

We have asked the managers of the Interior appropriations bill—now we have interrupted them—to come to the floor. They are scheduled to be on the floor. I know the Senator from Iowa is working to try and get an amendment included. I feel confident that will be done at some point. At this time, I have to object to the expansion of the unanimous consent request that was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts and support the request that was made by the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, under those circumstances and to accommodate the Member, I will not press this, although I do think we will have an opportunity to address these issues later in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Interior appropriations bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Ashcroft amendment No. 1188 (to committee amendment beginning on page 96, line 12 through page 97, line 8) to eliminate funding for programs and activities carried out by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, just so we will be clear what we have agreed to, Senator GORTON and the other manager of the bill will be here to, again, further debate amendments on the Interior appropriations bill. They have been good partners on this appropriations bill and have worked out some of the areas where there have been disagreements, but there will be amendments and, I presume, votes throughout the day on a number of issues, including the National Endowment for the Arts issue, perhaps on some mining issues. I understand perhaps the Senator from Arkansas has an amendment.

But we need to make progress on the Interior appropriations bill because we hope to finish it tonight or tomorrow and then go to FDA at some point. I hope we can work out a reasonable agreement where we can complete the debate on the Food and Drug Administration reform bill, and we hope to then pretty quickly, either late this week or early next week, go to the District of Columbia appropriations bill. That would be the 13th and last appropriations bill that we would have to deal with this session, and then we could focus the rest of next week and the next week on adopting conference reports to the appropriations bills. We will need to move them very quickly.

It will be my intent to try and hold time and focus on getting those conference reports agreed to.

I appreciate the cooperation of all Senators as we try to accommodate one of our most beloved Senators who has a problem this morning, and we will begin with the Interior appropriations momentarily. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are now on the Interior appropriations bill once again. I believe that the first vote on that bill will be on the Ashcroft-Helms amendment to strike the appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts. There has been discussion of several other amendments relating to that endowment. I believe it appropriate to continue that debate until the cloture vote at noon. I know that the majority leader hopes, and I hope, that shortly after we get back on the Interior appropriations bill, after our FDA vote, that we will begin to vote on amendments relating to the National Endowment for the Arts. In any event, that is the subject at the present time. I invite all Members who are interested in any of the amendments on the National Endowment for the Arts to come to the floor and speak on that subject between now and noon.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, is time controlled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wish to rise in support of the bill which has been brought forth by the Senator from Washington. I think he has done an extraordinary job in developing this appropriations language in this bill relative to the Interior and various departments which the Interior impacts. I especially want to thank him for his sensitivity relative to the Northeast.

There is a different view in this country between the Northeast and the West on a number of issues that involve land conservation and the question especially of protecting lands, public lands. In the Northeast, especially in northern New England, we are still struggling with the fact that we would like to protect some additional lands. We have a spectacular place called the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire, and it is the most visited national forest in the country. In fact, it receives more visitors per year than Yellowstone, which is a national park. It is under tremendous pressures from popular use because it is so close to the megalopolis of New York, Boston, and Washington.

It is an extraordinary place, but to maintain it and to maintain its character, it requires that we continue to address some of the inholding issues around the national forest, and the Senator from the West has been sensitive to the Senators from the East on this point. I thank very much the Senator from Washington for his sensitivity in allowing us to go forward in this bill and complete the purchase of a very critical piece of land called Lake Tarleton in New Hampshire.

In addition, he has assisted us in a number of other areas in this bill, and I thank him for it.

I also want to talk about a position that has been brought forward in this bill relative to the National Endowment for the Arts, because I think the Senator from Washington has reached the appropriate balance in the language which he has put in this bill relative to the National Endowment for the Arts.

The National Endowment for the Arts, as we all know, has been a lightning rod of controversy, especially on the House side, less so on our side of the aisle, because of some of the things that the Endowment over the years has funded, which have been mistakes, to say the least.

But the fact is that there is a role, in my opinion, it is a limited role, but there is a role for the Federal Government and for State governments in the area of assisting the arts in this country.

Arts are an expression of the culture of a country or a nation, an expression of the attitude, personality, and the strength of a nation. The ability to have a vibrant arts community in a nation is critical, I believe, to the good health and the good education of a nation.

The Federal role, in participating in this, should be one of an incubator. The Federal role should be one as the starter of the initiatives. And the dollars which are put in this bill for the purposes of assisting the NEA and the Humanities Council are just that—they are startup dollars.

Essentially, these dollars multiply two times, three times, sometimes five times their basic number.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The Senator explained some, I think, valid points concerning the role of our Government support for the arts. My question concerns the very, very high administrative costs that the National Endowment has experienced, approaching 20 cents on the dollar in administration, and the fact that the distribution of the funds from the National Endowment have gone primarily to very few cities in the country. In fact, I think one-third of all of the direct grants go to six cities in the United States. And the fact is that the Whitney Museum in

one exhibit received \$400,000, received as much as the entire State of Arkansas last year.

So my question is, if we are to continue a Government role in funding the arts, would it not be better to eliminate the National Endowment, block grant those funds directly to the States, cutting out the 20 percent in administrative costs and the inequities in the funding formulas for the funding decisions of the National Endowment—and of course I have offered an amendment that would do exactly that—and provide 45 of the 50 States with more money for the arts than they currently receive under the status quo approach that we find in this bill?

Mr. GREGG. That is a good question. I think it is one of the questions which we need to answer as we go forward with this bill. And there are a number of amendments—I think the Senator has one; and I believe there are other Senators who are offering them—as to the proper allocation of the dollars between the States and between the National Arts Council which administers the Federal moneys.

But if I can come back to that point, I want to talk generally about the need for Government support of the arts; and then in the allocation area I would like to come back to that. Because I think, first, we have to reach a consensus that there is a need for any dollars in the arts community to come from the Federal Government or from the State governments, and that consensus is a long way from being reached. Certainly on the House side they appear to be very resistant to that.

My view is, as I was saying earlier, that there is a need for the Federal Government to play a role as basically the initiator of arts activities, as the incubator that allows the multiplier to occur that creates funding for the arts.

As Governor of New Hampshire I had the same issue before me as to whether or not the State government should be involved in funding the arts. And at a time when we were having the most severe recession probably ever in the history of the State of New Hampshire, regrettably, and we were having to curtail our funding in a variety of areas and cut them back dramatically, I maintained the arts funding, in fact increased it a little bit in the State because I felt strongly that, first, it gave definition and it gave a way of viewing our culture that was critical and, second, it also had a very positive impact, especially in New Hampshire, on our tourist industry.

The arts—performing arts especially; but all forms of arts—go hand in hand, at least in New Hampshire, with the ability of the tourist industry, which happens to be our largest employer, to be a successful and vibrant industry.

So there is an economic benefit of significant proportions to having a strong arts community. The investment which the State or the Federal Government makes in the arts community pays back not only in the way of getting more people involved in the

arts, getting more schoolchildren involved in the arts, getting more parents involved with their kids in the arts, but also in the manner of producing economic activity which is fairly significant.

The Senator from Arkansas has raised a very legitimate issue. I know his amendment raised this issue, an issue I raised in committee as a member of the authorizing committee. I sit on both the authorizing committee and have the good fortune to work with the Senator from Washington on the Appropriations Committee. But he has raised the issue, what is the proper allocation here? I think that is proper for debate. How much of the money should be retained with the central arts planning here in Washington and how much should go out to the States?

I have always felt a larger percentage should go out to the States because I think that you get more benefit for the dollars spent at the State level. Therefore, a change in the formula would be something that I might well be amenable to. I have actually proposed such changes in committee. But I do think there is also a role, and I do not happen to believe we should eliminate a central arts council that manages a percentage of the dollars out of Washington.

Why is that? Basically because there are a number of national efforts which do transcend State lines which need to get their funding out of a national fund as versus out of a State fund.

For example, I believe the No. 1 item chosen by the NEA this year to fund—they have a competition obviously and, unfortunately, sometimes they choose some really poor ideas—but the No. 1 item that was agreed to on their list was to bring back out of mothballs the Egyptian exhibit which is now owned by the Brooklyn Museum. This is one of the most expansive exhibits of Egyptian art and artifacts in the world. It is competitive with the English collection and not completely competitive but certainly representative of even the collections in Cairo.

These items had been sort of put in storage and collecting dust. Now the Brooklyn Museum has decided to bring them back. And I believe they are taking this around the country. It will be exceptionally educational for a large number of schoolchildren who participate in seeing this exhibit. It will be a national effort. That is the type of initiative that really should be supported from the national level as versus having to be absorbed by, for example, the State of New York which will obviously benefit from this exhibit but actually the whole country will benefit from it because it is going to travel around the country. There are other items, yes, that obviously are of a national nature and, yes, most of those institutions which are of a national nature, whether it be the New York Symphony or some sort of major proposal in Chicago or Los Angeles are centered in your major urban areas. That is just a fact of life. They are centered there for a variety of reasons and, therefore,

those major urban areas do get a disproportionate amount of the national share of the NEA funding.

But that is inevitably going to happen that way as long as you have a national program that is trying to move these various cultural activities across the country. You are going to have to have a place where they are located where they start. The Boston Pops is in Boston, but it certainly has an impact across the country. Therefore, the main art centers of this Nation—and they do happen to be in your major urban areas—are always going to receive a disproportionate amount of the funds. So that does not bother me so much.

What I do think is legitimate is the question of the proper allocation between the funds going to the National Endowment for the Arts versus going to the States. I do think we can take another look at that formula. I know the Senator from Arkansas is going to make a very aggressive and effective point for restructuring that formula, for restructuring the entire institution.

I look forward to hearing his position on this. But I did want to make these initial comments first in support of the overall bill which I think the Senator from Washington has done an extraordinarily good job on and, second, in support of the basic thrust of his proposals relative to the endowments which are going to be the most controversial items I guess we will be hearing about on the floor. I yield back my time.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. President.

Just responding to some of the comments of my colleague concerning the National Endowment for the Arts and the need to preserve and maintain that national entity, I think that if the record is examined, as it has been examined by the General Accounting Office and the inspector general's office, that the record of the National Endowment is not only deplorable but fails to justify its continued funding and continued existence.

The issue of whether or not the Government plays a role in funding for the arts aside, the best means of providing the limited funding, the \$100 million approximately that has been appropriated for arts this year directly in the NEA, I think is clear that that money would best be used by eliminating the existence of the National Endowment and allowing the funds to flow directly to the Governors, to the various States for distribution to those programs and those projects and those artists within the States that are most deserving.

In fact, the notion that we are better off with a national endowment that

funds six States disproportionately, that funds certain congressional districts and certain States disproportionately, cannot be validated and cannot continue to be justified.

We have a General Accounting Office report indicating that the administrative costs of the NEA, at almost 20 cents on the dollar, is higher than most other Federal agencies, much, much higher than the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The mission statement for the National Endowment is simply that they are to broaden access to the arts. In effect, they are mandated to provide arts to underserved areas in this country. Yet, if you look at where the National Endowment today is sending those funds, it in no way corresponds to the mission that they have been given by this Congress to serve those areas which are, if you will, culturally deprived or who have less access to these arts programs.

Six cities getting over one-third of the direct grants from the NEA cannot be justified. When we had—and the chairman is on the floor this morning—our hearing on the National Endowment in April, and Jane Alexander came in and testified before us, I questioned her as to why, in view of the mission of the NEA to provide arts for underserved areas, in view of that mission, why, out of 12 grant proposals from the State of Arkansas last year, was only 1 approved and the Arkansas Arts Council got approximately \$400,000 last year. That equates to little more than many grants for single exhibits across this country.

Her answer was that it is only in certain select States that we find the environment such to foster the arts. And she gave the analogy of growing apples. She said, apples grow everywhere, but there are certain areas of the country in which they are more productive. I think the implication that there are parts of this country that do not have potential artists, there are parts of this country that among their populations do not have those ready to blossom into writers and sculptors and authors, I think, is the very epitome of the elitism that the American people find so offensive by the National Endowment.

So to my colleagues who believe that there is an important role that the Government plays in subsidizing and supporting arts, to those of my colleagues who feel very adamantly that we must show our support to culture and to the arts in general in this country by providing some seed money, I ask you to consider the possibility that we would be far better off eliminating the controversial and I think indefensible actions of the National Endowment, eliminate the NEA as it has traditionally existed, and allow that appropriation, exactly the same amount of money, the \$100 million to be sent directly to the States on this basis: A \$500,000 grant to every State, \$200,000 to every territory, the remainder of the appropriation to be distributed on a strictly per capita basis.

I ask you, could anything be more fair than that? If we took that simple formula, and we said that there will only be 1 percent spent for administrative costs on the Federal level, that the Department of Treasury can spend no more than \$1 million to write those checks, and that the State arts councils or the State legislatures or the Governors can spend no more than 15 percent in overhead, that if we adopt that simple formula, the result is that 45 of the 50 States will come out ahead, that 45 of the 50 States will have more resources to fund arts in their States than under the current status quo which this bill, with all due respect, maintains.

I simply ask my colleagues in the Senate, how can we, with a straight face, no matter which side we are on on the concept of whether the Government ought to be involved in the arts, how can we, with a straight face, face our constituents and say, we are going to defend 20 percent administrative costs, we are going to defend one-third of the grants going to six cities, we are going to defend three-fourths of the grants going to congressional districts represented by Democrats?

I just want to tell you, Mr. President, I do not believe those congressional districts represented by Democrats in this country are intrinsically less cultured or more culturally deprived or in more need of those arts grants than those congressional districts that happen to be represented by Republicans. Yet there has been a clear bias, with 75 cents out of every \$1 going to congressional districts represented by Democrats.

It has been very selective funding by a group of elitists in Washington, bureaucrats in Washington, who make themselves the arbiters of what is good art and what is culture and where it should be funded.

So I say consider an option that would say we will end the National Endowment, we will block grant the money to the States on a fair, fair, fair formula based upon the resident population. The result is that 45 States are going to have more money for the arts, more money to help the local writer, more money to go to the schools for education programs in the arts, more money to help that struggling artist who may not have an opportunity and may not happen to live in the six blessed cities that have been honored by the NEA with over one-third of the grants.

So when this amendment is debated and when this amendment is voted on, I trust later today, I ask my colleagues to look at that breakdown, to look at that chart, and to consider the fact that their State will come out ahead, that their Governor, their State legislature, or their State arts council will have more money to support their local efforts than under the status quo.

Remember that we are not responsible to a few culture elitists. We are responsible to our constituents in our

States for how those limited resources are spent and how we can support the arts. I believe it is fair. I believe it is equitable. I believe it makes eminent common sense. If we will just break out of our lock that the status quo has held over us in the disproportionate influence that this group at the NEA has had in this Congress and consider that there might be a better way, then I think the moral high ground is certainly on behalf of this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support it later today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the Senator from Arkansas has a minute, I would like to ask a question or two about this subject. I certainly support him in his effort.

I believe it was Senator HELMS yesterday who talked about substantial grants being given to Harvard University, which has an endowment of over \$6 billion, I believe, and Yale University. Does the Senator know if those figures are correct? Are there universities, let me ask, in Arkansas who could use funding from the National Endowment for the Arts equally as those great universities?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his question and thank him for his support and cosponsorship of this amendment.

My answer is an unequivocal yes, that is accurate; the incidents that Senator HELMS cited, to my knowledge, are accurate. And I secondly answer your question by saying, yes, there are many institutions in Arkansas very interested in the arts, very interested in promoting the arts within the State of Arkansas, many that have a great relationship with the local schools and foster arts education in those local schools who would rejoice at having additional funds.

The State of Arkansas would more than double what would be available for arts in the State of Arkansas by going to the block grant approach.

Senator GREGG, commenting earlier, was defending the distribution of these funds to a few select cities—one-third of all grants going to six cities. I say that many of those institutions currently receiving grants, like the Boston Symphony or like the Metropolitan Opera, are very well endowed, have very high annual incomes, have a huge base of support, and are less needy and less dependent upon any kind of Federal help than, say, the University of Arkansas or the University of Central Arkansas, or the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, or the many other fine institutions in Arkansas that would be able to work with our local schools and the Arkansas Arts Council, which received just a little over \$400,000 last year. That was all the State of Arkansas received. The Whitney Museum by itself received almost as much as the State of Arkansas, and if I am correct, I believe the State of Alabama was in a similar dilemma.

Mr. SESSIONS. Whitney funding almost matched the entire funding of the State of Alabama. It is a concern.

We have one of the finest Shakespeare festivals in the world. As a matter of fact, the Shakespeare theater in Montgomery is well renowned, and people have contributed very heavily of themselves. The former Postmaster General Winton Blount had gone beyond the call of duty in helping create this facility. We only got \$15,000 for that premier, world-class facility that is supported substantially by the gifts of local residents.

Let me ask you, if the money came to the State, would they be able if they so chose to give more money to the Shakespeare theater in Montgomery? Would they be able to do that?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. That, of course, is the whole concept behind our amendment—local control. Send the money back to the States, the Governors, the State legislatures, and the State arts council would have the discretion to increase funding.

In the case of Alabama, and I do not have the exact numbers in front of me, but the amount of resources available to the State of Alabama would be greatly enhanced under the block grants approach in which we send a \$500,000 grant to every State, and then simply distribute it on a per capita basis. That would allow the State of Alabama to give much more to the Shakespearean theater.

I was interested to hear your comments yesterday quoting Anthony Hopkins and his appreciation for that Shakespeare theater there in Montgomery.

So the needed resources would be much more available, and that would be controlled locally. So inasmuch as there was local support in Alabama for increased funding, I think the opportunity would be much enhanced.

Frankly, I am puzzled why anyone would oppose the approach that you and I are offering. I can understand the 5 States that would lose funding being opposed to this, but the 45 States and the Senators from the 45 States that would see their funding for the arts increased under our approach while eliminating bureaucracy in Washington, it is really difficult for me to see how someone objects to that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Let me ask the Senator this, and this is something I think we failed to think enough about, Mr. President. This money that is being spent in our States, the decision of where and how to spend that money primarily is being decided by a group of people in Washington. Under this procedure not only will 45 States have more money—correct me if I am wrong—45 States will have more money, but they will also have more control and be able to make the decisions that they feel would be the best use of that money; is that correct?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Senator SESSIONS, you are exactly right. One of the areas that this Republican-controlled

Congress has pushed for most strongly has been local control. In welfare reform, in a whole host of areas, we said, "Let's flow that power back out of Washington, back to the States."

There is no better example, I think, of where we could do that than in the area of the arts. We not only have a 20-percent overhead that we are paying just by having this bureaucracy of almost 150 employees dispensing this money, but we have a small group that makes decisions on what will be funded across this country, if you will, making themselves the arbiters of what is good art, and the control of our constituents is minimized because of the distance, the inability to really affect the decisions that are made.

So, yes, I think the citizens of Alabama, the citizens of my home State of Arkansas, will have much greater input dealing with the Arkansas Arts Council or the Alabama Legislature, or the Governor's office than trying to affect the decisions that are made in Washington, DC, by a select group.

Mr. SESSIONS. I understand one of the grants that was reported yesterday went to Philipps Academy, one of the most exclusive private prep schools, I think, in America. That is what I understood the reference to be. Do you think there are schools, public schools, throughout Arkansas and Alabama and other States in this Nation that would also likewise be able to make a claim for this money? And are any of those receiving any moneys from the National Endowment for the Arts in Arkansas and Alabama? In Alabama no private or public schools are receiving money as happened in the Northeast.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I believe those local schools in rural communities across our States and all across this country have a much more legitimate claim to those funds than where those funds have gone under the current status quo of the NEA.

I grew up in a town with a population, when I lived there, of 894. I can remember in junior high school it being one of the great thrills when we were able to take a field trip 40 miles to the University of Arkansas and watch a Shakespearean play. That is the first time I had ever seen a Shakespearean play.

Those kind of opportunities to the small communities of this country would be increased so much if we eliminated the Washington bureaucracy and allowed that money to flow back to the States.

The objectionable art, Senator SESSIONS, that you cited yesterday, that Senator HELMS spent a great deal of time on, that has characterized much of the debate around the NEA in recent years—if a local arts council, the State arts council, or State legislature or Governor made a decision to fund something that the mass of the people found highly objectionable, I guarantee you they will be more responsible in that State legislature or that State arts council, or that Governor will be

far more responsive to the complaints of the people than a faraway bureaucracy in Washington, DC, in some ivory tower making those decisions.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I agree with that and I support this bill wholeheartedly.

I had an outstanding conversation with the three leaders and directors of three orchestras in Alabama. They are concerned about funding. They need the little funding that we do get. It helps them. They do not want to lose that. I can understand that. I asked them if we could come up with a way that will leave the bureaucracy and put more money in your hand, with more freedom to spend it as you wish, would you support that? And they said, yes, of course they would.

I know some people believe and have committed themselves to supporting the National Endowment for the Arts, but the truth is it is not performing in a good and healthy way, it is not doing a good job of putting money to the arts, it is not invigorating the arts and providing leadership for an enhancement of the good and beautiful and fine in America. Too often, it is, in fact, participating in a degradation of the quality of art in America.

What we need to do is make sure it is done right. I believe the people at the Alabama Arts Council, the arts councils in the other States around this country, if given the opportunity, would spend that money wisely. They would be much less likely to give it to the arcane, the pornographic, the bizarre, and the just plain silly that is so often happening today. It is just not acceptable.

It is time for this body to follow through. It is time for this body, after years of begging and pleading with the National Endowment for the Arts to do a better job to manage their money better, to put an end to it and make sure that what we do actually supports the arts in an effective way. That is why I support this amendment.

I am so proud of the Senator from Arkansas for his outstanding work on it, the Senator from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, and the Senator from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, for their outstanding teamwork in putting this proposal together, which is a win-win situation for all America. It puts more money in the arts, and it will eliminate waste, bureaucracy, and silly funding projects.

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

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to use just a few moments this morning to talk about this appropriations bill that is pending before the Senate and two projects under the Land and Water Conservation Fund that the distinguished chairman, Senator SLADE GORTON, had put into the bill but subjected them to prior authorization: The so-called Headwaters acquisition in California which could cost \$250 million; is that correct, Senator GORTON?

Mr. GORTON. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. And the so-called New World Mine in Montana, which is an effort to acquire a mine before it is mined. That is in Montana. I believe it would cost \$65 million.

Now, I am not here on the floor of the Senate to tell the Senate that these projects are good, should be done, or should not be done. But I am here to tell them absolutely and unequivocally that if the administration, through whatever source, is telling Senators that the budget agreement reflected that these projects should be funded, I am here to tell the Senate that is not true.

Now, if the administration wants to say these are their high-priority items, which they have told the distinguished chairman, they are free to do that. In fact, they are free to do anything. Let me tell you that in the ritual and integrity of the agreement, they have spoken about these projects and some others. But we did not agree how the \$700 million in new money that we included in this budget agreement should be spent. So one would say, well, how should it be spent? Well, obviously, it was to be spent in a typical manner of spending money out of the land and water conservation fund. Congress and the White House have to work together to decide what they want to do. There is no priority treatment in this budget arrangement in any way, shape, or form.

Now, what I would like to do just visually for everyone so that they will understand. I have before me and I am holding up an agreement called the bipartisan budget agreement, May 15, 1997. Now, it is historic. Nothing like this has ever been done in the history of the Senate, where the leadership from the Senate and House signed an agreement with the White House to do things in a budget. In this agreement, if you look at it, from its 1st page until its 24th page, and two attached letters relevant to taxes, you will not find the names of these two acquisitions—Headwaters Forest or the New World Mine—mentioned. It is not in this agreement. Now, one might say, does it have to be? Yes. If it is a priority item that negotiators agreed would be done, it is in this agreement. If anybody wants to look at it, they can do so.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. GORTON. But I take it, Mr. President, that the \$700 million for the land and water conservation fund is, in fact, in that agreement, is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator, I am going to turn to that right now. It is in the agreement. Anybody who wants to look at it can look at page 19. There is a chart in here that says what this fund is about. Essentially, it says that we have decided that \$700 million can be set aside, at the option of the Congress, to be used for land acquisition, and a budget flow even shows how it will be

spent. And the language says the \$700 million, if spent for priority Federal land acquisition, can be done in excess of the caps for discretionary spending. That is why the U.S. House did not even put it in their appropriations bill, because there is nothing in this agreement that mandates it. It says that if you include \$700 million for land acquisition, then when you spend it, the budget credits it to the appropriations committee.

Mr. GORTON. But I ask the Senator from New Mexico, there is nothing there that mentions any specific project?

Mr. DOMENICI. I assumed everybody would be looking at the agreement. You are correct. Verbally, I state there are three footnotes, there are two charts, and nowhere in that do these two projects appear. They are not mentioned.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator, I want to tell you one other thing. The two instruments that judge our budget responsibility, vis-a-vis the President, what have we agreed to do with our President—frankly, they are not enforceable and everybody knows that, but we have agreed to do it. Might I say that this chairman, Senator SLADE GORTON, has taken the agreements that are stated and he has followed them. As a matter of fact, one found on page 24 of the agreement and is also in the budget resolution, which I will talk to in a moment, was approximately a \$74 million increase for Indian tribal priority allocation funding. Senator GORTON had a meeting and asked, "Is that a priority agreement that we agreed with?" I said, "Yes." He said, "So it will be funded." Is that not right?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Now, the only other instrument that has anything whatsoever to do with implementing this 24-page historic agreement is the budget resolution itself because what we chose to do is to put in the budget resolution the priority requirements of this agreement. So that if you look at page 23 of the budget resolution, you find a description of the \$700 million for land acquisitions and exchanges, but no mention of any single project—not a single project mentioned. It merely states very precisely what I told the Senate 4 minutes ago when I said how the \$700 million was to be set up. That is what it says.

But conversely, throughout this agreement, throughout this budget resolution, when we have agreed on a specific program in this agreement, it is found in this resolution. So, Senator, if you want to look at this agreement and say, what did the Congress and the President say about Head Start, that might be a question you could put to me. I would say that we agreed in this agreement that Head Start was a priority. Lo and behold, you will find in the budget resolution that Head Start, in the function on education, is listed,

and guess what? The dollar amount that we agreed upon is in the budget resolution.

Now, frankly, I think it is absolutely patent that had we agreed to these two projects—and I repeat that I am not sure how I will vote when we really have them before us in a proper mode. I am not sure how I will vote in the committee that authorizes them. But the pure simplicity of what I have just explained would say that if we agreed to these two projects, you would find them in one of these agreements. In fact, if you found them in the 24-page agreement, you would find them in the function of the budget that funds these kinds of projects, and they would be stated there. Now, I note the chairman is on the floor with a question. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. GORTON. So, I ask the Senator from New Mexico, then the bill that I drafted and is being debated on the floor here today regarding appropriations for the Department of the Interior includes both the \$700 million for the land and water conservation fund and a specific mention and, therefore, a degree of priority, for the New World Mine and for the California redwood purchase; this bill, in fact, goes beyond and is more specific than the budget agreement itself, is that not correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. No question. But you might say, in this respect, it is contemplated that if the Congress, and thus the Senate as the initiator, at some point in time wanted to implement the \$700 million fund, they would at some time have to decide what they are going to spend it on. At that point in time, however they decided, the White House and Congress would engage in a political dialog in the normal way, with each having its strengths; namely, a vote here, and namely, the President says I don't want it, do it another way; that is typical. That would be envisioned as part of how you would decide how to spend it.

Mr. GORTON. And so when the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], chairing the committee on which, incidentally, each of us serves as well, states that he has a number of questions about the very complicated transactions for these two projects proposed by the President and wishes to deal with those in the normal course of authorizing legislation, he, the Senator from Alaska, in the view of the Senator from New Mexico, is taking a quite reasonable position?

Mr. DOMENICI. As a matter of fact, the budget agreement doesn't say whether he should authorize them or not authorize them. The budget agreement speaks of allocating this money to this committee. But as I said, it does not prescribe the spending of the money in this committee on these projects. That is a legislative matter to be dealt with with the executive branch in the normal relationship that we have on spending money. It seems to me that the last thing that makes

this argument most rational is that if you didn't put the \$700 million in at all, there could not be a letter sent around saying "you violated the budget agreement."

As a matter of fact, the letter being sent by the administration—frankly, I want everybody to know I am trying desperately to get everybody to comply with the budget agreement. We are not complying in every respect. Nobody is finding this Senator running around saying you don't have to. Maybe others are, but I am not. Frankly, when the administration, under letter of September 11, a statement of administration policy, on the first page of that communication, it says: "In addition, the committee bill contains provisions that violate the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, such as the provision to require additional unnecessary authorizing language for key land acquisition in Montana and California."

It urges the Senate to strike that. They can urge that we strike it, but we are not striking it because it violates the budget agreement; we may or may not do it for some other reason. So, Senator, I wanted to come down here and make sure, since many Senators have stopped me and asked me if we agreed to these two projects, my answer is no.

Now, are we forbidden from agreeing upon them and the \$700 million to be used for them? Absolutely not. You are not disagreeing with that. As a matter of fact, you spend it. But you are saying that before we spend it we want to see what the authorizing committees say about that. I believe, to assume that you cannot authorize a project for the land and water conservation fund, which would give its resources from the \$700 million, is arguing an uncertainty. I mean, that can't be. We never said anything about that. Congress retained that right. Anything we didn't agree upon, the Congress can do. It is just that they can't do anything inconsistent with it.

I could go on, Senator, but I think the Senate will take my word that if you look at the agreement and find specifics that are priorities, you will find them in the budget resolution, which this Senate passed overwhelmingly. There's a lot of things in it that Senators said they didn't know were in it. That is not my fault. I will tell you that specifics like Head Start and specifics like a new program for literacy are found in the agreement as priorities, and they are found in the resolution—resolved that—priorities such as these shall be funded to the extent of so many million dollars.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from New Mexico believes, under those circumstances, we are obligated to keep our part of the agreement?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from New Mexico feels that if we don't follow those, that a letter like this one from the administration, under cover of September 11, could clearly say this bill does not fund a priority item that

was agreed upon. Therefore, it violates the budget agreement. I would not be here saying the correspondence is inaccurate, incorrect. It would be wrong. In this case, it is not.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just ask the Senator, because I don't intend to speak longer and clutter the RECORD unnecessarily, but would he think I should make the bipartisan agreement a part of the RECORD?

Mr. GORTON. Why don't you make the relevant page of the bipartisan agreement a part of the RECORD.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that page 19 of the agreement between the executive branch and the Congress be printed in the RECORD for purposes of showing how the priority land acquisition was described on the page of the agreement.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Environmental reserve fund*

[Outlay increases in millions of dollars]

| Orphan share spending: |       |
|------------------------|-------|
| 1998 .....             | 200   |
| 1999 .....             | 200   |
| 2000 .....             | 200   |
| 2001 .....             | 200   |
| 2002 .....             | 200   |
| 5-Year Spending .....  | 1,000 |
| 10-Year Spending ..... | 2,028 |

The proposal would provide new mandatory spending for orphan shares at Superfund hazardous waste cleanup sites. Orphan shares are portions of financial liability at Superfund sites allocated to non-Federal parties with limited or no ability to pay.

The funds will be reserved for this purpose based on the assumption of a policy agreement on orphan share spending.

*Priority Federal land acquisitions and exchanges*

[Outlay increases in millions of dollars]

| Priority Federal Land Acquisitions and Exchanges: |     |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1998 .....                                        | 300 |
| 1999 .....                                        | 150 |
| 2000 .....                                        | 150 |
| 2001 .....                                        | 100 |
| 2002 .....                                        | 100 |
| 5-Year Spending .....                             | 700 |
| 10-Year Spending .....                            | 700 |

Under this proposal, up to \$315 million would be available from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to finalize priority Federal land exchanges in FY 1998 and FY 1999.

Funding from the LWCF for other high priority Federal land acquisitions and exchanges (totaling \$385 million) would be available in fiscal years 1999 through 2001.

The funding will be allocated to function 3000 as a reserve fund exclusively for this purpose.

Mr. DOMENICI. I don't choose to put the budget resolution in the RECORD because it was adopted. I assume if anybody wants to refer to any changes on education or to find specifics on the crime section where we obligated funds for the FBI, et cetera, I assume you can look in the budget resolution and find it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I have not heard every speech on the question of the National Endowment for the

Arts. I know about the principal amendments. Frankly, the amendments that most intrigue me are those that propose for block grant. I am not sure I am going to vote for anything that provides for a block grant, based on what I know about the proposals that are being made. But I will come back to that in just a moment.

I would like to share with my colleagues one of the reasons I am a strong supporter of the National Endowment for the Arts. If I were "king," we would be putting over \$1 billion a year into the program, maybe more than that, because I personally feel that it provides the kind of cultural benefit that is not only sorely lacking in this country, but is diminishing. Mr. President, \$100 million represents one-tenth of 1 percent of our \$1.6 trillion-plus budget. That is 38 cents for every American citizen to provide programs that enrich the culture of this Nation and give a lot of youngsters who would not otherwise have the opportunity the absolute, abject joy of enjoying music, good literature, and dance.

I can tell you that no nation has ever really prospered well that didn't have a culture that embraced the performing arts and the fine arts.

I am sorry Mapplethorpe ever got a grant. That is the thing that set off the firestorm in the country, from which we have never recovered in the Congress. But let me go back.

I grew up in Charleston, AR, with a population during the Depression of 851 people. The only cultural enrichment we got in that town was a high school band. It was started when I was a sophomore in high school. So I took band and became a trumpet player and later became trumpet player in the University of Arkansas band as well as drum major of the Razorback Band—because I had learned some music in the high school band. I might add that we were extremely fortunate because we had an unusual band director, a brilliant man. He used to gather some members of the band at his home in the evening. We listened to great music—Mozart, Bach, Beethoven, Sibelius—and that is when I developed, as a very young teenager, a keen appreciation for symphonic music. We went to Jackson, MS, to a regional band contest, and our sextet won first place. Not only were we learning something about good music, but we were also learning something about how one builds his ego, his self-esteem, and his pride out of this little town.

So when I went to the University of Arkansas, as I said, I was in the band, sang in the university chorus, went to all the drama presentations, and then I went into the Marine Corps.

After the war—I told this story a couple of years ago on the floor of the Senate—I was waiting to come home. I was in Hawaii. One day I saw a bulletin saying that anybody interested in Shakespeare should show up at such and such a barracks this evening at 7 o'clock. So I went. Lord knows I had

never been exposed to Shakespeare. The man who had put the sign up and who was going to teach Shakespeare turned out to be a Harvard professor of Shakespearean literature. He had a tape recorder. Tape recorders were unheard of then. I had never seen a tape recorder, and I certainly had never spoken into one, and, therefore, I didn't know what my voice sounded like.

So, after giving us about a 1-hour lecture on Shakespeare, he took his tape recorder, and he said, "I am going to deliver a couple of lines from Hamlet's Speech to the Players." He had a magnificent baritone voice with that Shakespearean accent. He spoke into his microphone, "Speak the speech, I pray you." And then he went on. I could tell it to you now. I do not want to bore you with it. But I can still remember every word of it.

So, when he played it back, it was so beautiful to hear this mellifluous voice. Then he handed it to me and said, "Here, you do it." He put the lines in front of me, and I spoke into the tape recorder. Then he played it back. I could not believe how poorly I spoke.

You know, I took a vow that evening that I did not want to sound like that. I wanted to have a rich tone of voice like he had. But, more than anything else, I discovered that there was a lot of literature that I knew nothing about that could be very enriching.

So, I came back, and I studied diction and debate. I began, on occasions when I got a chance, to go to all the drama presentations. Most people in this audience are frustrated actors. But my point is all of that had such a powerful influence on my life. I daresay, if it had not been for those experiences, I would have never been Governor of my State, and I certainly wouldn't be standing here as a U.S. Senator. These are the sort of experiences that the National Endowment for the Arts funds for so many youngsters, experiences that they would never otherwise have.

When I was Governor, my wife was looking for some way to use her position as First Lady to benefit the children of Arkansas. Nancy Hanks, who was then Chairman of the National Endowment, came to Arkansas at Betty's invitation. Betty talked Nancy Hanks into giving her a \$50,000 grant to do a small pilot program of art in the first grade. Betty had been an art major. She thought children ought to be exposed to art in the first grade.

So, the National Endowment, because of her appeal to Nancy Hanks, gave her \$50,000, and she started a few programs. Today programs of that sort are common. Every first grade in Arkansas has art. It is mandated now.

She had a little left over from the \$50,000, so she decided she would take it down to the prison and see if any of the inmates had any talent for art. It was absolutely amazing how much talent the inmates had. All I could think about was how many of those people might not have been in prison if some-

body had picked up on either their artistic talent or maybe some musical talent that had never been explored.

Do you know something, Mr. President? When I became Governor of my State, the prisons were in such horrible condition that they were under the control of the Federal courts. We couldn't do anything in the prisons without Federal court approval, they were so terrible. I was sort of hesitant to go down there. But I went. I was doing everything I could to improve the condition of our prisons. You know what Winston Churchill said once that you can tell more about a civilization by the way they treat their elderly and the conditions of their prisons than anything else. It is a strange thing but probably true.

So, I started going down to have lunch with the inmates. I would visit with them. I visited with the hardened killers that were on death row. I can tell you, I don't believe in all my conversations with the inmates in the Arkansas prisons that I ever visited one who had a role in the senior class play in high school, who played in the band, who had a college degree—though there were a few there—or who owned his own home. Nobody is shocked at that. We know who is in the prisons—people from broken homes, people who are uneducated, and people who never had a dog's chance as far as learning anything about art, literature, or music.

I can tell you that the \$100 million we spend on this program may be the most productive money we spend. It is tragic that it is not at least 10 times more than it is. You think about the greatest Nation on Earth, the United States, spending 38 cents per person per year to support the arts while Canada and France spend \$32, almost 100 times more per person than we do. In Germany, it is \$27 per person. My colleague and I share a concern. I heard his speech a moment ago. He comes at it a little differently than I would. But certainly his argument about how much our home State gets is, in my opinion, a valid argument. We got about \$400,000 this year. I think that in the past we have gotten as much as \$500,000. But, if you disbursed the \$100 million of the National Endowment for the Arts money according to population, we would get \$1 million. We have 1 percent of the population of this country. We would get \$1 million. We feel a little slighted.

But there is another dimension to it. That is, if we are going to do block grants to the States, some money should be held aside for national programs that serve all of the States, such as PBS, public broadcasting. I see a lot of fine shows on PBS that are partially funded by NEA grants. In my opinion, many of those shows would not be there for all to enjoy without that funding. If you didn't have the National Endowment, a lot of national programs that benefit everybody, even National Public Radio in Alaska and West Virginia, would not exist.

Second, the national programs that are funded by the National Endowment for the Arts raise an average of \$12 in matching money for every dollar that NEA provides. In my State, we leverage \$3 in matching funds for all the money you send to Arkansas. And we are proud of that.

So, I am not so sure that, if you put these block grants out, you are not going to wind up losing a lot of matching dollars.

Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON from Texas has an amendment that has some appeal to me. It provides 75 percent of the money in block grants. I think maybe 60 percent for openers would be better. So I am not totally opposed to that. But I am not going to vote for any proposal to block-grant money that does not carry with it a mandate for matching money. If we are going to match money, as we do in Arkansas now, \$3 for every \$1, why not require the same of block grant recipients?

When you consider how much money the arts produce in this country—between \$30 and \$40 billion a year—and you think about how much income tax we collect a year from the arts, we are big winners. The \$100 million is peanuts compared to the \$ 3.4 billion in revenue the arts generate in this country.

I am not going to take much more time here. I see we have other speakers wishing to speak. But there are some national programs that we need to continue funding with this money. The YMCA is putting culture programs in its facilities throughout the country with NEA support. There are a lot of NEA-funded regional dance tours, a lot of national dance tours, and programs for children everywhere.

Incidentally, when I played in the high school band we thought we were pretty good. At the bi-State band contest with Oklahoma, the Iowa State band performed on the stage of the Fort Smith High School. I had never heard a really great band before. We only had 30 members in our band. Here was this Iowa State band with 150 members, and when that conductor brought his baton down, I thought I was going to faint. I had never heard such music. So it was, the first time I ever went to a symphony. I am telling you, these things are important to the culture of this country. I do not for the life of me understand the antipathy that some of the Members of this body have for what I consider to be absolutely essential and basic to the character of this country. It is important that we give a lot of citizens of this country access to the performing and fine arts. That would never happen if it were not for this program.

I look forward to the day—I will not be here, Mr. President, after next year—but I yearn for the day when we treat this program with the respect and the money it deserves. And, like so many other things, if we do away with it and let that bulwark of our culture slip into oblivion, we will pay a very heavy price for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I can only add a little bit to what the Senator from Arkansas has just said. I wish he would not be leaving the Senate. I have told him that a hundred times, but I will say it one more time.

Mr. President, as a Senator from Minnesota, I rise in support of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. I am troubled we are out here on the floor, again defending the Federal role in really supporting the arts in communities all across our country. Some of my colleagues are arguing that, with their block grant proposals to States, they really support the NEA. This will just get the money to States in a more efficient manner, a more timely manner. But these amendments do nothing more—and I think everybody should be aware of this before they cast their votes—than cut off the lifeblood of the National Endowment for the Arts. That is exactly what these amendments do. I think that is the purpose of these amendments.

There is a bitter irony to the timing of these amendments, because Jane Alexander has done such an excellent job of reorganizing the endowment. I come to the floor to recognize her fine work and to support the NEA. When Ms. Alexander was confirmed as Chairwoman of the NEA, she made a commitment that she was going to work closely with the Congress, that she would take necessary steps to reorganize the Endowment, and she has done that and, as a matter of fact, I think her effort has been nothing short of heroic. She has, through her leadership, helped form and lead a NEA that touches the lives of all citizens, regardless of their age, their race, their disability, their economic status or, I might add, their geographic location. Jane Alexander has been blessed with a lifetime of creativity and accomplishment and she has blessed our country with that creativity. She has done a marvelous job of bringing the arts into our classrooms and into every corner of our Nation.

Now, again we are out here having to defend the NEA. The budget is pathetically low. We could do much more to fire the imaginations of children all across the country. Yet we have another attack on the NEA, out here on the floor today.

In my State of Minnesota, the NEA has given support to the American Composers Forum, the Minnesota Alliance for Arts and Education, Gray Wolf Press, the Duluth Superior Symphony, the Rochester Civic Music Guild, as well as the nationally renowned Dale Warren Singers, the Saint Paul Chamber Orchestra, and the Guthery Theater.

In addition, because of support from NEA, national theater and dance groups have visited many rural com-

munities all across the State of Minnesota. The NEA has supported some wonderful partnerships in Minnesota, including a partnership between the Minnesota Orchestra Association and the science museum, which has created an interactive work between actors, the full orchestra, and fifth and sixth graders. That is what this is all about.

One grant we are especially proud of that really goes to Minnesota, but goes to the whole Nation—and one of the most important things about these grants is the way in which a grant can go, in this particular case to the Minneapolis Children's Theater Company—and what they have done is this grant has supported the development and production of a new work which is called the Mark Twain Storybook, which has toured 35 communities in 9 States, from Fergus Falls, MN, to Mabel, MN, to Skokie, IL, offering a total of 73 performances and 5 workshops.

Sometimes when my colleagues look at funding that goes to particular States, they forget that one of the things the NEA has done under Ms. Alexander's leadership is taking a chance, this particular case on the Minneapolis Children's Theater Company, which is marvelous, and they then take that on the road and reach out to 9 States, 73 performances, 5 workshops. This is enriching work.

I just would like to make the point that the block grant amendments are not friendly amendments. As I say, they undercut the very heart of what NEA is about, which is national leadership of the arts in our country. We as a national community make a commitment to the arts. We understand how important the arts are to enriching the lives of all of our citizens. We make it one of our priorities—not much of a priority, because we have had attacks on the NEA over the past few years and it is so severely underfunded—but, nevertheless, we as a national community understand that we make a commitment to leverage the funding and to get it to organizations to, in turn, get it to communities all across the country.

The block grant proposal takes us in the exact opposite direction. I really do believe that the timing of these amendments is just way off. One more time, I just want to repeat for colleagues that regardless of the words that are uttered and regardless of the intentions of colleagues, I think the effect of these block grant amendments is to just cut off the very mission, the very lifeblood, the very richness, the very importance of what the NEA is all about.

We are only talking about \$100 million. It is an agency that has been severely undercut because of attacks of past Congresses. But I will tell you something, people in the country have rallied behind the NEA, I think in large part because of Ms. Alexander's leadership. We have an agency that is bringing the arts into classrooms and bring-

ing arts into the communities all across our country. We have an agency which has done a marvelous job of being in partnership with local communities and States, doing a really superb job.

Mr. President, I also want to have printed in the RECORD a letter from James Dusso, who is assistant director of the Minnesota State Arts Board. He writes in behalf of Robert Booker, who is the Minnesota State Art Board executive director, who is currently away at a conference, making it very clear that the Minnesota State Arts Board is opposed to the block grant amendments, making it very clear that Minnesota, and I think many, many people in the arts community, appreciate the work of NEA, and making it very clear that these amendments, rather than improving NEA's work, would severely undercut what this agency has been about.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA STATE ARTS BOARD,  
St. Paul, MN, September 8, 1997.

Hon. PAUL WELLSTONE,  
U.S. Senate,

DEAR SENATOR WELLSTONE: I am writing on behalf of Robert C. Booker, the Minnesota State Arts Board's executive director, who is currently away from the office at a conference addressing enhanced accessibility to the arts for people of all abilities.

It is my understanding that the Senate is currently discussing the amount and the type of support to be provided to the National Endowment for the Arts. In that light, I think it is important that you are aware of the following:

The National Endowment for the Arts currently provides over two million dollars to the state in grants to the Minnesota State Arts Board and Minnesota arts organizations.

Since 1994 the Arts Board has experienced a 48% reduction in support from the National Endowment for the Arts. This decrease parallels the NEA overall budget cuts from \$175 million to the current \$100 million and reflects their ongoing problems in Congress.

Minnesota is proud of the outstanding caliber of its cultural institutions and its arts community. The citizens of this State and our corporations and foundations have provided extensive financial support to the arts in order to achieve their current high artistic level. Within our state borders, we are proud to have world-class arts organizations and artists of international stature.

Because of the quality of the arts in Minnesota, we consistently have been ranked third to fifth among all states in receiving National Endowment for the Arts support.

Under a block grant funding structure at the National Endowment for the Arts, Minnesota would drop to sixteenth or lower in the amount of federal support it receives for the arts.

Block grants would minimize, if not eliminate, any national leadership for the arts in the country.

NEA support historically has been a valuable tool in leveraging matching private support for the arts. Block grants to states would take that tool away from arts organizations, hampering their ability to raise needed private support.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or if there is any additional information I can provide.

Sincerely,

JAMES DUSSO,  
Assistant Director.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I think these amendments represent a different kind of attack. We had amendments to just eliminate the NEA. We may have one of those amendments on the floor now, maybe, to eliminate NEA. We have had amendments in the past to severely undercut the funding for NEA.

I just don't know what will satisfy colleagues. Jane Alexander made a commitment to us that she would be very tough in her management, she would do the necessary reorganization work, she would take all of her creativity and use that creativity to make the NEA an agency that clearly was rooted in communities all across our country. And for Minnesota, for rural America, the east coast, west coast, North and South—that is exactly what has been done. So I hope we will defeat these amendments and we can as a Senate vote for a commitment which is a national community commitment that we care about the arts, that we are committed to enriching the lives of children, all children in this country, and we are committed to making sure the arts reaches out and touches all of our citizens no matter their income, no matter their race, no matter disability, no matter age. That, I think, is what its mission is all about, and I think the NEA under Ms. Alexander's leadership deserves the strong support of the Senate. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, today we are for arts. Last week we were for education. Before that we were for housing. In fact, we are in about a 60-year cycle where the way you show you are for something is to have the Federal Government take the money of working Americans and spend that money for them on the thing you want to show that you are for. For 60 years, the choice that has been presented on the floor of the Senate is a choice about whether or not you are for something based on spending the Federal taxpayer's money on it. The choice is not, "Are you for art?" in the sense that you want to let working families keep their money to invest it in art, the choice is not whether you are for education but letting families decide how to spend their money on education. For 60 years, the only real choice we have had is whether or not we are for things based on spending the taxpayer's money.

It is like the compassion debate we have in Washington. Compassion is not what you do with your money, it's what you do with the taxpayers' money.

Rather than getting into all of the different elements of the debate today, I want to talk about this central point. This is the 12th appropriations bill that

we have dealt with this year, and when it is passed today, we will have spent \$268,195,000,000 on just domestic appropriations. Nobody knows how much money that is. I have a constituent, Ross Perot, who knows what a billion dollars is, but nobody knows what \$268 billion is. But it comes down to \$2,126 for every working American. When we pass this bill, we will have, in the last few weeks, spent \$2,126 of the income on average of every working person in this country, and what we have decided and, in fact, what we are debating about the arts today is whether or not we are going to spend their money on this purpose.

I know we hear our President say the age of big Government is over, but the plain truth is that next year, we are going to spend more money in Government as a percentage of the income of working Americans than we have ever spent in the history of the United States of America. We are going to have the largest Government that we have ever had in the history of America next year as a result of the money that we are spending here, as a result of the money that we have committed to programs we call entitlement programs and as a result of money that is being spent by State and local government. In other words, the tax burden on the average working American next year will be higher than it has ever been in the history of the country in terms of how much of their money the Government will be taking.

How does this debate about the arts fit into that big picture? It seems to me that we are having the wrong debate. The debate here shouldn't be whether or not you are for the arts based on how much money the Government is going to take from working people and spend on arts. Why don't we have a debate about who should do the spending?

I was examining the figures on spending for the National Endowment for the Arts, for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, programs where we are taking money out of the paychecks of working American families and we are bringing the money to Washington and deciding on their behalf that we want to spend it on NEA, NEH, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

We have heard a lot of debate about whether we are spending it wisely, whether what is being defined as art with the expenditure of our taxpayer money through NEA is, in many cases, art. I think the vast majority of Americans would say in many cases it is not.

But the point is, if we took those three agencies and eliminated them, we could give an art and entertainment tax credit of about \$200 to every working family in America. It is in that context that I want to talk about the National Endowment for the Arts, because what we are deciding today is not that we are for the arts by voting to continue funding NEA. What we are

deciding is that by funding NEA, NEH, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that we are doing more for the average working family in terms of the arts and the humanities and access to information through broadcasting than they could do if they were able to keep \$200 more and spend it as they chose.

Granted, I am sure there are some here who would get up and say, "Wait a minute, with this \$200, we are funding the symphony, and if we let working families keep the \$200, they might go see Garth Brooks, they might decide to spend it going to three or four Texas A&M football games." I guess I would argue that families ought to have a right to choose what is art and what is entertainment to them rather than delegating that responsibility involuntarily through the IRS to 100 Members of the Senate.

In a very real sense, this is the choice that working families are making. How many families would choose to get an Internet hookup rather than to fund public broadcasting if they had the choice to make? How many families would choose to get the cable rather than to fund public broadcasting?

So my point is, this is not a debate about whether you are for the arts or not. This is a debate about whether Government should be the final decisionmaker about what is art and what should be funded.

Our colleague from Minnesota said, "Well, this is only \$100 million." Well, \$100 million is a lot of money.

I personally would like to begin the process of making fewer decisions in Washington so that we could have more decisions made back home. I think part of our problem in the arts, part of our problem in Government, is that too many spending decisions are made around these committee room and Cabinet tables and too few decisions are made by families sitting around their kitchen tables. The question that we face as Republicans is, if we are not for less Government and more freedom, what are we for? What do we stand for? If we really want to reduce the size of Government and to let people keep more of what they earn to invest in their own family and their own future, to invest in their own art, to invest in their own entertainment, to invest in their own education and housing and nutrition, if that is what we really want, where do we begin?

We are not eliminating a single program in the Federal Government this year that I am aware of. Not a single program in the Federal Government will be terminated as a result of this budget which will spend a record amount where we are increasing discretionary spending and, in the process, deciding that the Government ought to direct more goods and services and where they go.

I don't, quite frankly, know a better place to start than the National Endowment for the Arts. It is not that I am against the National Endowment for the Arts or the National Endowment for the Humanities or against

public broadcasting. But the question is, why not eliminate these programs and let working families keep \$200 more per family and decide what they want to invest that in, what brings the most to their family. It seems to me that that is the choice.

As I understand it and they proliferated a little, we have three amendments that are before us in some form. One of the amendments would block grant the money to the States and eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts by giving the money directly to the States. Another amendment would give 75 percent of the money to the States, have 20 percent of the money go to national art organizations and give the National Endowment for the Arts 5 percent so we can maintain their infrastructure. The third proposal is to eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts.

Since I see all three of these as an improvement over the status quo, I am going to vote for all three of them. But the position that I want to take today and make clear is that you are not saying whether or not you are for the arts based on how you vote on spending the taxpayers' money. I am for the arts, but I think families ought to have the right to decide what is art and what is not art. I think families ought to have the right to make these decisions. I don't think we should be making those decisions for them.

Finally, if we are really serious about less Government and more freedom, if you really believe that Government is too big and too powerful and too expensive, if you really believe that having the average family give Government almost a third of its income is too much, if you believe all of those things, as I do, I don't see how you can then justify having the Government take \$100 million from working families to spend on what we define as art.

So I think this is a fundamental choice. I would have to say that for 60 years, I think we have been making it the wrong way. For 60 years, we have been losing in the appropriations process, because the choice is always spending money and being for something, rather than not spending money. What I would like to do is to have the ability to put all these appropriations bills out here and go through them one by one and basically decide, would you like to do less of this and let families keep more of this money themselves? I think when we start changing the way we make these decisions, when we start looking at them from a bigger perspective, I think ultimately freedom will start winning in this debate instead of losing.

The vote on NEA today is not a vote about arts to me, it is a vote about freedom. It is a question of whether or not we want the Government, with the highest tax burden in American history set to be imposed on working families next year, to spend another \$100 million trying to tell people what is and what is not art, and I think given our

record on the subject and given the issue itself, that we would be better off letting families keep this money. If they call Garth Brooks art, I call it art. If they would prefer spending their money on an Internet connection instead of public broadcasting, or if they would prefer going to Texas A&M football instead of going to the symphony, maybe there is wisdom in each and every household. And what is wisdom in each and every household can hardly be folly, even in the greatest nation in the world.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I spoke at length yesterday. I will try not to beat that record, but I do want to make a few comments.

First of all, if you take \$100 million and divide it by 250 million, you come up with about 38 cents a person and that represents what the endowment costs. I think we have to put in focus what we spend on the arts and why we spend it there.

We had some excellent presentations yesterday and we had some this morning on different views of how the money for the Endowment ought to be spent. I guess if you analyzed the Senate, we would have probably 70 or 80 people who say, "OK, let's spend the money, but we have a different way to spend it."

A number would spend it with more going to the States. Some would spend it with all going to the States. Others would spend it in different proportions. But I guess that if it was just a question of whether there ought to be that much money out there available, that we would have a big vote, 70, 80 votes in the Senate, and that is what we need to do—analyze and figure out whether the way we are spending it is the best way.

That, I think, is what is being asked of this body, and I think is being asked of the people throughout the country: Are we spending too much on administration? Are we directing too much of the money to the big cities? Are we spending too much in other areas rather than out in the States? So I hope we keep that in mind as we go forward and examine the amendments that we will be faced with.

I would also like to point out some of the very excellent points that were made by other Senators yesterday. I think Senator BENNETT from Utah probably made one of the best presentations I have heard on why the Endowments are so important and what it does mean to have your particular program get the stamp of approval. As he stated, it is like the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval for a program. What this does is allow you to not only utilize the money, the small amount of money you get from the Endowment, but to use that as a fundraiser to be able to let people know, "Hey, this is a good program and it has

the sanction of the Endowment and, therefore, you should help us put that program on." It was an excellent presentation.

We have had others this morning, Senator TIM HUTCHINSON and others, as well as Senator HUTCHISON of Texas saying, well, yes, it is a good program, but more of it ought to be distributed to States and a lot less of it ought to be spent from Washington.

I spent my time yesterday stating that I might have an amendment which would spend more of the money in the area of education, indicating that the studies demonstrate that those people who participate in programs of art and music do substantially better on SATs than those who do not. I think that is something we should take note of. And there are a lot of reasons for that.

Some of the basic problems we have in education is the lack of discipline and respect by students. Both of these qualities come along with the arts and the programs with the arts—I delineated a number of those programs that I have viewed as I traveled around the country where students have done exceptionally well, from the east coast to the west coast. When the authorization bill came out of the committee, we suggested that NEA ought to look at trying to evaluate and assist the rest of the country, understand which programs do work, what programs are helpful in improving the access to the arts in education.

Also, as I pointed out yesterday, there are many programs which have been successful in the cities around the country in helping those who are impoverished. I mentioned one program in New York City where there was a horrible situation—so many young people had come from homes of violence, where a member of a family had been killed. Through art and art therapy they were able to bring out the horrible experiences in that child's life and begin to open up a vista of perhaps a life without violence and fear introducing instead hope and other positive things like that.

I think there is a general consensus—or close, a substantial number of Members of this body—that we ought to keep the Endowment but perhaps take a look at how those funds are utilized. So I expect that the Senator from Alaska will have an amendment along those lines.

Also, I would like to just raise a few things. I did not talk about the importance of the Endowment in extending the benefits of the arts and the benefits of museums around the country.

For instance, the Portland Arts Museum moves out to support the Northwest Film Festival, showcasing the works of artists from Alaska, Idaho, Montana, and Washington; the Paul Taylor Dance in New York received a grant to tour through Alaska, Texas, and California; the NEA-supported Educational Broadcasting Corporation in New York to put "Great Performances" and "American Masters" on TV

for the enjoyment of millions. The New England Foundation for the Arts received a grant to bring the "Dance on Tour" program to Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Massachusetts. The YMCA in Chicago received a grant to expand its Writers Voice centers—writing workshops for young people—to Georgia, New Hampshire, Florida, and Rhode Island.

States have little incentive to fund projects which benefit people outside its borders, yet it is those partnerships which enrich our Nation. These are examples of why national leadership is important. So I hope that as we move forward we remind ourselves that there are many activities of the Endowment other than some of the areas of controversy that we have heard of.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are less than 30 minutes from moving on to another subject, the cloture vote on the bill relating to the Food and Drug Administration. If I may, I would like to summarize where we are on this interesting and multifaceted debate on the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Senator from Missouri, Mr. ASHCROFT, who is present on the floor, and Senator HELMS have proposed an amendment that will terminate the National Endowment for the Arts in much the same way as the House of Representatives has already voted.

I hope that we will be able to vote on that amendment in not too great a time after the completion of whatever the majority leader seeks to do with respect to the Food and Drug Administration bill. The Senator from Missouri may very well tell us how much more time he thinks he needs on his amendment.

After that, logically the next amendment would be that proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], which would also close down the National Endowment for the Arts but would transfer the money to, I believe, the National Park Service for the preservation of historic American treasures.

The next proposal would be that of the Senators from Alabama and Arkansas who would essentially block grant the entire appropriation for the National Endowment to the States; following that the proposal by the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], that would have 25 percent, roughly, governed by the National Endowment for the Arts here and 75 percent block granted for the States.

Those are the proposals that have been discussed on the floor at some length yesterday afternoon and this morning. I hope that we can reach an orderly method for voting on each of those amendments so that the will of the Senate with respect to the National Endowment will be made known.

I regret deeply to say that my partner on this bill, Senator BYRD, is indis-

posed today and will not be able to be here at all, something he regrets. He hopes that maybe at least some of these votes could be postponed until tomorrow. I will have to leave that up to the majority leader, who I think wants to move forward as quickly as we possibly can.

It is appropriate now, however, I think, for me to state my own view at least on the four amendments that are in front of us. My views reflect those of the Appropriations Committee and, most particularly, my subcommittee. I believe the National Endowment for the Arts does in fact play a constructive role in culture in the United States. I believe that reforms in the last 2 or 3 years have cut down tremendously on some of the truly objectionable grants which were rightly objected to by the vast majority of the American people.

So with respect to the first two amendments, I will vote no. I also am unable in my own mind to feel that we would somehow deal more sensitively if all of these grants were decentralized to State arts commissions.

Finally, I find myself somewhat in sympathy with the proposal of the Senator from Texas. I believe that perhaps a greater focusing, but not a universal focusing, on State and regional arts organizations may well be appropriate but that there are also grants that are appropriately national in nature and that many of the institutional grantees, while they may be located in a particular city or a particular State, have an impact on the arts that goes far beyond the locale of their principal office, their museum, their symphony orchestra or their opera company.

Because, however, the Ashcroft-Helms position has governed the House of Representatives, my inclination is to vote against all of these amendments that change the present system simply because we will have to take into account the views of the House of Representatives in a conference committee, a conference committee that I think is likely at least to come out with a proposal that is perhaps closer to that of the Senator from Texas than any other that I have heard at this point.

So at the present time, unless I am persuaded to the contrary, Mr. President, I am going to suggest to the Members of this body that they leave the appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts contained in the bill as it is before us now untouched and discuss the very important questions that all of them have raised with the House of Representatives that has taken a quite different view in a conference committee. With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

AMENDMENT NO. 1188

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I rise to address the issue of the National Endowment for the Arts and

some of the arguments that have been raised in this debate.

I think it is important that we debate this issue thoroughly. I think it is important that we have the discussion of as many Members of this body on this issue made as explicitly as is possible for the American people.

I am not in any rush to judgment or to election on this. To say because the House of Representatives has taken a position that here the Senate should not take a position or that it should merely endorse the position of the Committee on Appropriations I think is to do less than the American people expect of us.

The American people understand that the issue before us is whether or not arts are to be funded by Government and whether that is a role for Government to play. We must look at the reason why we have Government, the reason why we take money from people that they have earned and they cannot spend on their own families. That is a major issue. And whether or not we are going to take it and then give some of it back to a State where we do not have the ability to control it, or whether we are going to give part of it to the State and we are going to control the rest of it, is another major issue.

I think we ought to debate these things. So I, frankly, want the Senate to move forward, and I want us to move forward with dispatch and make sure that we do not unduly delay things. But this is an issue worthy of the American people, it is worthy of our understanding. I think there are substantially basic, philosophic items that are of importance here: Does the Government have a responsibility to shape the culture by paying for artistic expression, and by paying for some artistic expression and not paying for other artistic expression? I think that is a very important point.

I say that it is important to understand that both artists and nonartists are on both sides of this issue. There are people who love the arts so much that they do not want the Government to contaminate the arts. They feel that when the Government gets in the position of starting to say that this art is good and is worthy of being subsidized and this other art over here is not good and is not worthy of being subsidized, they think that is likely to distort the arts and to leave the arts in a situation of impurity, with artists who are seeking not to express themselves but to express what the bureaucrats in Washington or in a State capital would want them to express.

As a matter of fact, that is exactly the point that Jan Breslauer, the critic from the Los Angeles Times, has written about. Eloquent she states—and as a matter of fact, it is more than an eloquent statement. This is a rather embarrassing indictment of the National Endowment for the Arts. Let her words speak this position as I quote them. And she says—or he says. I do

not know whether Jan, J-a-n, is a "he" or "she." I apologize if there would be any offense in what I have said.

[T]he endowment has quietly pursued policies rooted in identity politics—a kind of separatism that emphasizes racial, sexual and cultural differences above all else. The art world's version of affirmative action \* \* \*.

She is describing the way the bureaucracy, known as the National Endowment for the Arts, has operated, that it has emphasized separatism, emphasizing racial, sexual, and cultural differences above all else.

I think we need to get to an America that emphasizes our identity, the common things we enjoy, the freedom we embrace, not the differences we have. I think the Statue of Liberty has stood there without wincing for a long time. She stood through hurricanes and the tests of time, storms, good times and bad, in war and in peace, but I think she winces a little bit when she thinks about all the people that have come here to pursue common goals of freedom being driven by Government to be separate, to be forced apart.

Jan Breslauer says, "The Endowment has quietly pursued policies rooted in identity politics," this idea of separating us into separate identities. I kind of like a single identity for the United States of America. What are the different identities, she says, that are being emphasized by the National Endowment for the Arts? She says that the National Endowment is pushing us into separate racial identities, that it is pushing us into separate sexual and cultural identities. These differences are being elevated, instead of minimized, in the way, she says, the funds are given out from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Fundamentally, I do not believe that Government should be striving to drive wedges between Americans. Whether it is an arts program or anything else, I think we ought to come to the point where we realize there is only one word that ought to describe us in a way that unites us, and it is "America." I don't need someone to try and push me into some politics of separatism or some identity politics and provide a basis for separating me from my fellow Americans. I think the great unity of America is so very important.

I think of the millions of lives lost in the Civil War for unity, so that this would be one Nation united under God with liberty and justice for a few or for this group or that group, with preferences? No, for all.

The National Endowment for the Arts "has quietly pursued policies rooted in identity politics—a kind of separatism that emphasizes racial, sexual, and cultural differences, above all else." These are not my words. These are not the words of some individual who is against art. These are words from a critic from the Los Angeles Times. The art world's version of affirmative action, to prefer people on the basis of their group identity rather than to prefer people on the basis of their own merit. The United States of America is a place where individuals

should have the ability to succeed or fail based on their own merit. She says the art world's version of affirmative action, and its policies have had a profoundly corrosive effect on American art.

A corrosive effect—I don't know how you can define that as lifting up the arts or improving the arts. We have heard individuals come to the floor over the last several days and say the reason we need this is because it allows the arts that are sponsored to be shared with the entire culture. Do we want to corrode the arts before we share them?

I want to mention I believe there are some artistic endeavors here that are supported that are good ones. Sure there are. You are spending \$100 million, you will probably have some good ones. The question is, Is this what Government is for, to take the hard-earned money of individuals and say we can spend that money better on art than you can spend it on your family?

At a time when real wages for individuals for over half the Americans, according to a recent national article in one of our business journals, are lower than they were in 1989, some 8 years ago, do we still believe that we want to take money that people could be spending on their own families and we want to spend it on art that separates us, that emphasizes racial differences, cultural differences, that has a corrosive effect on the arts itself? That is incomprehensible.

Some people think it is great to have the symphony, it is great to have great art and they think about the great artists of the past, they think about artists from my State whose works are shown in art galleries of this country and have been for hundreds of years. But that is not all that we are talking about here.

Here is a piece of art that is interesting to me. This art was funded by the National Endowment for the Arts. This is a poem. No, Senators, this is not the title of the poem, this is a poem. This poem, spelled L-I-G-H-G-H-T, I am not sure what it means—maybe light—this poem cost the taxpayers \$1,500. This was the subject of a grant. Now, this is the English version of the poem, I have to tell you. This is not the French or the German version. Maybe it is the German version of the poem. Maybe it is not the English version. This is it. This is why we would tax individuals, take money that they earned, working hard on their jobs, and we want to say to the rest of the world, this is what you should be doing.

I was stunned by the fact that my colleagues came to the floor and said we need this not because the arts need the money. They recognize it is 1 percent of the art funding in the country. As a matter of fact, less than that. But 1 percent of the art funding in the country comes from the Government. But we need it so we can have the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval, that somehow when Government comes and puts its seal of approval on things like

this, it signals to the country that this is what we are supposed to really look up to.

I am sure getting this poem around to schoolchildren will inspire lots of them to be poets. I don't know whether this is a typographical error or whether this is profoundly insightful, but I don't think it is inspirational. I don't think we have to have the U.S. Government taking tax money from people who get up early and work hard all day and go home late, families with two parents working, one to pay the Government, the other to support the family. I don't think we do that in order to be able to put a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on this.

I want to talk a little bit about this concept that you put a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on things by having Government tell people what is good and what is bad. Let me just indicate that one of my colleagues yesterday spoke, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1997:

The National Endowment for the Arts is something like a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval put on a local effort which allows people who are running that local effort to then go out and do their fundraising and say you see what we have here is really a class operation. It is something worthy of your support, worthy of your private contributions. Look, it's good enough that the National Endowment for the Arts has put their seal of approval on it.

And the argument is that somehow the American people don't have the intelligence or the judgment or the capacity to know what values they want expressed in their culture. They need someone from the Federal Government to tell them that this is great poetry and that they should buy it or subsidize it.

I don't believe the genius of a democracy is having the Government tell people what is good or bad. The genius of a democracy is not that the Government informs the people. The genius of a democracy is that the people inform the Government. The genius of a democracy is that the collective wisdom of the people is reflected in what is done in Washington. We have inverted the flow of information here. The people are supposed to be represented in Washington to do the will of the people. The Government is not supposed to be represented by a good seal of approval so that the people can then do the will of Government. The whole idea of a democracy is not that the Government puts its good seal of approval on anything and then the people do it. The ideal of a democracy is that the people express their wisdom to the Government, sending their representatives to achieve the will of the people, not the will of the Government.

It is kind of amusing to me that we have this information flow. We are so conditioned to believing that Washington is the source of wisdom that now

we have to tell the people what good poetry is, and stuff like this is good enough for their support or something else is good enough for their support. You would think we would learn that the central government is not the place to direct investment, whether it be in art or whether it be in industry.

There are different cultures, there are different ways to do government. There are different ways to allocate resources. One way is to have central planning, to have the Government make the decisions, encourage or allocate the resources on its own. That is a way which was tried for a long time.

Communism was a system which said we will do central planning. We will not trust the marketplace. We will not trust the judgment that people will reach on their own. We will trust the central planners, the superior intellects of Government to make those decisions. We will ask them to decide how many potatoes are grown and how many cars are made and how many TV's are made, and with the superior wisdom of centralized government, we can tell the people how things are and it will all be better.

I love the joke Ronald Reagan used to tell about the guy going to buy a car.

The guy said, "You have to wait 10 years for your car but on the 12th day of February, 10 years from now, in the morning, we are going to deliver your car to you."

The guy said, "Oh, no, you can't deliver the car on the 12th day of February 10 years from now."

The car salesman says, "Why not?"

He says, "Well, the plumber is coming then."

The whole point is planned allocation of resources by central government is a failure, an abject failure.

Yet we have people come to the floor of the Senate and say people really do not know the good art from the bad art, what to support, what not to support, and they need the Government to come look and be the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. We cannot trust the private marketplace, the will of the people, the understanding of the people to allocate the resources that they ought to put or want to put into art. We have to confiscate resources from them and then we have to use those resources as some sort of gold stock. This is what you must support, you ought to support this, this is great.

Well, if you put the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on material that emphasizes, above all else, racial, sexual, and cultural differences, in the words of Jan Breslauer, the art critic, what we have is the Government telling us what is good and telling us that all these things that divide us are good and the things that unite us are not worthy of funding.

In my judgment, I think we should have learned something. We should have learned that when the Founders of this great country considered this question, they voted overwhelmingly

not to have the Federal Government involved in subsidies for the arts. This is not new. This idea came into being in Lyndon Johnson's plan for a Great Society. We know how the governmentalism of the Great Society has been so eminently successful in other areas—such as attempting to deal with poverty. We see there are more children on poverty now than there were when the so-called Great Society began. And in an attempt to deal with situations where there were children being born to parents who would not be parents—there were no families there, really—we have seen that problem exacerbated and intensified rather than assuaged or reduced. Here we have one of the Great Society programs and here is another one that says we know best from Government.

In the area of the Great Society, as it relates to the welfare program, we have that figured out that the central government should not have a sort of a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. We have abandoned the old Federal approach that says there is a way you are going to do this and this is the way, the truth, and I guess it would not be the light, would it? The Federal Government's welfare program, we found out, was a failed program.

I yield to the Chair, if there is an item that needs to be brought to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the hour of 12:15 having arrived, the Senate is to conduct a cloture vote.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute in which to conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair. It is clear to me that the National Endowment for the Arts takes resources from taxpayers to spend in a way that the Government thinks it can spend better than taxpayers. Even art critics indicate that that taking has not only a bad effect on people, it divides them, seeks to separate them, but it has a corrosive effect on the arts. I believe that having the Government establish values that it tries to impose on people is a denial of the genius of America, which is when the American people impose their values on Government, not when the Government imposes its values on the people. The so-called Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval theory of support for the National Endowment for the Arts reveals the bankruptcy of the concept of Government telling people what they should believe and what they should value.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Since the Senator from Missouri has taken all the time, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 60 seconds before the vote to make some comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank Senators for their indulgence. I do not have the time to lay out all the reforms that we have made in the National Endowment for the Arts, nor to give you the details on how every single dollar that my colleague talked about is leveraged by \$12 in every community across this great country of ours, because the arts, just as they are in the military, preserve our culture. We spend twice as much on military bands as we do on the National Endowment for the Arts. If the military bands make a mistake and play a song that we don't think is appropriate, we don't stop funding the military bands, because they are a very important part of our culture. If a postman acts wrong and is obnoxious, we don't stop delivering the mail.

So I think it is very important that when we go back to this debate—and I think right now it won't be for a couple of days—that we lay out all of the reforms that have been made and all of the wonderful programs, such as the Youth Symphony, the ballet, and all the things we do with the arts, and have a fair debate.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

#### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION MODERNIZATION AND ACCOUNT- ABILITY ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the substitute amendment to Calendar No. 105, S. 830, the FDA reform bill:

Trent Lott, James M. Jeffords, Pat Roberts, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Tim Hutchinson, Conrad Burns, Chuck Hagel, Jon Kyl, Rod Grams, Pete Domenici, Ted Stevens, Christopher S. Bond, Strom Thurmond, Judd Gregg, Don Nickles, and Paul Coverdell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the modified committee amendment to S. 830, the FDA Administration Modernization and Accountability Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?