pass H.R. 1460 to remedy the cost of the Federal requirement that election ballots for delegates of Guam to the House of Representatives be by separate ballot from those of other elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, we should unanimously support our colleague and H.R. 1460 because it would facilitate the election of the delegate in Guam and avoid unnecessary costs. I urge my colleagues to support enactment of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would further like to thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking Democrat, for their efforts to bring this bill to the floor today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their attention to the issues pertaining to Guam, and I am particularly grateful to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for his interest in the insular areas and in attending to issues pertaining to us.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1460, a bill which will permit the government of Guam to include the candidates for the position of Guam's Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives on the same ballot with candidates running for territorial office. The bill will also extend for 5 years a food assistance program in the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to help the government of Guam reduce its election expenses for a couple of years now. I want to thank Chairman DON YOUNG and senior Democrat GEORGE MILLER for scheduling committee action on this legislation so we could address Guam's election problem.

For the record, there are similar provisions in the Federal laws which govern the election of congressional delegates in American Samoa and the Virgin Islands, but it is my understanding that the leaders of these two governments prefer not to change the laws governing their elections at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of extending the food assistance program for the Republic of the Marshall Islands. The United States created a multidimensional disaster

when it conducted atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons in the Pacific and the people of the Marshall Islands are still suffering from the aftermath of those tests. We have a moral obligation to provide this food assistance, and much more, for the damage we did to their country with our atmospheric tests. As this is the same provision which passed the Senate as section 1 of S. 210, I am glad to see we are considering at least this small portion of that legislation, so these Pacific islanders can continue to receive this necessary assistance.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GUTKNECHT]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1460, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1460, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2107, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Yates moves that the managers on the part of the House be instructed to agree to the amendments of the Senate numbered 120, 121, and 122.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to instruct the conferees on the Interior appropriations bill, to accept the provisions of the Senate bill improving funding for the National Endowment of the Arts.

The House, my colleagues will recall, provided no funds for the National Endowment of the Arts because it was said it was unauthorized. And yet, Mr. Speaker, 14 other agencies in the House bill which were unauthorized received waivers from the Committee on Rules in order to permit them to receive money for their operations.

NEA was the only unauthorized agency that did not receive a waiver of the Committee on Rules. And therefore, it was subject to being stricken by the bill on a point of order. That is why we attacked the rule, Mr. Speaker. We sought to vote down the previous question to correct the discriminatory treatment accorded to the NEA.

Mr. Speaker, we lost by one vote. One vote, Mr. Speaker. And NEA was stricken from the bill on a point of order when the bill came to the floor. That strong showing, Mr. Speaker, indicates to me that there is strong support for the NEA in the House, and that is why I believe the House is ready and willing to join the Senate in providing the fund for NEA, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I have filed this motion to agree with the Senate.

I urge support for my motion.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I have not had any requests for time at this point on this motion to instruct. I reserve the balance of my time if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] would go forward.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I supported it in the House when we first brought this issue up. But of course, it was eliminated, as the gentleman stated, really on a parliamentary maneuver, not only the lack of a waiver but the parliamentary maneuver to defeat the rule.

I am afraid that a lot of people were opposing it because they thought it was reducing the budget deficit, and I do not believe that had validity. But more importantly, there was a parliamentary maneuver that denied us the vote, not only denied us the vote,

but really gave some people the opportunity to dodge the issue instead of confronting it directly. I am afraid that it put the House on record as being part of a dumbing down of America. I hate to say that, but I regretfully must admit that is the way the people across the country interpreted that vote. And in my opinion, it will be part of a "dumbing down" and denying Americans and the children especially the benefits of cultural and educational programming.

Fortunately, the Senate had the wisdom to include the funding. And indeed, I want to remind my colleagues, as they are aware from their own situations in their own communities, this is not just something that is good for urban communities; it supplements in urban, suburban, and rural areas alike improve the educational and the cultural qualities, whether we are talking about community orchestras or dance companies or the numbers of other children's programs that are supported by the NEA.

I want to tell my colleagues also, from my own experience as a member of the authorizing committee and for those that are fearful that there are some violations of community ethical and cultural standards and some that are still operating under the assumption that there is somehow a pornographic or indecent material here, I want to speak now as one of those who worked with our late departed colleague Paul Henry in 1990 to put the reforms in place.

This statement and debate was not permitted because we were denied, under the previous rule, the opportunity to debate this issue under the rules. The law as it now exists as to how the community standards must be met and it is precise as to how those selections are made. There is no longer any reason to look askance at the NEA as violating community standards of decency or projects that have questionable background.

So I guess in summary I want to say, for those who are concerned that we are violating community standards under this proposal, that is a thing of the past. Our committee put in good operational standards as long ago as 1990. This is no longer valid as an argument against the NEA. But to those who were taken in by the parliamentary maneuver so that some dodged the issue as to whether they stood squarely for continuing support for the National Endowment for the Arts, I want to say, this is a straight up-or-down vote. We are agreeing or disagreeing directly with the funding and authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts and following the wisdom of the Senate.

I know that all those letters and telephone calls that my colleagues had those editorials, commentary that was highly critical of us in the House, we now have a way, a direct up-or-down vote, to correct that problem that we created for ourselves under the parliamentary procedure and to correct it