

DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gordon
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)

Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-Gutierrez
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)

NOES—244

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bliley
Blunt
Boehler
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dooley

Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Galleghy
Ganske
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson

Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourrette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCreary
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann

Northup
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radinovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rosrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen

Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stump

NOT VOTING—21

Bereuter
Bilirakis
Callahan
Chenoweth
Cubin
Dickey
Gekas

Gephardt
Gonzalez
Granger
Klug
McCarthy (NY)
McIntosh
Mollohan

Ney
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Rangel
Ryun
Schiff
Smith (OR)

□ 1311

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, regrettably I was not present to vote on rollcall vote 530 on the motion to adjourn. I was detained in a conference with the House leadership. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time so that I may ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] a question about the schedule.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Members on this side of the aisle who are concerned about what the schedule is for the remainder of the day. Is it correct and can Members be assured that the only remaining business today is the disposition of this conference report, and that we will not be going on to any other legislative matters?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, yes, I have been advised by the leadership that the last vote of the day will be the vote on the Interior conference report, and I also want to assure the Members, because many of them have plane schedules, that we are going to meet the 2 o'clock deadline. We will cut the speeches short, at least on our side, because we have heard it all. So we want to make the deadline.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2107, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 277, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 277, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 22, 1997, at page H9004.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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].

□ 1315

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 conference report to accompany H.R. 2107, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.
Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], I have had a couple of requests for colloquies, and I would like to do those now so we can pace our time here.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

As the chairman knows, the Fish and Wildlife Service proposed to divide its Pacific region into two regions beginning on October 1, 1997. A new region would be created located in Sacramento, CA. This transfer was intended to assist the large work load on the west coast that is putting a strain on the regional office in Portland, OR.

I understand that the committee is concerned about the outyear costs of the program and that the bill directs the Fish and Wildlife Service to consider alternatives to establishing an additional regional office in Sacramento. However, the language in this bill would not preclude establishing a regional office in Sacramento; is that correct?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct, that such establishment requires committee approval. The committee will continue to work with the

Department of the Interior to identify an acceptable solution to the problem.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, the commitment of the administration to include funding for the regional office in its 1999 fiscal year budget, as Interior Secretary Babbitt has indicated he is going to do in a recent letter to the chairman, will help address the committee's concern that the establishment of this office would be facilitated at the expense of other priorities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the annual Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. The committee is also concerned that the budget submitted by the administration to the Congress for fiscal year 1999 appropriately addresses this problem in the context of service-wide priorities for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thank the chairman for his assurances.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] for a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report includes several provisions related to management of the national forests. I would like to engage the chairman in a brief discussion about a couple of those.

One of those provisions, from the Senate bill, relates to national forest lands in New Mexico and Arizona, where the Forest Service is under court order to adjust grazing levels. As I understand it, the language says that the Forest Service cannot make those adjustments until they have issued an adjustment schedule, or March 1 of next year, whichever comes first. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SKAGGS. So as I understand it, this will not prevent the Forest Service from making these adjustments as they were ordered to do, once the adjustment schedule has been issued, or March 1, at the latest?

Mr. REGULA. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SKAGGS. On another point, concerns have been expressed about section 332 of the conference report which deals with the process of revising national forest plans. This also originated in the other body, and I understand that as it was approved there, it would have directly affected several forests in Colorado as well as many forests in other States.

While the conference report does include a similar provision, the original language has been revised, and I would like to make sure I understand the effect of this part of the report. I under-

stand the Forest Service has already given notice of its intention to revise the plans for some forests.

Am I right in understanding that in those cases, the revisions can proceed?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, yes, if the Forest Service has given notice prior to October 1 the revisions can proceed.

Mr. SKAGGS. Sometimes there are court orders calling for planned revisions. What about those cases, I would ask the chairman?

Mr. REGULA. Again, those revisions can go forward.

Mr. SKAGGS. I also understand that plan amendments, as opposed to general plan revisions, are not affected by this revision. I ask the gentleman, is that correct?

Mr. REGULA. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. SKAGGS. Finally, would the chairman agree that the Forest Service can and should go ahead with necessary environmental analysis and other work related to the planning process? Would the chairman agree with me that the Forest Service can and should go ahead with necessary environmental analysis and other work related to the planning process to avoid more delays and backlogs, once the process of plan revisions resumes?

Mr. REGULA. Yes.

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the chairman very much for his discussion of these matters.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this. It is tough to do. There is much in this bill that is very popular and issues we have all worked very hard for. But nevertheless, in the context of acting on measures that are important, we should not be forced to accept spending and a spending policy path that is inappropriate. This bill goes beyond just the responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations and writes fundamental law dealing with many issues.

We won a court case in Alaska of \$1.6 billion. In this bill, the authorization exists to send half of that back to the State of Alaska, maybe for good purposes, maybe for bad purposes. I do not know what the consequence of that is going to be.

The timber road credit, which put a limit of \$25 million on this bill, takes the limit off, and in fact goes in the reverse in terms of that particular issue. There are many, many additions in this bill that do a lot of good, but it is not worth it. I think we could have done better. These provisions were not in the bill when it left the House. We should not be held up by the Senate and forced to accept these types of antienvironmental provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the fiscal year 1998 Interior ap-

propriations conference report and urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill. If Congress passes this bill and the President signs it into law, the ramifications for protection and enjoyment of America's natural resources will be grave.

Appropriation measures don't require a rule, if in fact the committee stays within its responsibility, but this measure, not for technical, but for substantive political reasons, is misusing the rule and abusing the process of this House to make bad public policy and wasteful expenditure. I have heard a lot of reasons why I should vote for this bill. There's more money for the parks and national wildlife refuges. There are sensible Indian health provisions. There's importantly \$98 million for the NEA when the House measure that passed, didn't even permit a vote upon this issue, but hid behind the lack of reauthorization. There's just enough in this bill to satisfy everybody, but not too much to make folks too angry—at least that's what the supporters of this flawed bill would have you believe.

The popular programs funded by this measure are being used to enact numerous provisions that will cause havoc with our public lands and parks and cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars. I feel compelled to note the flawed policy decisions that have been forced on us in this conference report. Most of these ridiculous proposals have never had a hearing in the House and Senate or been subjected to proper legislative procedures. In short, Mr. Speaker, these proposals were slipped into this bill without review, hearing, or debate. Perhaps after explanation, Members will understand why these measures were shielded from open debate and the light of day.

There is a provision in this law that basically guts the ban on logging exports from our national forests and State-owned lands in the West. This popular law will now be unenforced. It will instead depend on the voluntary compliance of exporters. Voluntary compliance? We wouldn't need a law banning exports if we thought there was going to be voluntary compliance. So we can effectively kiss this timber—that is apparently so important for maintaining our domestic supply of paper products—goodbye.

There is a provision that prevents the Forest Service from updating and revising its forest management plans. This is required by the National Forest Management Act. That sets a foolish precedent, and essentially forces the Forest Service to be unresponsive to the needs of the lands they manage and the people that manage them.

There is a provision in this bill that prevents the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the Bitterroot ecosystem of Idaho and Montana. This hinders proper application of the Endangered Species Act and is based not on sound science but on the fears of a vocal minority. It has absolutely no place in

this conference report, a sop to the fears and the pseudo-science that dominates this Congress the past years more concerned with anecdote than facts.

This bill ignores provisions passed by the House earlier this year that placed limits on special subsidies for road construction by the timber industry to \$25 million for such credits. I was a supporter of tighter limits than the House passed, but I thought we had begun to make some progress. I thought we may have sent a message to the timber industry that they were going to have start paying their own way if they wanted to despoil our Nation's forests. Apparently, I was wrong. The purchaser road credit program is now just as it always was: bloated, inefficient, and completely unnecessary, wasting tax dollars and despoiling our forests.

This conference report sets a new low mark in establishing a precedent of expending the Land and Water Conservation Fund into the Road Maintenance and Political Payback Slush Fund. This is indeed a sad day and consequence when we don't have the funds to fulfill the purposes of law, the preservation, and conservation of lands. Now we will see these scarce dollars expended. Specifically, this bill now provides a \$10 million payoff to Humboldt County, CA and a \$12 million road maintenance fund for a highway in Montana—paid for by the LWCF. The State of Montana also will receive a \$10-million gift in the form of Federal mineral holdings which three tracts in the year 2000 may be valued at \$500 million—also paid for by the LWCF or paid even more by the mineral assets of the American people. Apparently, these gifts serve to ease the blow of protecting the important Headwaters Forest and the proposed New World Mine site. In fact the preservation of such land is a benefit, not a negative to the two States and areas. That sets a horrible precedent, Mr. Speaker. Allowing LWCF money to be used for nonland acquisition purposes is not something that I have ever, can ever, or will ever support. On these grounds alone, the President should veto this bill if Congress makes the mistake and passes it.

The measure directs \$800 million into a fund—improper legislation on this appropriation measure—for capital improvements in our national parks and for research on Alaska fisheries—maybe positive purposes—but again no hearings and only in one State—\$160 million in research. The source of the funds is the \$1.6 billion awarded the U.S. Federal Government in court over submerged lands and a disagreement with the State of Alaska. So the consequence is the U.S. taxpayer won, but now we convey significant amounts which enure principally to the benefit of Alaska.

There are many more flaws in this bill—the moratoria on road rights of way in law isn't repaired—but I think the ones I have summarized here give the Members of this House an idea of

why we should return this legislation to conference. I should note that I do not, Mr. Speaker, believe this conference report is beyond repair. As I have said, there are provisions in this bill that I support and are good policy. I applaud Mr. REGULA and Mr. YATES for making progress in these areas.

But until we fix the LWCF provisions in this bill, until we fix the logging export provisions in this bill, until we restore limits on special subsidy programs for the timber industry, I will oppose it. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for including language with regard to the Salton Sea, which is now beginning to move forward, and the step required here for a plan of remediation will be of extreme benefit and will lead to a much more definitive program being presented in future years for appropriations to really solve the problem. But the first step I think is adequately taken care of here. I thank the chairman for what he is doing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands [Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN].

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Interior appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1998. While it is not perfect, it represents a fair compromise on the many difficult environmental issues that the subcommittee had to wrestle with under this bill.

I am especially pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees were able to reach agreement on the funding level for land acquisition in our national parks. The nearly \$400 million that will be available for this purpose will greatly enhance the possibility that funding will be made available for the purchase of two important parcels in Salt River National Park and the Virgin Islands National Park, in my district.

I also want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], for their willingness to include in the bill two other provisions that are very important to the economic recovery of the Virgin Islands. This is a good compromise conference report, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], a member of the subcommittee, a very valued member, I might add, for a colloquy.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter into this colloquy with the chairman.

On my own behalf, but also, obviously, of the Speaker of the House, who

has worked very hard and diligently in favor of research for diabetes funding, I would just engage the chairman, and ask if the chairman would enter into this colloquy regarding the establishment of a coherent and unified policy and the expeditious distribution of Federal money as appropriated by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 for special diabetes programs for Indians, subsection 4922.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to discuss this important issue with a subcommittee member and co-chairman of the House Diabetes Caucus. I understand that the gentleman has developed this colloquy in consultation with the Speaker of the House.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I have indeed, Mr. Speaker, because of the Speaker's great leadership on this issue relative to diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee, is it his understanding that in subsection 4922 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, that the 5-year \$150 million special diabetes programs for Indians grant be distributed in a timely manner with a coherent, detailed policy formulated by those within the Indian Health Service who have direct programmatic oversight responsibility and expertise in diabetes care for Native Americans?

Mr. REGULA. Yes. We feel those professionals from the IHS diabetes program who deal on a daily basis with the clinical and public health implementation of issues related to diabetes should have full authority, and all necessary resources given to them by national IHS officials to make decisions and administer these grants, after timely consultation with tribal leaders, which shall be completed by November 30, 1997.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, further, I ask the chairman, is it the committee's intent that the extensive epidemiologic data related to prevalence, complications, care process, and outcomes currently collected and coordinated on an earlier basis by the Indian Health Service diabetes program shall be used as the primary basis for the distribution of these funds?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Furthermore, is it the intent of the committee that the IHS diabetes program fully consider that 25 percent of the grant should be used for primary diabetes prevention and 75 percent of the grant should be utilized for secondary and tertiary diabetes prevention?

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thank the gentleman very much for clarifying the committee's intent on how this money should be utilized. I urge strongly that this conference report be

approved. I thank the chairman for his leadership, and that of the Speaker of the House, as well.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the subcommittee chairman. How much money is included in this bill for the National Endowment for the Arts?

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. \$98 million.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman REGULA for the job he has done on this bill. It was a very difficult bill. In all the years I have been dealing with Interior bills in this Congress, I have never participated in one that had as many controversies as this had. I think it is a testimonial to the expertise, the effectiveness, and the popularity of Chairman REGULA that we have this bill and this conference report here today.

I find this bill acceptable, Mr. Speaker. I would have preferred if it had other environmental provisions in it than the ones it has, but we succeeded in toning down many of the environmental positions from their original writing.

The bill does give life to the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, and that is a very, very good thing. I shall vote for this bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska, [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the House authorizing committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been a torture to get to the floor, primarily because of two issues that came under my jurisdiction, the Headwaters Forest acquisition of \$250 million, and the New World Mine acquisition of \$65 million.

I agreed to this position of the Headwaters authorization in this bill because of the gentleman from California, [Mr. FRANK RIGGS]. The gentleman from California, [Mr. RIGGS], did an outstanding job conveying the fact that there has been a war in the Headwaters area for about 10 years, and it is time to solve this problem. So I considered this a very good point to solve the problem of the Headwaters, and remember, the President asked for this. We have given it to him, as we should.

The big reason I worked on the New World Mine is because of the gentleman from Montana, [Mr. RICK HILL], who is a member of my committee. The gentleman from Montana, [Mr. HILL], argued for months that Montana was going to lose 300 rural jobs and lose revenues because of the buyout the administration agreed to. I believe, very

frankly, that the mine would have gone ahead.

But the gentleman from Montana has done an excellent job protecting Montana and providing jobs in his district. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have heard some rumblings that the extremist fringes of the President's advisers may recommend vetoing this bill. If that occurs, I think we should send the President a clean bill, I mean strip everything out of it, send him down a bill with none of the so-called extras, including the money he wanted for the project I just spoke of.

So I will suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this conference report is a good conference report; tremendously hard to do, a tremendous effort put forth by the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. YATES], and the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. REGULA]. I want to compliment them in their work, but especially these, the gentleman from California, [Mr. RIGGS], and the gentleman from Montana, [Mr. RICK HILL].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] for a colloquy with the chairman.

□ 1330

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that part of the bill provides authority for the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest in California. One of the key provisions related to the acquisition makes further land acquisitions that enlarge the Headwaters Forest by more than 5 acres at a time subject to specific authorization by Congress. I would ask the gentleman, is that correct?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, would this provision affect land acquisitions by the Federal Government through donation, exchanges, or legal settlement or is it limited to land that is acquired through purchase with appropriated funds?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the provision requiring an authorization is limited to acquisitions of the Federal Government that are purchased through appropriated funds. It would not restrict the acquisition of lands or interest in lands exceeding 5 acres that are received through donation, exchange, or settlements with the Federal Government.

For example, this provision would not restrict the Federal Government from enlarging ownership of the Headwaters Forest as a result of settlement involving the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Office of Thrift Supervision.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, I would like to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] on title VI of the

log export provision contained in the Interior appropriations agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is nothing in the language of the log export provision which would allow the holder of a sourcing area to export private timber from within their sourcing area. Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, yes, that is my understanding of the language.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, would the chairman be willing to work with me and those who supported this provision to monitor implementation with the Forest Service to ensure that concerns such as this are addressed?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I will be pleased to work with the gentleman from Washington to monitor the provision's implementation.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to say that I strongly support the conference report and urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I believe there are a number of very significant provisions in this bill, riders added to this bill that have had no review by the House, added by the Senate, that are very much to the detriment of the environment. I spoke about them at length during the rule. Nothing has changed here before us. I would urge Members to vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is trying to clarify some very complicated provisions added into the bill by the Senate having to do with the export of logs. I still have the opinion of the IG from the Department of Agriculture who says, no, in fact this would allow the virtual explicit export of Federal logs. The gentleman says he is trying to fix that. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, that points out the whole problem with doing legislation on appropriations bills. It is an extraordinarily complicated subject. It has not been reviewed by the committee of jurisdiction in either the House or the Senate. It has been added to this bill without any scrutiny.

The gentleman is now trying to say that it does not do what this attorney who works for the agency charged to enforce the law says it does do. I do not really know. Who knows?

So, Mr. Speaker, we should reject this bill. If we need changes in substitution, we should do it in the regular order, not in an appropriations bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, as I understand it, the memo that the gentleman from Oregon is reading from is a draft provision that has not been cleared by the Department. We will get

this straightened out. I guarantee that what we have just said will cure the problem because there was not a problem in the first place.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure Members that are watching this that we are going to stay on schedule and we are going to be done with this before 2 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, there may be some malignment in the debate here with regard to a road, a road called the Bear Tooth Highway that someone suggested existed in Montana. I want to point out to my colleagues this is not a Montana road. It is actually within the borders of Wyoming, but it is a U.S. Government road and constructed for the purpose of creating access to Yellowstone Park. Only the Federal Government has jurisdiction and responsibility over this road.

Mr. Speaker, the President's initiative to purchase the New World Mine is going to eliminate 466 jobs in a small community called Cooke City, MT. This road simply provides tourists access to Cooke City, MT. With the withdrawal of these minerals and withdrawal of these roads, it is a community that is isolated and dependent on tourism for its economy in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I promise my colleagues I will be brief. I hear the calls of "vote."

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has a tremendous impact on my district, as has been pointed out by certain of my colleagues earlier today. Last September, Pacific Lumber Co., which is the largest private employer in the largest county of my congressional district, agreed to sell the so-called Headwaters Forest, this last old growth stand of redwood trees, to the Federal Government and the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I endorsed the agreement along with our Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, who worked hard to bring all of the parties to this agreement together. A number of conditions that are set out in this bill must be met before the Headwaters agreement will be finalized.

The bill before us today helps the achievement of one of those conditions by authorizing and appropriating the Federal funds necessary to consummate the transaction, \$250 million in Federal taxpayer funding through the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. Speaker, getting to this very point today, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will attest, was not easy. I thank the gentleman and his very capable staff, and I want to thank Chairman LIVINGSTON and Jim Dyer for their work on this, and especially the members of the authorizing committee, Chairman YOUNG, Chief of Staff Lloyd Jones, and somebody who de-

serves special note, Senior Counsel Duane Gibson, who worked so hard on this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, many in Congress had serious reservations about whether this acquisition which was contemplated by the bipartisan agreement to balance the budget should go forward. For my part, the Government already has a very strong presence in my congressional district along California's north coast. My district includes all or part of four national parks or forests, including the largest and most expensive national park, the most expensive to acquire national park in the continental United States, the Redwood National Park.

This bill provides certainty, though, that this acquisition will happen in the right way. The Federal Government gets access to the funds needed to uphold its part of the bargain. Pacific Lumber Company and the State of California gets certainty that the Headwaters agreement can go forward and will happen and Humboldt County gets an upfront payment plus continuing compensation in the form of a payment in lieu of taxes to mitigate the economic impacts of Headwaters. This is not to compensate for lost timber business, but to compensate for the loss of property tax revenues by transferring this land from private ownership to public ownership and removing it from the tax rolls.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all involved for helping this legislation become a reality and helping to resolve a long-simmering dispute in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. REGULA, for the attention he has given an issue of great importance to my constituents, going so far as to visit my district to learn the facts first-hand for himself. I also thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON and his capable staff for their efforts to reach an agreement that takes into account often-conflicting interests.

In my view, the most significant element of this conference report is title 5, which both authorizes and funds a number of priority land acquisitions. Foremost among these is the acquisition of Headwaters Forest, in my congressional district. Headwaters Forest, the largest stand of old-growth redwoods remaining in private hands, is owned by Pacific Lumber Co., the largest private employer in Humboldt County, CA.

Last September, Pacific Lumber agreed to sell Headwaters Forest to the Federal Government and State of California. I endorsed this agreement, along with our State's senior Senator, Senator FEINSTEIN, who worked hard to bring the parties together.

A number of conditions must be met before the Headwaters agreement can be finalized. The bill before us today helps the achievement of one of those conditions by authorizing and appropriating the Federal funds necessary to consummate the transaction—\$250 million. Getting to this point was not easy.

Many of us in Congress had strong reservations about whether this acquisition should go forward. For my part, the Federal Government

already has a strong presence along California's north coast. My district includes all or part of four national parks and forests, including the largest and most expensive to acquire national park in the continental United States, Redwood National Park.

This presence has had a heavy impact on the area, and not wholly in a positive way. It has impacted us in the form of greater regulation, lost tax revenues, closed mills, and lost living wage jobs that have not been replaced despite government promises.

On the part of many of my colleagues, there was a feeling that the Federal Government has already acquired too much land. At a minimum, they wanted to assure that the large expenditure for Headwaters was justified, and that the executive branch was not rushing forward without a plan for management of the property to be acquired.

For these reasons, I consistently emphasized to all of the parties the need to involve Congress in the acquisition. Not only would this further legitimize such a large expenditure of public funds, but it would also permit Congress to correct some items the administration had failed to address.

This would also give us an opportunity to address the economic impact of the acquisition on the people of Humboldt County.

Nonetheless, the administration wanted to give the Congress no say in the Headwaters transaction. They said that Congress should just provide the money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Yet they could not answer such basic questions as which agency would manage the property, what arrangements would be made for public access, or how they knew the Government was getting fair value for its money. Interior Secretary Babbitt even went to so far as to say in a July 18, 1997, press release that he did "not believe that requirements for additional authorization are necessary or helpful."

This could not stand. And it did not stand, Mr. Speaker, thanks to your personal intervention and the insistence of the authorizing committees. Mr. Speaker, you assured that action would not be taken in this bill affecting the people I represent without my involvement on their behalf.

Months ago, you promised me that you would look out for the interests of my constituents. You kept that promise by giving me a direct role in negotiating the Headwaters legislation, and by personally interceding when it appeared that negotiations were not on track. For your leadership, I thank you.

I also thank the chairman of the House Resources Committee, the gentleman from Alaska, Mr. DON YOUNG. He brought to the table his extensive knowledge and experience. Because he also represents an area of our country whose economy is heavily resource based, he understands how the Headwaters acquisition impacts Humboldt County.

Perhaps his greatest contribution, however, was allowing members of his senior committee staff to devote a substantial amount of time to the negotiations, including Chief of Staff Lloyd Jones and Counsel Duane Gibson.

Duane merits special recognition. Not only did he travel twice of Humboldt County in recent months, but he was lead negotiator for the committee. On both the Headwaters and Crown Butte, MT, transactions, he fashioned a legislative solution that serves well the interests of all of the parties.

I would be remiss if I did not also thank all of the executive branch personnel who participated in these difficult negotiations. I want to particularly acknowledge T.J. Glauthier of the Office of Management and Budget, who demonstrated both firmness and compromise when appropriate, and who continually was able to disagree without being disagreeable.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our persistence has led to a win-win result. This is a balanced package that protects living wage jobs, respects the rights of private property owners, and preserves key environmental assets.

The bill provides certainty that this acquisition can happen the right way. The Federal Government gets access to the funds needed to uphold its part of the bargain; Pacific Lumber Co. and the State of California get certainty that the Headwaters agreement can go forward; Congress gets a role in how \$250 million in taxpayer funds are spent; and Humboldt County gets an up-front payment, plus continuing compensation, to mitigate its law enforcement expenses and other economic impacts of the Headwater agreement.

I will not detail all of the provisions of the Headwaters legislation, but I do want to highlight a few.

Securing financial guarantees for Humboldt County was my highest priority in these negotiations. Going forward without an aid package was not an option; economic mitigation had to be on the table or there would be no settlement.

The \$10 million to Humboldt County included in this bill is unprecedented. Together with annual payments in lieu of taxes from the Federal Government and increased revenue from timber harvesting on Pacific Lumber lands, the county should be made more than whole.

Another important provision is the limitation on growth of Headwaters Forest. Except for parcels of 5 acres or less, no Federal money can be used to purchase additional land to expand Headwater Forest without express congressional authorization.

I am an ardent believer in private property rights. That is why I fought hard to assure that upon completion of the multispecies habitat conservation plan [HCP] covering Pacific Lumber Co. property, the lands of abutting smaller property owners will be removed from the critical habitat designation for the marbled murrelet.

Of course, Pacific Lumber Co. and Headwaters do not exist in a vacuum in Humboldt County. That is why I was able to get included in this legislation two other notable provisions. In view of the unique circumstances faced by others engaged in harvesting timber, this bill establishes that the Pacific Lumber HCP is not to be considered precedent.

To help both Federal and State officials in California, a provision is included that allows greater flexibility in cooperative management of government lands. This effectively enacts H.R. 262, which I had earlier introduced at the urging of Redwood National Park, but which will be beneficial to many of our National and State parks.

Mr. Speaker, last week my congressional office in Eureka was vandalized by individuals

who are not satisfied that we are only protecting 7,500 acres of timber. But I do not believe that this action of a few extremists who favor a 60,000-acre preserve reflects the views of most people. A calm appraisal of this legislation will reveal its balance.

This is a Headwaters solution that all fair-minded people can support. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the conference report.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. Earlier this year a majority of the Members of this body, in a recorded vote, voted to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. We knew what the vote was on. A majority of us said, "No more money. You have misused what you had, and it simply does not make sense to tell our 13,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who are on food stamps that we do not have enough money for them to get them off of food stamps, but we have money for the National Endowment for the Arts; to tell those military retirees who are not getting the health care that they were promised that we do not have enough money for them, but we have \$100 million for the National Endowment for the Arts."

We spoke on this subject. I want to remind my colleagues that it has made its way back into this bill and if they were serious about the vote earlier in the year, then vote against this bill today.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I should tell the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] that the House of Representatives lost the vote by one vote when the opportunity was being presented to offer an amendment on the National Endowment for the Arts in changing a rule.

Second, Mr. Speaker, on my motion to instruct the House conferees when they went to conference to accept the provisions of the Senate bill which provided funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and for the Humanities, the House voted without an objection to do that.

So the gentleman's statement that the attitude of the House is opposed to the National Endowment is entirely incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been around here a long time and I have often seen a lot of peculiar things happen. Many of us have seen on many occasions individual Members of this House drag their feet or oppose a project or do very little to promote the project until that project is going to

pass, and then all of the sudden there are an awful lot of instant fathers for the project.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that for the sake of historical accuracy, the RECORD ought to show that with respect to the creation of the Headwaters project in this bill today that without question the driving force in the Congress behind that project was, first of all, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Resources, and Senator FEINSTEIN, who worked extremely hard to get that project developed.

With respect to the comments of the gentleman from Mississippi, I would simply say if this Congress simply stopped funding idiotic projects like the B-2 bomber or the F-22, we would not only have enough money to put every soldier off food stamps, we would have enough money to put them all in alligator boots.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my staff and especially Barbara Wainman. Barbara has been with me 17 years working with Interior matters, and she will be leaving us. This is her last time on this, and we very much appreciate what she has done.

This truly is a "Take Pride in America" bill, as I mentioned this morning. It does a lot of very positive things for the environment, for the culture of this Nation, for the enjoyment of our parks and our forests, and just a lot of positive things.

Mr. Speaker, three points: It is \$400 million less than last year, if we take out the 700 special amount, so we are managing very carefully yet we are getting a lot accomplished. Second, my colleagues heard the colloquies on the forest issue, and I think it is clear that there is latitude in the forest planning that will meet the needs.

Third, on the arts issue, we have constrained the NEA as much as possible in light of the Senate action, and I think all in all the Members should support this bill. It is something I believe we can point to with pride. When Members come over to vote, if they are interested, we have all the sheets about what is contained in the bill.

I want to take this opportunity to clarify that the funding provided to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for habitat conservation planning for the Prebles Meadow Jumping Mouse applies to four counties in Colorado. These mice range over four counties in Colorado and two counties in Wyoming. However, they are on private land in Colorado and on Federal land in Wyoming. The Habitat Conservation Plan only applies to the private lands in Colorado.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	575,664,000	587,495,000	581,591,000	578,851,000	583,270,000	+7,606,000
Wildland fire management	352,042,000	280,103,000	280,103,000	282,728,000	280,103,000	-71,939,000
Central hazardous materials fund	12,000,000	14,900,000	12,000,000	14,900,000	12,000,000
Construction	4,333,000	3,154,000	3,254,000	3,154,000	3,254,000	-1,079,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	113,500,000	101,500,000	113,500,000	124,000,000	120,000,000	+6,500,000
Land acquisition	10,410,000	9,900,000	12,000,000	8,600,000	11,200,000	+790,000
Oregon and California grant lands	103,015,000	101,406,000	101,406,000	101,406,000	101,406,000	-1,609,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	9,113,000	7,510,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite)	7,966,000	7,966,000	7,966,000	7,966,000	7,966,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,195,648,000	1,121,539,000	1,128,538,000	1,138,323,000	1,135,917,000	-59,731,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	526,047,000	561,614,000	591,042,000	585,064,000	594,842,000	+68,795,000
Construction	59,256,000	35,921,000	40,256,000	42,053,000	45,006,000	-14,250,000
Natural resource damage assessment fund	4,000,000	4,628,000	4,128,000	4,328,000	4,228,000	+228,000
Land acquisition	44,479,000	44,560,000	53,000,000	57,292,000	62,632,000	+18,153,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	14,085,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	-85,000
National wildlife refuge fund	10,779,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,779,000	10,779,000
Rewards and operations	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	9,750,000	15,000,000	10,500,000	13,000,000	11,700,000	+1,950,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	670,596,000	687,923,000	725,126,000	728,716,000	745,387,000	+74,791,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,154,611,000	1,220,325,000	1,232,325,000	1,250,429,000	1,233,664,000	+79,053,000
National recreation and preservation	37,978,000	42,063,000	43,934,000	45,284,000	44,259,000	+6,283,000
Historic preservation fund	36,812,000	45,612,000	40,412,000	39,812,000	40,812,000	+4,200,000
Construction	182,744,000	150,000,000	148,391,000	173,444,000	214,901,000	+32,157,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000
Land acquisition and state assistance	53,915,000	70,900,000	129,000,000	126,690,000	143,290,000	+89,375,000
Everglades restoration fund	100,000,000
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,435,858,000	1,598,900,000	1,564,062,000	1,605,659,000	1,646,926,000	+211,068,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	740,051,000	745,388,000	755,795,000	758,160,000	759,160,000	+19,109,000
Minerals Management Service						
Royalty and offshore minerals management	156,955,000	157,922,000	139,621,000	135,722,000	137,521,000	-19,434,000
Oil spill research	8,440,000	6,118,000	6,118,000	6,118,000	6,118,000	-322,000
Total, Minerals Management Service	163,395,000	164,040,000	145,739,000	141,840,000	143,639,000	-19,756,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	94,172,000	93,209,000	94,937,000	96,937,000	94,937,000	+765,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal	94,672,000	93,709,000	95,437,000	97,437,000	95,437,000	+765,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	177,085,000	177,348,000	179,624,000	177,624,000	177,624,000	+539,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	271,757,000	271,057,000	275,061,000	275,061,000	273,061,000	+1,304,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs	1,443,502,000	1,542,305,000	1,526,815,000	1,529,024,000	1,528,588,000	+85,086,000
Construction	100,531,000	125,118,000	110,751,000	125,051,000	125,051,000	+24,520,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	69,241,000	59,352,000	41,352,000	43,352,000	43,352,000	-25,889,000
Indian guaranteed loan program account	5,000,000	5,004,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,618,274,000	1,731,779,000	1,683,918,000	1,702,427,000	1,701,991,000	+83,717,000
Departmental Offices						
Insular Affairs:						
Assistance to Territories	37,468,000	39,494,000	40,494,000	39,494,000	39,794,000	+2,326,000
Northern Marianas Islands Covenant	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000
Subtotal, Assistance to Territories	65,188,000	67,214,000	68,214,000	67,214,000	67,514,000	+2,326,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Compact of Free Association.....	10,038,000	8,445,000	8,445,000	8,545,000	8,545,000	-1,493,000
Mandatory payments.....	13,500,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	-1,500,000
Subtotal, Compact of Free Association.....	23,538,000	20,445,000	20,445,000	20,545,000	20,545,000	-2,993,000
Total, Insular Affairs.....	88,726,000	87,659,000	88,659,000	87,759,000	88,059,000	-667,000
Departmental management.....	58,286,000	58,286,000	58,286,000	58,286,000	58,286,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	35,443,000	35,443,000	35,443,000	35,443,000	35,443,000
Office of Inspector General.....	24,439,000	24,500,000	24,439,000	24,500,000	24,500,000	+61,000
National Indian Gaming Commission.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....	32,126,000	39,337,000	32,126,000	35,689,000	33,907,000	+1,781,000
Total, Departmental Offices.....	240,020,000	246,225,000	239,953,000	242,677,000	241,195,000	+1,175,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	6,335,599,000	6,566,851,000	6,518,192,000	6,592,863,000	6,647,276,000	+311,677,000
Appropriations.....	(6,365,599,000)	(6,596,851,000)	(6,548,192,000)	(6,622,863,000)	(6,677,276,000)	(+311,677,000)
Rescissions.....	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest and rangeland research.....	179,786,000	179,781,000	187,644,000	188,644,000	187,944,000	+8,158,000
State and private forestry.....	155,461,000	156,408,000	157,922,000	162,668,000	161,237,000	+5,776,000
National forest system.....	1,278,176,000	1,325,672,000	1,364,480,000	1,337,045,000	1,348,377,000	+70,201,000
Wildland fire management.....	1,080,016,000	514,311,000	591,715,000	582,715,000	584,707,000	-495,309,000
Reconstruction and construction.....	180,184,000	146,084,000	154,522,000	155,689,000	166,045,000	-14,139,000
Land acquisition.....	40,575,000	41,057,000	45,000,000	49,176,000	52,976,000	+12,401,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts.....	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	3,995,000	3,811,000	3,811,000	3,811,000	3,811,000	-184,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000
Midewin national tallgrass prairie restoration fund.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	+100,000
Cooperative work, Forest Service.....	128,000,000
Total, Forest Service.....	2,919,564,000	2,368,595,000	2,634,565,000	2,481,199,000	2,506,568,000	-412,996,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology:						
Rescission.....	-140,000,000	-153,000,000	-101,000,000	-101,000,000	-101,000,000	+39,000,000
Deferral.....	-133,000,000
Subtotal.....	-140,000,000	-286,000,000	-101,000,000	-101,000,000	-101,000,000	+39,000,000
Fossil energy research and development.....	364,704,000	346,408,000	313,153,000	363,969,000	362,403,000	-2,301,000
Alternative fuels production (indefinite).....	-4,000,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	+2,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.....	143,786,000	117,000,000	115,000,000	107,000,000	107,000,000	-36,786,000
Energy conservation.....	569,762,000	707,700,000	644,766,000	629,357,000	611,723,000	+41,961,000
Economic regulation.....	2,725,000	2,725,000	2,725,000	2,725,000	2,725,000
Strategic petroleum reserve.....	-11,000,000	209,000,000	+11,000,000
(By transfer).....	(220,000,000)	(209,000,000)	(207,500,000)	(207,500,000)	(-12,500,000)
Energy Information Administration.....	66,120,000	62,800,000	66,800,000	62,800,000	66,800,000	+880,000
Total, Department of Energy:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	992,097,000	1,158,133,000	1,039,944,000	1,063,351,000	1,048,151,000	+56,054,000
Appropriations.....	(1,132,097,000)	(1,444,133,000)	(1,140,944,000)	(1,164,351,000)	(1,149,151,000)	(+17,054,000)
Rescission.....	(-140,000,000)	(-153,000,000)	(-101,000,000)	(-101,000,000)	(-101,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
Deferral.....	(-133,000,000)
(By transfer).....	(220,000,000)	(209,000,000)	(207,500,000)	(207,500,000)	(-12,500,000)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services.....	1,806,269,000	1,835,465,000	1,829,008,000	1,958,235,000	1,841,074,000	+34,805,000
Indian health facilities.....	247,731,000	266,535,000	257,310,000	168,501,000	257,538,000	+9,807,000
Total, Indian Health Service.....	2,054,000,000	2,122,000,000	2,086,318,000	2,126,736,000	2,098,612,000	+44,612,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education.....	61,000,000	-61,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses	19,345,000	19,345,000	18,345,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-4,345,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute	5,500,000	5,500,000	3,000,000	5,500,000	4,250,000	-1,250,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses	318,492,000	334,557,000	334,557,000	333,708,000	333,408,000	+14,916,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	3,850,000	3,850,000	3,850,000	3,850,000	3,850,000
Repair and restoration of buildings.....	39,000,000	32,000,000	50,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	-7,000,000
Construction.....	10,000,000	58,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	+23,000,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	371,342,000	428,407,000	388,407,000	402,558,000	402,258,000	+30,916,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses	54,281,000	53,899,000	55,837,000	55,837,000	55,837,000	+1,556,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	5,942,000	5,942,000	6,442,000	5,942,000	6,192,000	+250,000
Total, National Gallery of Art	60,223,000	59,841,000	62,279,000	61,779,000	62,029,000	+1,806,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and maintenance	12,475,000	11,375,000	11,375,000	11,375,000	11,375,000	-1,100,000
Construction	12,400,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-3,400,000
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	24,875,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	-4,500,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses	5,840,000	5,840,000	1,000,000	5,840,000	5,840,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration.....	82,734,000	119,240,000	83,300,000	81,240,000	-1,494,000
Matching grants.....	16,760,000	16,780,000	16,760,000	16,760,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	99,494,000	136,000,000	100,060,000	98,000,000	-1,494,000
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration.....	96,100,000	118,250,000	96,100,000	96,800,000	96,800,000	+700,000
Matching grants.....	13,900,000	17,750,000	13,900,000	13,900,000	13,900,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	110,000,000	136,000,000	110,000,000	110,700,000	110,700,000	+700,000
Institute of Museum and Library Services/ Office of Museum Services						
Grants and administration.....	22,000,000	26,000,000	23,390,000	22,290,000	23,280,000	+1,280,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	231,494,000	298,000,000	133,390,000	233,050,000	231,980,000	+486,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses	867,000	867,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	+40,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+1,000,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses	2,500,000	2,745,000	2,700,000	2,745,000	2,745,000	+245,000
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	5,390,000	5,740,000	5,700,000	5,740,000	5,740,000	+350,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	500,000	-500,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council.....	31,707,000	31,707,000	31,707,000	31,707,000	31,707,000
Total, title II, related agencies:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,792,244,000	6,533,095,000	6,434,637,000	6,463,487,000	6,443,162,000	-349,082,000
Appropriations	(6,932,244,000)	(6,819,095,000)	(6,535,637,000)	(6,564,487,000)	(6,544,162,000)	(-388,082,000)
Rescission	(-140,000,000)	(-153,000,000)	(-101,000,000)	(-101,000,000)	(-101,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
(By transfer)	(220,000,000)	(209,000,000)	(207,500,000)	(207,500,000)	(-12,500,000)
TITLE III - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS						
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18)	386,592,000	-386,592,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE V - PRIORITY LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES						
Priority land acquisitions and exchanges.....		700,000,000		700,000,000	699,000,000	+ 699,000,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	13,514,435,000	13,799,946,000	12,952,829,000	13,756,350,000	13,789,438,000	+ 275,003,000
Appropriations.....	(13,297,843,000)	(14,115,946,000)	(13,083,829,000)	(13,887,350,000)	(13,920,438,000)	(+ 622,595,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(386,592,000)					(-386,592,000)
Rescissions.....	(-170,000,000)	(-183,000,000)	(-131,000,000)	(-131,000,000)	(-131,000,000)	(+ 39,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	(34,615,000)	
(By transfer).....	(220,000,000)		(209,000,000)	(207,500,000)	(207,500,000)	(-12,500,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management.....	1,195,648,000	1,121,539,000	1,128,538,000	1,138,323,000	1,135,917,000	-59,731,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service.....	670,596,000	687,923,000	725,126,000	728,716,000	745,387,000	+ 74,791,000
National Park Service.....	1,435,858,000	1,598,900,000	1,564,062,000	1,605,659,000	1,646,926,000	+ 211,068,000
United States Geological Survey.....	740,051,000	745,388,000	755,795,000	758,160,000	759,160,000	+ 19,109,000
Minerals Management Service.....	163,395,000	164,040,000	145,739,000	141,840,000	143,639,000	-19,756,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.....	271,757,000	271,057,000	275,061,000	275,061,000	273,061,000	+ 1,304,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,618,274,000	1,731,779,000	1,683,918,000	1,702,427,000	1,701,991,000	+ 83,717,000
Departmental Offices.....	240,020,000	246,225,000	239,953,000	242,677,000	241,195,000	+ 1,175,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior.....	6,335,599,000	6,566,851,000	6,518,192,000	6,592,863,000	6,647,276,000	+ 311,677,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service.....	2,919,564,000	2,368,595,000	2,634,565,000	2,481,199,000	2,506,568,000	-412,996,000
Department of Energy.....	992,097,000	1,158,133,000	1,039,944,000	1,063,351,000	1,048,151,000	+ 56,054,000
Indian Health Service.....	2,054,000,000	2,122,000,000	2,086,318,000	2,126,736,000	2,098,612,000	+ 44,612,000
Indian Education.....	61,000,000					-61,000,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation.....	19,345,000	19,345,000	18,345,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-4,345,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.....	5,500,000	5,500,000	3,000,000	5,500,000	4,250,000	-1,250,000
Smithsonian Institution.....	371,342,000	428,407,000	388,407,000	402,558,000	402,258,000	+ 30,916,000
National Gallery of Art.....	60,223,000	59,841,000	62,279,000	61,779,000	62,029,000	+ 1,806,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	24,875,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	-4,500,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	5,840,000	5,840,000	1,000,000	5,840,000	5,840,000	
National Endowment for the Arts.....	99,494,000	136,000,000		100,060,000	98,000,000	-1,494,000
National Endowment for the Humanities.....	110,000,000	136,000,000	110,000,000	110,700,000	110,700,000	+ 700,000
Institute of Museum Services.....	22,000,000	26,000,000	23,390,000	22,290,000	23,280,000	+ 1,280,000
Commission of Fine Arts.....	867,000	867,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	+ 40,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs.....	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+ 1,000,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.....	2,500,000	2,745,000	2,700,000	2,745,000	2,745,000	+ 245,000
National Capital Planning Commission.....	5,390,000	5,740,000	5,700,000	5,740,000	5,740,000	+ 350,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	500,000					-500,000
Holocaust Memorial Council.....	31,707,000	31,707,000	31,707,000	31,707,000	31,707,000	
Total, Title II - Related Agencies.....	6,792,244,000	6,533,095,000	6,434,637,000	6,463,487,000	6,443,162,000	-349,082,000
TITLE III - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS						
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18).....	386,592,000					-386,592,000
TITLE V - PRIORITY LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES						
Priority land acquisitions and exchanges.....		700,000,000		700,000,000	699,000,000	+ 699,000,000
Grand total.....	13,514,435,000	13,799,946,000	12,952,829,000	13,756,350,000	13,789,438,000	+ 275,003,000

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report to H.R. 2107.

While I may have disagreements with other portions of the bill, I would like to focus my remarks on the funding provided for the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA]. Again, let me state that my primary objection to the NEA is that the agency is constitutionally indefensible. Of course, I object, too, to the cavalier attitude exhibited by the bureaucrats at the NEA in the funding of lewd, sacrilegious, and pornographic art over the years. But regardless of the type of art funded by the NEA, the agency is unnecessary and a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Rather than reiterate my well known objections to the NEA, I want to address the funding and the reforms for the NEA in this conference report. First, the funding for the NEA is hardly a compromise with the other body. When the House passed H.R. 2107, it contained no funding for the NEA. When the other body considered the bill, they inserted \$100 million for the fiscal year 1998 operations of the agency. The bill then went to conference. A conference committee is designed to arrive at a compromise between the differences of the two Houses. Yet, this conference report exhibits no signs of compromise on the NEA. A logical compromise may have been a \$50 million funding level for the agency, but instead, the bill provides \$98 million—a mere \$1.5 million cut from last year's appropriation.

Now, my colleagues that served on the conference committee are claiming that the real compromise was with regard to the so-called NEA reforms. While some of these may modestly improve the performance of the agency, history has demonstrated that merely reforming the NEA has produced insignificant results. The arts in America will be better off only when Washington bureaucrats no longer determine what good and proper art deserves the support of involuntarily raised tax dollars.

This NEA appropriation amounts to less than 1 percent of the annual private sector contributions to the arts and humanities in America, which is more than \$10 billion. Clearly artists in America rely on privately raised money rather than NEA grants to survive. Yet, with one of the reforms in this bill, the NEA will be allowed to begin to compete with private arts foundations for private contributions. If Congress is allowing the NEA to solicit private contributions, why does the agency need these extravagant taxpayer subsidies?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my colleagues that our constituents will never believe that Washington will balance the budget unless Congress musters the fortitude to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful Government agencies. While the NEA appropriation is a relatively small percentage of the entire Federal budget, it is a huge symbol of both Washington's insatiable appetite for the money of American taxpayers, as well as the attitude that Washington knows better than our constituents what is best for them.

I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is really a mixed bag. There are many provisions I strongly support. There are others I just as strongly oppose. On balance, I believe I must oppose this bill because I am

deeply concerned about the impact of some of these provisions on our Nation's public lands.

This is a difficult decision for me, because I am impressed with the work of the conferees. They have agreed to some pretty wise investments that are important to me and my constituents. For example, I was pleased to see that the conferees agreed to fund the National Endowment of the Arts at \$98 million, especially after the bitter disappointment arts advocates suffered during House consideration of this appropriation. An investment in the arts is an investment in our Nation's culture and the livability of our communities. As a strong advocate of the public/private partnership that characterizes arts funding, it is encouraging to see that the conferees have not abdicated their responsibility to our Nation's cultural heritage.

In addition, the conferees included funding for land acquisition in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The Columbia River Gorge is a national treasure—rich in the historical, cultural, and resource legacy of the Nation. Among the countless waterfalls that spill from high hanging valleys is Multnomah Falls, one of the tallest in the United States and the single most visited attraction in the entire National Forest System.

I remain grateful to conferees for providing funds to continue our Nation's commitment to preserving the gorge. The funds provided in the conference report will allow for the purchase of lands critical to the ongoing protection of this geologic, historical, and botanical wonder.

However, in spite of all that is good about this conference report, I will be opposing this legislation. There are simply too many environmental riders that I cannot support, including: Language that effectively guts the 1990 law banning log exports from our National Forests and State-owned lands in the West; delays in funding Land and Water Conservation Fund purchases of the Headwaters and New World Mine; the use of \$32 million in LWCF funds for payoff to Humboldt County, CA and for a road maintenance fund in Montana; language that eliminates any limits on the Forest Service's use of purchaser road credit. Congress needs to develop a comprehensive policy on the construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning of forest roads. These ongoing attempts to legislate forest policy on the Interior appropriation bill simply exacerbate efforts to develop a policy that makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, I support much of this report, and applaud the work of the conferees in making critical investments in the arts and the preservation of our natural resources. I cannot in good conscience, however, vote for a bill that I believe will, in the end, cause more harm than good to our public lands. I urge the conferees to reassess the environmental riders and present to the House a conference report we can all support.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the leadership of the committee and subcommittee and the conferees for the hard work they have done to bring the conference report to H.R. 2107, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1997, to the House floor. I especially want to express my gratitude to the subcommittee chair, Mr. REGULA, and the ranking minority member, Mr. YATES, for their willingness to work with the conferees to include in the con-

ference report language regarding Marty Indian School, in Marty, SD. The report language promises to be helpful to the Indian School where conditions are a threat to the health and safety of the young students there. I can attest to the serious problems, having been there myself. The language calls on the Bureau of Indian Affairs to consider "high priority requirements" at the Marty Elementary School through the Facilities Improvement and Repair Program. It is my hope that something can be done in the fiscal year 1998 or 1999 budget.

After years of negotiations with the BIA, the Marty School obtained funds to replace half of the school. The leadership at the school and of the Yankton Sioux Tribe decided to use the funds to replace the high school because of the tremendous dropout rate of Indian high school students who attend the public high schools in the area. The dropout rate has traditionally been less at Marty Indian High School.

However, the young elementary school students face attending a facility which is scattered among several deteriorating buildings, some of which are 70 years old. A few years back, the BIA determined that it was not economically feasible simply to repair the school and that the entire school needed to be replaced. However, a grant awarded Marty was enough to do half of the job.

The conference report in my opinion gives clear direction to the BIA to address immediately this serious problem. The tribe's environmental specialists have estimated that it will cost up to \$1 million to renovate all elements of the heating system alone. No public school system should allow its students to be educated in such a facility.

It has been my pleasure to work with the chair of the Yankton Sioux Tribal Council, Steve Cournoyer; the vice-chair of the tribal council and former school board president, Bob Cournoyer; the president of the school board, Mike Red Lightning, and his colleagues on the school board. I admire their willingness to make every effort to have a suitable school for the students at the Marty School and their recognition that the future of the Yankton Sioux Tribe is embodied in their children. I look forward to continuing to work with these good leaders and the BIA. Again, I thank the Committee and its leadership for what it has done to help Marty.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reluctantly oppose H.R. 2107, the Interior appropriations conference report.

There are many programs in this appropriations conference report that I strongly support. I applaud the conferees on their decision to restore funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. I thank President Clinton for his leadership in restoring funds for the land and water conservation fund. I also commend my colleague Senator SLADE GORTON for dropping his opposition to removal of two dams on the Elwha River and allowing the dams to be eligible for acquisition and future removal.

However, I am voting against the legislation because of an issue that has been very controversial amongst my constituents throughout the Interior appropriations process.

Earlier this year the House approved an amendment to the Interior appropriations bill which would have reduced the appropriation for the roads budget of the Forest Service and

would have placed a cap on the use of the Purchaser Road Credit Program. Offered as a compromise, the Dicks amendment was a balanced alternative to an enormously controversial policy of the Forest Service.

The Purchaser Road Credit Program may have been an effective tool for some small timber companies in the past, but I feel that it has outlived its usefulness and should be phased out. Timber companies should take more financial responsibility up front when roads are needed for a timber harvest on public lands, as they do currently on private lands.

Unfortunately, the Interior appropriations conferees refused to accept this compromise language, instead opting to raise the cap on the Purchaser Road Credit Program. I am disappointed because the House approved the Dicks amendment, the Senate came within one vote of approving a very similar amendment, and President Clinton has indicated his willingness to begin phasing out the Purchaser Road Credit Program.

Again, I regret that I cannot support this bill because there are many good things in it. However, my concern that we are not taking the first step to reform the outdated Purchaser Road Credit program has forced me to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Interior appropriations conference report, H.R. 2107, and to express my appreciation for the hard work of my chairman RALPH REGULA, the distinguished ranking member, SIDNEY YATES, and my other colleagues on the subcommittee. I also want to recognize the staff of the subcommittee, including Debbie Weatherley, Barbara Waneman, Loretta Beaumont, Chris Topik, Joel Kaplan, and Angie Perry. I have thoroughly enjoyed working on the committee and agree with Chairman REGULA that this is one of the most important communities in the House.

I know that some of my colleagues still have problems with this bill because of concerns about the environment. This bill certainly is not perfect. For example, I opposed the provision allowing unlimited use of timber purchaser credits, which funds the construction of new National Forest logging roads. These purchaser credits allow timber companies to build roads throughout our forest system and be reimbursed at taxpayer expense. It's bad policy and I regret that this provision remains in the conference report.

I was also concerned about the provision preventing the revision of forest management plans until the Forest Service issues a final rule on forest plans. Two forests in Virginia are currently on the process of revising their plans and such a provision would have prevented them from completing the work to help bring needed changes into the management of these forests. I support the changes made to the language which exempt plans currently being revised from the provision in the bill and appreciate any clarification the chairman may give on this issue.

There are other provisions in this bill that I have problems with. Looking at the bill as a whole, however, I think it represents a fair compromise on most of the important issues and represents a step forward in funding important initiatives that benefit our environment.

The \$699 million appropriation for land acquisitions will ensure that two important acquisitions, the Headwaters Forest and the New

World Mine can take place, protecting fragile ecosystems from environmental harm. The remaining funds can be used by the Forest Service, the National Park Service, the BLM, and the Fish and Wildlife Service for additional land acquisitions in environmentally sensitive areas.

I am pleased with the changes in the bill removing provisions allowing Alaska Native corporations to file claims to 30,000 acres of coastal lands within the Lake Clark National Park. Any division of the park, particularly of the coast line, would destroy the integrity of the park as a complete ecosystem and prohibit essential public access to the park.

The additional \$136 million in the bill for the Everglades will help provide needed restoration of flora and fauna within the Everglades system; \$384 million for maintenance of our National Parks; and an additional \$41 million for operating the National Wildlife Refuges will be used for operational and maintenance backlogs on refuges and parklands. This additional funding is sorely needed and will help to improve our refuge and park systems, making them more accessible for all Americans.

As Chairman REGULA has mentioned, there is a large increase in energy conservation programs under the bill, including State energy programs and weatherization assistance programs, which help low-income families insulate their homes to make them more energy efficient.

Finally, I am particularly pleased that the conference committee agreed to restore funding to the NEA. Our country needs the NEA to bring the arts to underserved, underprivileged communities across this country. We have no better tool to help leverage private dollars with Federal dollars to generate quality arts programming. The NEA is a success story and we need to put politics aside and recognize how much it does for citizens across the country. I hope that in the next Congress we can provide a much needed increase to NEA funding so that it does not merely survive, but flourish.

Mr. Chairman, the conference agreement appropriates a total of \$13.8 billion for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Interior and related agencies. While we can all point to certain programs within the bill with which we might disagree, overall I think the conference agreement will improve our environment and enhance the stewardship of our natural resources. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the intent of an amendment I offered to the House's version of this bill, which was accepted, in regards to current leaseholders in the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. The conference report contains a different version of my original amendment, and I wish to clarify for the record my intent behind it.

Many of the current leases at Sleeping Bear Dunes will expire soon. While the National Park Service has stated that it plans on restoring the properties of expired leases to their natural state, they do not have the funds to restore these properties. Clearly, this amendment prohibits the Park Service from evicting current leaseholders until they have the necessary funds to do so. However, my intent was also to have the Park Service restore the existing abandoned residential structures before evicting any additional leaseholders.

Currently, there are numerous abandoned structures that have been standing empty for

a number of years. Not only are these deteriorating structures blights on the natural beauty of the lakeshore, but they are also health and safety hazards for the visiting public and local citizens. The National Park Service Report on "Residential Occupancy Under Special use Permits" dated June 21, 1996, raises serious concerns about the Park Service's ability to remove the structures on park property. The report states, "Without sufficient funding the lag time between abandonment of a structure and its ultimate disposition will increase. This will create safety, and other problems, for the park."

Who will be served by evicting these families from their homes, leaving deteriorating structures that will become eyesores and health and safety hazards? No one. These families take great price in maintaining the integrity and beauty of Sleeping Bear Dunes. It makes no sense to continue evicting families, adding to the number of deteriorating structures that are blights on this pristine National Lakeshore, when the Park Service has yet to take care of the currently abandoned and decaying structures. It is my hope that the Park Service is willing to address this situation before evicting more families and adding to a growing problem.

In addition, the Park Service has indicated that they may use funds raised through the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program to restore the properties of leases that expire during fiscal year 1998. I believe that this would be a misuse of the revenue generated by this program and violate the intent of the Congress. In 1996, the Congress authorized the National Park Service to collect entrance fees to deal with a growing backlog of maintenance problems due to funding shortfalls. I believe that using the revenues created by this program to restore the properties of leases that will expire during fiscal year 1998, and thereby ignoring the existing backlog of residential structures, is inconsistent with the desire of the Congress in authorizing this program. These fees should be used to address the restoration of properties that have been neglected over years past, not to evict current leaseholders.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope to work with the National Park Service to address these concerns and find a solution to this problem that is satisfactory to all parties involved.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 171, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—233

Abercrombie	Barrett (NE)	Boehlert
Ackerman	Bass	Boehner
Allen	Bateman	Bonilla
Archer	Bentsen	Bono
Armey	Berry	Boswell
Baesler	Bilbray	Boucher
Baker	Bilirakis	Boyd
Baldacci	Bishop	Brown (CA)
Barcia	Billey	Burr

Buyer	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Calvert	Hobson	Porter
Canady	Horn	Portman
Cannon	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capps	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Cardin	Hyde	Quinn
Castle	Jackson (IL)	Radanovich
Chambliss	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Clay	(TX)	Ramstad
Clayton	Jefferson	Redmond
Clement	Jenkins	Regula
Clyburn	John	Reyes
Collins	Johnson (CT)	Riggs
Cook	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Coyne	Kelly	Rogers
Cramer	Kennelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Crapo	Kim	Roukema
Cummings	King (NY)	Sabo
Danner	Kingston	Sawyer
Davis (FL)	Klecicka	Saxton
Davis (VA)	Klink	Scott
Deal	Knollenberg	Serrano
DeLauro	Kolbe	Shaw
Deutsch	LaTourette	Shays
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Sherman
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Doyle	Linder	Skaggs
Dreier	Livingston	Skeen
Dunn	LoBiondo	Smith (MI)
Edwards	Lofgren	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Lucas	Smith, Linda
Emerson	Manton	Snyder
English	Martinez	Solomon
Eshoo	Mascara	Spence
Etheridge	Matsui	Stokes
Farr	McCrery	Strickland
Fattah	McDade	Stupak
Fawell	McHale	Sununu
Fazio	McHugh	Tanner
Flake	McInnis	Tauscher
Foley	McIntyre	Tauzin
Forbes	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	Meek	Thomas
Fox	Menendez	Thompson
Frank (MA)	Metcalf	Thune
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Torres
Frelinghuysen	Millender-	Towns
Galleghy	McDonald	Traficant
Ganske	Miller (FL)	Turner
Gekas	Mink	Upton
Gilchrest	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Gillmor	Murtha	Walsh
Gilman	Nethercutt	Wamp
Goode	Ney	Waters
Goodlatte	Northup	Watkins
Gordon	Norwood	Weldon (PA)
Goss	Nussle	Weller
Granger	Oberstar	White
Greenwood	Obey	Whitfield
Gutknecht	Olver	Wicker
Hall (OH)	Ortiz	Wise
Hamilton	Owens	Wolf
Hansen	Oxley	Woolsey
Harman	Packard	Wynn
Hastert	Pappas	Yates
Hastings (WA)	Pastor	Young (AK)
Hefner	Peterson (PA)	Young (FL)
Hergert	Pickett	
Hill	Pombo	

NAYS—171

Aderholt	Coburn	Gibbons
Andrews	Combest	Goodling
Bachus	Condit	Graham
Ballenger	Conyers	Green
Barr	Costello	Gutierrez
Barrett (WI)	Cox	Hall (TX)
Bartlett	Crane	Hastings (FL)
Barton	Cunningham	Hayworth
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hefley
Berman	DeFazio	Hilleary
Blagojevich	DeGette	Hinche
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Blunt	DeLay	Hoekstra
Bonior	Dellums	Holden
Borski	Dingell	Hooley
Brady	Dixon	Hostettler
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Hulshof
Brown (OH)	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bryant	Duncan	Inglis
Bunning	Ehrlich	Johnson (WI)
Burton	Engel	Johnson, E.B.
Camp	Ensign	Johnson, Sam
Campbell	Evans	Jones
Carson	Filner	Kanjorski
Chabot	Frost	Kasich
Christensen	Furse	Kennedy (MA)
Coble	Gejdenson	Kennedy (RI)

Kildee	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Kilpatrick	Nadler	Sessions
Kind (WI)	Neal	Shadegg
Kucinich	Neumann	Shimkus
LaFalce	Pallone	Skelton
Lampson	Pascrell	Slaughter
Lantos	Paul	Smith (NJ)
Largent	Paxon	Smith, Adam
Latham	Pease	Snowbarger
Levin	Peterson (MN)	Souder
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Spratt
Lipinski	Pickering	Stabenow
Lowey	Pitts	Stark
Luther	Poshard	Stearns
Maloney (CT)	Riley	Stenholm
Maloney (NY)	Rivers	Stump
Manzullo	Roemer	Talent
Markey	Rogan	Taylor (MS)
McCarthy (MO)	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
McCollum	Rothman	Thurman
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
McGovern	Royce	Tierney
McKinney	Rush	Velazquez
McNulty	Salmon	Vento
Meehan	Sanchez	Watt (NC)
Miller (CA)	Sanders	Watts (OK)
Minge	Sanford	Waxman
Moakley	Schaefer, Dan	Weldon (FL)
Moran (KS)	Schaffer, Bob	Wexler
Morella	Schumer	Weygand

NOT VOTING—29

Bereuter	Gephardt	Parker
Callahan	Gonzalez	Payne
Chenoweth	Houghton	Pelosi
Chokesey	Istook	Rangel
Cubin	Klug	Ryun
Dickey	LaHood	Sandlin
Everett	Leach	Scarborough
Ewing	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Foglietta	McIntosh	Smith (OR)
Ford	Mollohan	

□ 1405

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
 Mr. Smith of Oregon for, with Mr. Scarborough against.
 Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Gephardt against.
 Messrs. BACHUS, SHIMKUS, MOAKLEY, HINOJOSA, STENHOLM, and SESSIONS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
 Messrs. JEFFERSON, OWENS, and TORRES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."
 So the conference report was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday October 24, 1997, I was granted a leave of absence. Unfortunately, I missed rollcall votes 526 through 531.

Had I been here, I would have voted: "Yea" on rollcall 526, on approval of the Journal; "nay" on rollcall 527, rule for fiscal year 1998 DOI conference report; "nay" on rollcall 528, motion to rise; "yea" on rollcall 529, Representative Quinn Amendment to H.R. 2247; "nay" on rollcall 530, motion to adjourn; and "nay" on rollcall 531, final passage fiscal year 1998 DOI conference report.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1270, THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 105-345) on the resolution (H. Res. 280) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the remainder of the day and of next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

I am happy to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week.

The House will meet on Tuesday, October 28, at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 noon for legislative business. We do not plan to have any recorded votes before 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 28.

On Tuesday, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed this afternoon.

After the suspensions, the House will take up the conference report on the Department of Defense authorization bill.

We will then proceed to the rule, and rule only, on H.R. 1270, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997.

For Wednesday, October 29, and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following bills, all of which will be subject to rules:

We intend to finish H.R. 1270, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997; H.R. 2493, providing for uniform management for livestock grazing on Federal lands; H.R. 2616, the Charter Schools Amendments Act; the HELP Scholarships Act; and H.R. 2614, the Reading Excellence Act.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10:00 a.m. On Friday, the House will meet at 9:00 a.m. We should finish legislative business by about 2:00 p.m. next Friday, October 31.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman is available for a question, I would like my friend from Texas to maybe give us a sense of what is in the wind regarding suspensions and his intentions with respect to the Amtrak bill.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate the gentleman's request and his interest in the subject.

We will be, at this point, consulting with the Senate and talking to the committee chairman, and we would expect to have announcement later.

Mr. BONIOR. I would also say to my friend from Texas, with respect to the case of the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, as the gentleman clearly knows from yesterday