

Smith (WA)	Thomas	Wamp
Snyder	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Souder	Thompson (MS)	Watkins
Spence	Thornberry	Watt (NC)
Spratt	Thune	Watts (OK)
Stabenow	Tiahrt	Waxman
Stearns	Tierney	Weiner
Stenholm	Toomey	Weldon (FL)
Strickland	Towns	Weldon (PA)
Stump	Traficant	Weller
Stupak	Turner	Wexler
Sununu	Udall (CO)	Whitfield
Talent	Udall (NM)	Wicker
Tancredo	Upton	Wilson
Tanner	Velazquez	Wolf
Tauscher	Vento	Woolsey
Tauzin	Visclosky	Wu
Taylor (MS)	Vitter	Wynn
Taylor (NC)	Walden	Young (AK)
Terry	Walsh	Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Norwood
Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Brown (CA)	Kasich	Thurman
Chenoweth	McDermott	Weygand
Combest	Meek (FL)	Wise
Gejdenson	Scarborough	
Hastings (FL)	Sweeney	

□ 1515

Ms. BALDWIN changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Monday and earlier today due to the death of my uncle. Had I been here on Monday, I would have voted "yes" on roll-call votes 278 and 279. Today, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 280.

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2466.

□ 1517

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURRETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. Chairman, for those who might not have noticed, this is Ohio day, both from the standpoint of the chairman of the two Appropriations bills being considered today and of the gentleman from Ohio presiding this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to pay a compliment to my ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). This is his first year of being the Ranking Member on the subcommittee, and he has been a partner. We have worked together on the things in this bill in a nonpartisan way. I think it is fair, and I think a lot of this is thanks to the contributions that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) made and also the staff, both his staff and the staff of the subcommittee. It has been a real pleasure to work with the gentleman from Washington on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, today I would ask Members in their mind's eye to fast forward to the year 2049, 50 years from now, because their actions and votes on this bill will be the America we leave to our children and grandchildren.

We have to ask ourselves some questions: Will it be an America free from the scars of resource exploitation? We have put an extra \$11 million for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund to avoid that problem.

Will it be an Everglades fully watered and with its unique ecology preserved and enhanced? Again, when it is all said and done, we will have spent about \$10 billion of U.S. taxpayer dollars to take care of the Everglades. If Members read the language in the bill, they will see we are making a point that we want to ensure that there is an adequate water supply, not just now but 50 years from now.

Will it be a Nation with clean air, clean water, with rivers that we point to with pride? Will there be 629 million acres of forests, parks, fish and wildlife facilities and grazing lands, with beautiful vistas, with unique ecological wonders?

Will there be an Smithsonian that continues to tell the unique story of our Nation's heritage? Will there be a Kennedy Center that continues to excite millions of visitors with a wide range of artistic opportunities? Will there be a Holocaust Museum that con-

tinues to remind Americans and people from many nations that this tragedy shall never happen again? Will there be a National Gallery Of Art and Sculpture Garden that shares the treasures of many nations in addition to our own?

Will there be new sources of energy that foster a livable society with a prosperous economy? Will we be a Nation that respects its arts and its humanities?

Members get to answer those questions today by giving a resounding vote of yes to this bill. We will soon be voting on a \$265 billion defense bill to defend many of the values that this bill represents. Fourteen billion dollars, the amount of this bill, is a small price to invest in preserving these values.

We have made a number of important policy changes. The Inspector General at the Department of the Interior told us that the National Park Service was unable to balance its books. We have instituted reforms and turned that situation around in 18 months. This bill continues those reforms. We have made changes in many programs as a result of 18 oversight hearings over the past 4 years.

We have heard about the \$1 million comfort stations built by the U.S. Park Service. We have streamlined and reformed the way in which the Park Service manages its construction program, and we are not going to have those kinds of activities in the future.

According to testimony of the leaders of the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Smithsonian, all of these agencies, that we have a \$15 billion backlog maintenance. We have to take care of what we have, and we are doing that in this bill. We continue to work at it, and I think it makes a difference.

Our subcommittee recently visited some facilities in the State of Washington. In Olympic National Park we saw a building that was being fixed as a result of fees and as a result of the understanding that we need to take care of maintenance.

We are looking into problems of financial and contract management in the Department of Energy, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

We have provided for the Everglades restoration effort in this bill. A unique feature, and I think it is one of management, that is that we require the States to provide a 25 percent match on weatherization. Forty-eight of the States have current balances, some of them over \$1 billion. I think the States have a responsibility of participating, and frankly, if they do, they are going to be a little more careful how they manage the funds. Now they manage the funds and we provide all the money. Under this proposal, we have not reduced weatherization significantly; we are saying, States, you put up 25 percent and we will be able to do more. We will also get better management of the dollars involved. I think

this is a very positive approach to this program. I hope Members will all support it by their votes on the bill.

We have added \$99 million to the Operation of the National Parks. We hear this mantra, "they are going to shut down the parks." Do not believe it. We have added \$99 million to support our national parks over what we provided last year, even though the bill in its present form is \$1 million less than the 1999 bill, excluding the supplemental appropriations. It is \$200 million less if we include the enacted bill, which would include the supplemental appropriations.

So we have been very careful in managing it, but we have tried to emphasize the things that are important to people: their parks, \$99 million; \$200 million for Indian education and health programs. I think we need to do more, but that is the best we could under the circumstances.

But when the American Dental Association testifies that only one Indian has dental care out of four, we need to remedy that. We need to ensure that every Native American has the health care he or she needs, and we likewise need to ensure that they have educational opportunities.

We saw the President visiting a reservation last week talking about the poverty there. The way to get out of poverty is to improve education. We have tried to address that as much as we could in this bill.

We have provided \$205 million for high priority land acquisition. I know people would like to buy a lot more land, but that is the best we can do under the circumstances.

What we have tried is where we have inholdings, we have tried to focus on the importance of pulling together the lands that we have, so our priority has been to pick up wherever possible with a willing seller, a willing buyer, inholdings.

We have included \$33 million additional for national wildlife refuges. I mentioned the Everglades. We have included land acquisition funds, but we have said that we want to guarantee that the water will be there not just tomorrow but 50 years from now, and to that end we have put in restrictive language to ensure that we have that guarantee before we commit vast sums of money from the taxpayers of this Nation. Their focus is on the Everglades. The taxpayers are not putting up \$10 billion to \$11 billion to provide more development money or more agriculture, they are putting up the money to take care of the Everglades, which belongs to all the people of this Nation. We have tried to recognize that.

I mentioned earlier that the AML fund is \$11 million more than last year. We want to repair some of the scars we have inflicted on the landscape of America from coal mining. We have level funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities. I think that is consistent with the fact that the bill

is level funded in terms of the 1999 appropriations.

I think all of these programs taken together represent a good management of our Nation's resources, and most importantly, I think they represent policies and programs that every one of us who support this bill will be able to point to our actions with pride 50 years from now, and on into the future as far as the eye can see.

I hope that the Members will support the bill, that we will continue this effort that we are making in managing our resources and the dollars to give the public the best possible value received for the money they provide in the form of taxes.

OVERVIEW OF BILL

Mr. Chairman, today I am pleased to bring to the House for its consideration the fiscal year 2000 Interior Appropriations bill. While the pressures of the 1997 budget agreement between the Congress and the White House have required us to make some difficult choices in this year's bill, I believe we are presenting you a good bill. The bill provides for \$14.057 billion in budget authority and \$14.556 billion in outlays. Funding is \$200 million below the FY99 enacted bill and \$1.1 billion below the Administration's FY 2000 request. Within these limits we are continuing to focus our priorities on operational shortfalls and backlog maintenance in the national parks, wildlife refuges and national forests by providing modest increases for these priorities.

Despite our severe funding limitations, we continue the federal commitment for the restoration of the Everglades with \$114 million. This funding includes the federal commitment necessary for the purchase of critical lands within Everglades National Park, as well as the other national parks and wildlife refuges, critical to the restoration effort. In providing this funding, we have included specific language to ensure a true environmental restoration of the Everglades by requiring specific water flow amounts and timing for these critical natural areas.

Throughout my tenure as Chairman of this Subcommittee, I have focused on bringing improved management and accountability to the taxpayer. You may remember that in last year's bill we made changes to the Park Service's Denver Services Center and the way the Park Service manages and funds construction projects, so that the taxpayer will never again be asked to fund a \$784,000 outhouse in a national park. This year we have focused on the various trust funds of the U.S. Forest Service. These funds are off budget funds which have not been transparent to the taxpayer. We have included a number of changes to address this situation, and I will enumerate them more specifically when I address the Forest Service portion of the bill.

As federal spending for these programs continues to be squeezed by our obligations to the American people to maintain balanced budgets and protect Social Security and Medicare, we must increasingly focus exclusively on our federal responsibility. States must share in these programs as our partners. For this reason, we have not provided funding for the states to purchase lands under the Administration's Lands Legacy program. State continue to do extremely well financially under the excellent economic conditions we enjoy. We

call on these same states to make the financial commitment to protect lands of priority to them.

In the area of energy programs funded within the bill, we continue this philosophy by asking the states to participate in funding the Weatherization program. Throughout the many years of this program, only the federal government has provided the funding for this program, and in our FY00 bill we ask the states to share in the program with a 25 percent cost share.

Like last year, we have funded the bill without the selling oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) to finance its operations. Congress created the SPR IN 1975 to provide a national defense against future oil shocks. This year, we are pleased to report that the SPR is being filled with oil from royalties owed the federal government by entities producing oil from federal lands. This creative relationship between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Energy is working well, while at the same time adding to our nation's strategic oil defense.

THE NATION'S LANDS

The Interior Appropriations bill provides funding for the vast majority of our nation's federal lands. I would like to highlight the vast treasures we hold as a nation in the resources of our lands. Together as a nation we hold ownership of nearly one third of the land across this great country, and we cherish the open space and tranquility these vast holdings provide. They include 192 million acres in Forest Service land, 77 million acres within the National Park System, 94 million acres in Wildlife Refuges administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service and 264 million acres in Bureau of Land Management (BLM) holdings.

Although we often refer to our national parks as the "crown jewels" of our public lands which include the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone and Yosemite, many spectacular gems are also found on these other public lands. Both the Forest Service and the BLM administer their lands under a multiple use mandate, and therefore, these lands are used not only for recreation as our national parks, but also for hunting and fishing, as well as for generating revenues from minerals and oil and gas development.

While many people associate the Forest Service as a source for American's lumber needs, it is a little known fact that the Forest Service actually receives three times the number of visitors to its lands for recreational purposes than the national parks. Forest Service lands received more than 650 million visits last year.

The American public does not distinguish between federal lands administered by different agencies, and as such, I encourage these agencies to work together on behalf of the public. I would like to compliment the BLM and the Forest Service on their work to consolidate their activities at the field level to achieve savings and provide improved services to the public. The Department of Agriculture and Interior have also achieved success in coordinating their efforts on the development of the Joint Fire Science Plan which provides the scientific aspect of the fuels management programs of the Departments. I encourage all of the agencies to follow these excellent examples and coordinate their services effectively.

REVENUES FROM THE FEDERAL LANDS/REC FEE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

In addition to the growing role as respite to millions of Americans from the everyday stresses of an increasingly urbanized society, these lands also provide a major source of revenues. Revenues from mining, oil and gas leasing and grazing are expected to generate more than \$6 billion in fiscal year 2000. These resources belong to the American people, and they are benefitting from the revenues they generate.

During my first year as Chairman of this Subcommittee, I initiated the recreation fee program demonstration on our federal lands. This is a concept I have supported for many years; it allows the parks, wildlife refuges, national forests and public lands to collect a modest fee from visitors. This fee stays in the park where it is collected and allows the land manager to use the funds to conduct backlog maintenance or improve services for the visitor on that particular site. We are receiving tremendous support of these fees from the American people, the land managers and from national organizations involved with our federal lands. The fees are expected to generate over \$400 million over a five year period and will greatly enhance our ability to reduce the maintenance backlog on the public lands. Other unexpected benefits of the program include a reduction in vandalism which the superintendent at Muir Woods in California called to my attention recently. With Americans making a contribution to the land, they feel they have a stake in its beauty and preservation.

FOREST SERVICE LANDS

The National Forest System lands represent about one third of the nation's forest land and historically have produced approximately 20 percent of the total softwood harvested in the United States each year. Much more timber is grown on these lands each year than is harvested. The timber sale program generates revenues for the Treasury and for local timber-based economies, as well as providing the raw material for lumber, paper and other forest products that are critical to our economy. The timber program on public lands, however, has declined from a high of 11.1 billion board feet in FY90 to the 3.6 billion recommended in this bill and the same level as in fiscal year 1999. This number is a dramatic reduction over the decade, and further cuts to it would be an irresponsible act of the Congress and dramatically impact timber-dependent communities.

Earlier I mentioned increased accountability of various Forest Service trust funds. Despite continuing concerns expressed by this Committee, the House Agriculture Committee and the GAO about the accountability of these funds, we remain deeply troubled about the way these trust funds are being administered. To address these concerns, this year we are requiring the Forest Service to submit a detailed plan of operations to the Congress for the Knutson-Vandenberg (KV) fund, the salvage sale fund and the brush disposal fund. The plan should include an explanation and justification for the program of work and expected accomplishments at each national forest unit using KV funds. To address ongoing concerns that these funds have been used for purposes other than those for which they are intended, we have limited their use at both the regional and Washington levels to only those activities strictly related to the program. We

have specifically prohibited their use for general assessments within either the Forest Service or the Department of Agriculture. The American people deserve to know that these funds are being used for their intended purposes of reforestation together with restoration of watersheds and habitats, and therefore we have also required that these funds be displayed in future budget justifications for the Forest Service. I am pleased with the new requirements we are placing on the management of these funds.

We are making a significant commitment to fire-fighting in this bill, with \$561 million for wildland fire management. The fund supports preparation for wildfires, wildfire operations and reduction of hazardous fuels.

Last year we included the transfer of the Volunteer Fire Assistance program from the Department of Agriculture Appropriations bill to this one. This small grant program, through the State and Private Forestry account, is a tremendous partnership between local volunteer fire departments and the federal government. It allows for enhanced training and equipment to these local fire-fighting agencies and provides for highly trained volunteers should their assistance be requested at federal fire sites. The bill includes \$4 million for this grant program, with a total of \$29 million in total for the Cooperative Fire Assistance program. Clearly, the bill makes a strong commitment to the fire-fighting needs on the local, state and federal levels.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Health Care for our native Americans is the responsibility of the federal government and remains a challenge for this subcommittee. We continue our commitment to Indian Health Services with total funding of \$2.4 billion, a \$155 million increase over fiscal year 1999. Within this increase is additional funding of \$35 million to meet contract support costs, a growing obligation. Within this increase we have also included an additional \$20 million to construct the highest priority hospitals and clinics, thus providing needed access to health care.

SCIENCE

The bill includes \$820 million for the U.S. Geological Survey. This Department of the Interior agency performs first-class scientific research and analysis in areas including water resources, geology and biological resources. I am pleased to report that our transfer of the Biological Resources Division to the U.S. Geological Survey continues to work very well, and the other bureaus rely on the expertise of the outstanding agency to meet their scientific needs.

We have provided \$188 million for ecological services for the Fish and Wildlife Service, including \$105 million for endangered species work. As we all know, the Endangered Species Act needs to be reauthorized. I urge the Administration to present legislation to the Congress so that together we may address virtually needed reforms for the program.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The Interior Appropriations Bill funds programs at the Department of Energy for research to develop technologies to more efficiently use fossil fuels. Low energy prices and energy efficient technologies are a major reason for our strong economy, so we must continue to support federal energy research programs for fossil energy, coal, oil and natural gas, as well as other sources of energy.

Funding for the Department of Energy's programs are cut \$209 million below last year's level. With many fewer dollars, we continue to emphasize partnerships between the federal government and the private sector to ensure that there is a commitment to the technologies in the marketplace. Our goals continue to be to develop technologies that meet the highest energy efficiency and environmental standards possible. Fossil energy will remain the cornerstone of our nation's energy supply well into the next millennium and will also be the source of energy for the world's developing countries. Our continued leadership in this research is vital as we become an increasingly global economy.

DOE's Energy Efficiency account includes a number of programs, including the Industries of the Future program which is an outstanding public-private partnership as the nation's most energy intensive and highest polluting industries work with government in setting joint goals to increase efficiency and reduce waste as we look to these industries' futures. We have provided \$193 million for this program, the success of which will continue to ensure world class economic strength in our leading industry sectors which employ so many Americans.

Funding for the state energy programs remains at the 1999 level of \$33 million, and we have funded the Weatherization Assistance Program at \$120 million, and we are now requiring a 25 percent cost share which I noted earlier. This requirement will allow us to leverage the program dollars and in turn expand the funding and the number of people who may benefit from the program.

Finally, we continue to support the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) and have provided \$24 million for it. This program is an excellent industry/government partnership in which the private sector works with federal agencies to reduce energy usage by incurring the costs of installing high efficiency equipment in exchange for a share of the resulting energy savings. The program has great potential for energy savings, as the federal government is the largest energy user in the world.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS FOR THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Over the past few years, funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has been a challenge in this appropriations bill. During last year's floor debate on this bill, the House of Representatives voted to continue to provide federal funding for the NEA. This year we have included funding for the NEA and the NEH at the fiscal year 1999 levels of \$98 million and \$110 million, respectively. I believe the reforms we have put in place at the NEA are working, and the current directors of these agencies are doing a fine job on behalf of the American people.

CULTURAL AGENCIES

One of the most enjoyable tasks I have serving as Chairman of the Subcommittee, is overseeing the budget for our nation's cultural agencies. These fine agencies, including the Smithsonian Institution, the Kennedy Center, the National Gallery of Art and the U.S. Holocaust Museum all provide wonderful services to the American public not only when they come to visit our nation's capital, but also through numerous outreach programs throughout the states and local communities, as well as on the Internet.

For fiscal year 2000 we are providing \$438 million for the Smithsonian Institution. This funding includes \$48 million for repair and restoration of Smithsonian facilities. "Taking care of what we have" is a high priority for me, and I am pleased that the Smithsonian agrees with this priority in maintaining their world class facilities for all Americans to enjoy.

Within the constraints of the tight budget, we have provided modest increases for the various cultural agencies within the bill.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to reiterate that the bill I present before the House today is a good bill. It reflects the priorities of taking care of the lands and resources of all

the American people. It is a responsible bill which keeps our obligation to balance the budget, while meeting the many responsibilities under our jurisdiction.

At this point Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert into the RECORD a table detailing the various accounts in the bill.

The table referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources	612,511	641,100	632,068	+19,557	-9,032
Wildland fire management	286,895	305,850	292,399	+5,504	-13,451
Central hazardous materials fund	10,000	11,350	10,000	-1,350
Construction	10,997	8,350	11,100	+103	+2,750
Payments in lieu of taxes	125,000	125,000	125,000
Land acquisition	14,600	48,900	20,000	+5,400	-28,900
Oregon and California grant lands	97,037	101,650	99,225	+2,188	-2,425
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,000	10,000	10,000
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	8,055	8,800	8,800	+745
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	8,800	7,700	7,700	-1,100
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,183,895	1,268,700	1,216,292	+32,397	-52,408
United States Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management	661,136	724,000	710,700	+49,564	-13,300
Construction	50,453	43,569	43,933	-6,520	+364
Emergency appropriations	37,612	-37,612
Land acquisition	48,024	73,632	42,000	-6,024	-31,632
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	14,000	80,000	15,000	+1,000	-65,000
National wildlife refuge fund	10,779	10,000	10,779	+779
North American wetlands conservation fund	15,000	15,000	15,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	800	800	800
Multinational species conservation fund	2,000	3,000	2,000	-1,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	839,804	950,001	840,212	+408	-109,789
National Park Service					
Operation of the national park system	1,285,604	1,389,627	1,387,307	+101,703	-2,320
Emergency appropriations	2,320	-2,320
National recreation and preservation	46,225	48,336	45,449	-776	-2,887
Historic preservation fund	72,412	80,512	46,712	-25,700	-33,800
Construction	226,058	194,000	169,856	-56,202	-24,144
Emergency appropriations	13,680	-13,680
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000
Land acquisition and state assistance	147,925	172,468	102,000	-45,925	-70,468
Conservation grants and planning assistance	200,000	-200,000
Urban park and recreation fund	4,000	-4,000
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,764,224	2,058,943	1,721,324	-42,900	-337,619
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	797,896	838,485	820,444	+22,548	-18,041
Emergency appropriations	1,000	-1,000
Minerals Management Service					
Royalty and offshore minerals management	217,902	234,082	234,082	+16,180
Additions to receipts	-100,000	-124,000	-124,000	-24,000
Oil spill research	6,118	6,118	6,118
Total, Minerals Management Service	124,020	116,200	116,200	-7,820	<b">.....</b">
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement					
Regulation and technology	93,078	94,391	95,693	+2,615	+1,302
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	275	275	275
Subtotal	93,353	94,666	95,968	+2,615	+1,302
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	185,416	211,158	196,458	+11,042	-14,700
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	278,769	305,824	292,426	+13,657	-13,398
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs	1,584,124	1,694,387	1,831,050	+46,926	-63,337
Construction	123,421	174,258	126,023	+2,602	-48,235
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments
to Indians	28,882	28,401	25,901	-2,981	-2,500
Indian guaranteed loan program account	5,001	5,008	5,008	+7
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)
Indian land consolidation pilot	5,000	-5,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,746,428	1,902,054	1,787,982	+41,554	-114,072
Departmental Offices					
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories	38,455	40,355	38,600	+145	-1,755
Northern Marianas Islands Covenant	27,720	27,720	27,720
Subtotal, Assistance to Territories	66,175	68,075	66,320	+145	-1,755

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466) —Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Compact of Free Association	8,930	8,545	8,545	-385
Mandatory payments.....	12,000	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Compact of Free Association	20,930	20,545	20,545	-385
Total, Insular Affairs	87,105	88,620	86,865	-240	-1,755
Departmental management	64,686	63,064	62,884	-1,822	-200
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations).....	80,347	-80,347
Office of the Solicitor	36,784	41,500	36,784	-4,716
Office of Inspector General.....	25,486	27,614	26,086	+600	-1,528
Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.....	61,299	90,025	90,025	+28,726
Indian land consolidation pilot.....	10,000	5,000	+5,000	-5,000
Natural resource damage assessment fund	4,492	7,900	5,400	+908	-2,500
Management of Federal lands for subsistence uses	8,000	-8,000
Glacier Bay fishing (emergency appropriations)	26,000	-26,000
Total, Departmental Offices.....	394,199	328,723	313,024	-81,175	-15,899
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	7,130,235	7,768,930	7,107,904	-22,331	-661,026
Appropriations	(6,999,276)	(7,798,930)	(7,137,904)	(+138,628)	(-661,026)
Emergency appropriations.....	(180,959)	(-180,959)
Rescissions.....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest and rangeland research	197,444	234,644	204,373	+6,929	-30,271
State and private forestry.....	170,722	252,422	181,464	+10,742	-70,958
National forest system	1,298,570	1,357,178	1,254,434	-44,136	-102,744
Wildland fire management	560,176	560,730	561,354	+1,178	+624
Emergency appropriations.....	102,000	90,000	-102,000	-90,000
Reconstruction and maintenance.....	297,352	295,000	396,602	+99,250	+101,602
Emergency appropriations.....	5,611	-5,611
Land acquisition	117,918	118,000	1,000	-116,918	-117,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts.....	1,069	1,069	1,069
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	210	210	210
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	3,300	3,300	3,300
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	92	92	92
Management of Federal lands for subsistence uses	3,000	-3,000
Total, Forest Service	2,757,464	2,912,645	2,603,898	-153,566	-308,747
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Clean coal technology: Deferral.....	-40,000	-256,000	-190,000	-150,000	+66,000
Fossil energy research and development	384,056	340,000	335,292	-48,764	-4,708
Biomass energy development (by transfer)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-1,300	-1,000	-1,000	+300
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	14,000	-14,000
Elk Hills school lands fund	36,000	36,000	36,000
Energy conservation	691,701	812,515	693,822	+2,121	-118,693
Biomass energy development (by transfer)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(+25,000)
Economic regulation	1,801	2,000	2,000	+199
Strategic petroleum reserve.....	160,120	159,000	159,000	-1,120
SPR petroleum account	5,000	-5,000
Energy Information Administration	70,500	72,644	72,644	+2,144
Total, Department of Energy:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	1,316,878	1,170,159	1,107,758	-209,120	-62,401
Appropriations	(1,356,878)	(1,426,159)	(1,297,758)	(-59,120)	(-128,401)
Deferral	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-190,000)	(-150,000)	(+66,000)
(By transfer)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(+49,000)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services.....	1,950,322	2,094,922	2,085,407	+135,085	-9,515
Indian health facilities.....	291,965	317,465	312,478	+20,513	-4,987
Total, Indian Health Service.....	2,242,287	2,412,387	2,397,885	+155,598	-14,502
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses	13,000	14,000	13,400	+400	-600
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute.....	4,250	4,250	-4,250	-4,250

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses	347,154	380,501	371,501	+24,347	-9,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	4,400	-4,400
Repair and restoration of buildings	40,000	47,900	47,900	+7,900
Construction	16,000	19,000	19,000	+3,000
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	4,700	-4,700
Total, Smithsonian Institution	412,254	447,401	438,401	+26,147	-9,000
National Gallery of Art					
Salaries and expenses	57,938	61,438	61,538	+3,600	+100
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	6,311	6,311	6,311
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	101	-101
Total, National Gallery of Art	64,350	67,749	67,849	+3,499	+100
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts					
Operations and maintenance	12,187	14,000	12,441	+254	-1,559
Construction	20,000	20,000	20,000
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	32,187	34,000	32,441	+254	-1,559
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars					
Salaries and expenses	5,840	6,040	7,040	+1,200	+1,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration	83,500	137,000	83,500	-53,500
Matching grants	14,500	13,000	14,500	+1,500
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	98,000	150,000	98,000	-52,000
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and administration	96,800	129,800	96,800	-33,000
Matching grants	13,900	20,200	13,900	-6,300
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	110,700	150,000	110,700	-39,300
Institute of Museum and Library Services/ Office of Museum Services					
Grants and administration	23,405	34,000	24,400	+995	-9,600
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	232,105	334,000	233,100	+995	-100,900
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses	898	1,078	935	+37	-143
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs					
Grants	7,000	6,000	7,000	+1,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation					
Salaries and expenses	2,800	3,000	3,000	+200
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses	5,954	6,312	6,312	+358
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	381	-381
United States Holocaust Memorial Council					
Holocaust Memorial Council	32,107	33,786	33,286	+1,179	-500
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	900	-900
Emergency appropriations	2,000	-2,000
Total, United States Holocaust Memorial Council	35,007	33,786	33,286	-1,721	-500
Presidio Trust					
Presidio trust fund	34,913	44,400	44,400	+9,487
Total, title II, related agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	7,167,568	7,497,207	6,996,705	-170,863	-500,502
Appropriations	(7,091,875)	(7,863,207)	(7,186,705)	(+94,830)	(-478,502)
Emergency appropriations	(115,693)	(90,000)	(-115,693)	(-90,000)
Deferral	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-190,000)	(-150,000)	(+66,000)
(By transfer)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(+49,000)
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	14,297,803	15,266,137	14,104,609	-193,194	-1,161,528
Appropriations	(14,091,151)	(15,462,137)	(14,324,609)	(+233,458)	(-1,137,528)
Emergency appropriations	(276,652)	(90,000)	(-276,652)	(-90,000)
Rescissions	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)
Deferral	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-190,000)	(-150,000)	(+66,000)
(By transfer)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(+49,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management	1,183,895	1,268,700	1,216,292	+32,397	-52,408
United States Fish and Wildlife Service.....	839,804	950,001	840,212	+408	-109,789
National Park Service.....	1,764,224	2,058,943	1,721,324	-42,900	-337,819
United States Geological Survey.....	798,896	838,485	820,444	+21,548	-18,041
Minerals Management Service	124,020	116,200	116,200	-7,820
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	278,769	305,824	292,426	+13,657	-13,398
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,746,428	1,902,054	1,787,982	+41,554	-114,072
Departmental Offices.....	394,199	328,723	313,024	-81,175	-15,699
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior.....	7,130,235	7,768,930	7,107,904	-22,331	-661,026
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
Forest Service	2,757,464	2,912,645	2,803,898	-153,566	-308,747
Department of Energy	1,316,878	1,170,159	1,107,758	-209,120	-62,401
Indian Health Service.....	2,242,287	2,412,387	2,397,885	+155,598	-14,502
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation.....	13,000	14,000	13,400	+400	-600
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	4,250	4,250	-4,250	-4,250
Smithsonian Institution.....	412,254	447,401	438,401	+26,147	-9,000
National Gallery of Art	64,350	67,749	67,849	+3,499	+ 100
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	32,187	34,000	32,441	+254	-1,559
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	5,840	6,040	7,040	+1,200	+1,000
National Endowment for the Arts	98,000	150,000	98,000	-52,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	110,700	150,000	110,700	-39,300
Institute of Museum and Library Services	23,405	34,000	24,400	+995	-9,600
Commission of Fine Arts	698	1,078	935	+37	-143
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs.....	7,000	6,000	7,000	+1,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,800	3,000	3,000	+200
National Capital Planning Commission	6,335	6,312	6,312	-23
Holocaust Memorial Council	35,007	33,786	33,286	-1,721	-500
Presidio Trust.....	34,913	44,400	44,400	+9,487
Total, Title II - Related Agencies.....	7,167,568	7,497,207	6,996,705	-170,863	-500,502
Grand total.....	14,297,803	15,266,137	14,104,609	-193,194	-1,161,528

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee in support of H.R. 2466, the FY 2000 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

I, too, want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the staff of the committee, both the majority and minority staff members. Debbie Weatherly and Del Davis have done a very fine job on this bill, and all the other staff members, including Leslie Turner on my staff.

□ 1530

I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), who has skillfully crafted this bill. This bill is fair and balanced and I believe adequately addresses the needs of the programs within its jurisdiction.

Our allocation was not high, nearly \$1 billion below the President's budget request, which required many difficult decisions. Under those difficult circumstances, I believe the bill is justly prioritized. I also add that I am extremely pleased that the bill is free of many legislative riders objectionable to the Congress.

It is my firm hope that we can continue to work with the administration on a few key items which the subcommittee was unable to fund in this tight budget year. The Lands Legacy Initiative proposed by the administration was not fully funded in this bill. I am hopeful that we can continue a dialogue as the bill moves through the legislative process and perhaps make more money available for some of the key land acquisitions put forward by the President.

This bill supports our national wildlife refuge system and continues critical efforts to address the needs of threatened and endangered species. These vital programs enable our agencies to achieve better ecosystem management and more comprehensive protection of our public lands.

Just last week I had the pleasure of hosting several Members, including the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), our chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, in my home State of Washington. We toured several area parks including the Olympic National Park in my congressional district and were able to view firsthand some of the work being done on the ground both through annual appropriations as well as through the fee demonstration project.

Once again, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for his attention and elevation of the backlog needs in our parks. We need to

do something about that. This bill provides significant increases in operations money to protect the treasures of the park system throughout the United States.

The bill continues support for our Native American citizens and is instrumental in upholding their treaty rights. Through the Interior Appropriations bill, we support economic and educational assistance to the tribes, aid natural resource management and support tribal health programs through the Indian Health Service.

Lastly, the bill provides funding to support both the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Although we were not able to provide the requested increases called for in the President's budget, it is my firm hope that the House will approve funding for the endowments and we can continue to seek some increase as the bill moves through the process.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2466 and the important program it sustains.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2466, the fiscal year 2000 funding bill for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies.

This bill provides \$14.1 billion for the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Smithsonian, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And I am happy to say that based on the hard work of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and my colleagues, both the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and other valued members on the subcommittee, we have an opportunity to support a bill that will manage and protect our environment; it will maintain our obligations to our sovereign Indian nations; it will protect our Nation's cultural resources and maintain fiscal responsibility.

It was not an easy task for the chairman of our subcommittee to come up with all of the pressures of this bill in the form that this bill takes. But it is a good package. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for inserting language that I authored in the report that will force the Pacific Northwest region, which covers my State of Washington, to look at all impacts to the endangered salmon problem in the Pacific Northwest and not just focus on dam removal as the solution to restoration of our salmon populations. It is not the solution. It is a multifaceted problem that requires a great deal of analysis and careful consideration.

Right now our region faces an immediate challenge with almost 8,000 pairs of Caspian terns which nest on a man-made island called Rice Island, which is located 20 miles upriver from the mouth of the Columbia River.

The National Marine Fisheries Service estimates that over the past 2 years these little birds have feasted on between 10 and 23 million juvenile salmon that are migrating out to the ocean. These birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for carrying out.

I appreciate the committee working with me on report language that requires the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to come up with a mitigation plan that will include, but not be limited to, transporting these birds to areas that are more in line with their natural habitat.

If we come up with a responsible plan for managing the Caspian terns, we will see a positive impact on the number of salmon returning to the Columbia and Snake Rivers to spawn. This is an important piece of the salmon restoration puzzle that we cannot ignore.

I am also pleased that within our budget limitations we were able to increase funding for health care provided the Native Americans through the Indian Health Service. The health disparities among Native Americans are profound. One area in particular is diabetes that seriously affects Native American populations and other minority populations in our country. The prevalence of diabetes among Native Americans is higher than it is for the rest of the Nation's population, and the rate is rapidly increasing to epidemic proportions in some tribes across this Nation.

For the second year in a row, we have provided funds in this bill for diabetes screening through the Joslin Diabetes Center, a great center dedicated to curing and doing more research and understanding the complications of diabetes.

We have also included language in the report to increase the number of podiatrists within the Indian Health Service to attempt to avoid one of the major complications of diabetes through preventive care and early treatment of diabetic foot ulcers for Native American populations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a delicate balance for Forest Service funding and programs. As Members may remember, we reached a hard-fought agreement on this issue last year when supporters of active forest management agreed to eliminate the purchaser road credit program. That was a difficult problem to overcome, to eliminate that program. This program primarily affected small timber purchasers, many of which were in my district on the east side of the State of Washington.

While the agreement held throughout the process last year, attempts may be made today to unravel that agreement. So I urge all Members, all of my colleagues who may consider supporting a Forest Service amendment, to think hard about the agreement that was reached in good faith last year. We should not destroy the accord that was achieved.

All in all, this bill is well balanced. It considers carefully the delicate nature of the programs that are contained within the Interior appropriations measure. It is one that I hope will see great approval in this body. The chairman and the ranking member and all of us on the subcommittee worked very hard to make that balance occur. We still have to deal with the Senate. We have to get a bill that goes through the process to the President.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

On July 20, 1969, the lunar landing module of Apollo touched down in the Sea of Tranquility on the surface of the Moon. Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin descended from the landing module and became the first humans to walk on any heavenly body. This feat established American supremacy in space even to the present day.

The Apollo 11 mission represents the success and preeminence of the American Space Program; we must preserve the monuments of this era. Of all the artifacts representing the glory and triumph of the Apollo Program, one in particular stands out—the Saturn V Rocket. The Saturn V is the largest, most powerful rocket ever produced in history. The Soviet Union was never able to even attempt to undertake such an ambitious project.

Only three Saturn V Rockets remain in the world today. The U.S. Space & Rocket Center is home to one of these historic vehicles which has the distinction of being designated a National Historic Landmark. The Saturn V at the U.S. Space & Rocket Center has been on display for thirty years, and the elements have caused significant deterioration of the vehicle. Although there is no question that it should be preserved for future generations as a monument of the American Space Program, once again we face budget constraints that make this task a difficult one.

Restoration of the Saturn V at the U.S. Space & Rocket Center should be a priority of the Smithsonian. I am hopeful that we will be able to allocate the resources necessary for the restoration and preservation efforts being made by the U.S. Space & Rocket Center before it is too late.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), our chairman, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), our ranking member, for the excellent job they have done putting this bill together under very difficult circumstances. I also want to thank the subcommittee staff for their hard work on the bill and thoughtful consideration of the many difficult issues that we faced.

What we have before us is a fair and balanced bill that genuinely takes into consideration the many different concerns and interests of Members of the House, and of the people that we represent.

None of us support every item in the bill, but I think all of us can agree that it is fair, reasonable, and representa-

tive. The difficult circumstances I allude to are obvious. Our subcommittee's allocation is far below the real needs of the agencies funded through this bill. Although we have heard widely varying figures on the National Park Service's maintenance backlog, it certainly amounts to several billion dollars at least. The same is true of the Forest Service.

As our population grows and our open space shrinks, we have an ever-increasing need to protect open space and wildlife to protect recreational opportunities for our people, to conserve the watersheds we all depend on, and to save our historic and cultural sites.

Our subcommittee received hundreds of requests from Members for projects that are sensible and worthy, but we could not fund them even though we would have liked to and should have. There simply was not enough money.

But our chairman, I think, in the final analysis has used his discretion very, very wisely. The bill and the bill report include language regarding the management of the Everglades restoration project that we hope and believe will guarantee that the project serves the national interest. And the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) should take full deserved credit for this.

We are putting Federal money into the reengineering of the Everglades because we want to see its unique ecosystem restored and conserved for the future because we want to reverse past mistakes that led to overdevelopment and overuse of fragile resources. This bill aims to ensure that that is what will happen and that the Federal funds will not ultimately be turned against the Everglades and be used to promote unwise development.

I am delighted to say that despite the constraints on this bill, it includes increased funds for the Park Service, which are badly needed to meet the demands both of conservation and increased visitorship. I am similarly very happy that the bill also includes a small increase in the Forest Service's recreation budget above the administration's request.

The national forests are more widely used for recreation even than the national parks; and recreation has become an increasingly important part of the Forest Service's mission, but its budget has not kept up. The increase is a much-needed step in the right direction.

The bill also provides for a small increase in the Forest Services State and private forestry budget. Again, this is very welcomed. These programs are not as well known as they should be, but they are immensely valuable to those States where most forests are in non-Federal ownership.

In my own State, they are particularly important for the role they play in protecting our urban watersheds, but they also provide critical assistance to people who never see a forest through their support for such beneficial and popular projects as urban tree planting and disease prevention.

The Interior bill's public lands titles almost always attract more attention than its energy research and conservation provisions, but I am also pleased in what we could accomplish in those areas as well. Our subcommittee heard a great deal about the progress that can be made if we keep supporting these programs in achieving energy independence and providing our citizens with a cleaner environment. I am particularly pleased that the bill increases funding for Energy Department conservation programs that can help our constituents reduce their household energy costs.

There were some disappointments. I am sorry that the bill provides no increase for the Arts and Humanities Endowments, despite the administration's excellent plan for new outreach and education programs at both those agencies. I am hoping we can correct that in an amendment.

I am sorry too the bill provides only a small fraction of the administration's request for its Lands Legacy programs. But these are good programs, and I hope that they could be improved upon in the final analysis.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent bill and our chairman and our ranking member deserve great credit for the way they have put it together.

I strongly believe we should acquire and protect critical lands for open space, recreation, and wildlife habitat while we can: I have seen to many lost opportunities in my own state. But I realize the funding constraints made full funding of Lands Legacy impossible. Finally, I regret that the bill does not include requested funding for the addition to the Roosevelt Memorial here in Washington that the last Congress authorized, but I hope that can be resolved soon.

I will be supporting several amendments that I believe would improve our bill, but again, I urge support for the bill itself.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking Democrat on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, a good friend.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for yielding me this time. I know how precious it is during general debate; and I greatly appreciate it because there is a very important message that I want to share with my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from Washington.

While the rest of America was heeding John Adams's appeal to celebrate the birth of our Nation with fireworks, Mother Nature went on a rampage of her own with fireworks of a different kind in the Boundary Waters Canoe area of Minnesota in my district.

Over the 4th of July with a storm packing 100-mile-an-hour winds that leveled 340,000 acres of the Boundary

Waters Canoe area, the Nation's largest water-based wilderness, 250,000 acres of lands, 21 million trees estimated down, 6 million cords, which is equal to the total wood supply, the total cut, for 2 years for the whole State of Minnesota.

□ 1545

We have an enormous fuel supply on the ground. Trees that began growing years before the Civil War were ripped out, flattened. Chain saws, 24-inch bar chain saws on either side of the tree cannot cut through them.

But the Forest Service did absolutely heroic service. I want to pay tribute to the Forest Service personnel who worked 18-hour days over several days to inspect 1,300 camp sites and rescue some 20 injured campers and free hundreds of others. There were 3,000 in the wilderness at the time.

I flew over the area on Sunday and observed a scene that perhaps the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) only can fully appreciate. It is like the aftermath of the Mount St. Helens' disaster where trees were just flattened, blasted. They are piled, in many cases, one on top of each other, 20 feet high. The line supervisor for the electric co-op said he walked a half mile in from the roadway to one of the sites to begin work on power restoration and never stepped on land the entire way, just walked on downed trees.

The Forest Service had been absolutely superb. The three rural electric co-ops have been magnificent. They have had their teams out there working 15- and 18-hour days, 35 hours the first few days.

There will be benefits for those areas outside the Boundary Waters. But inside the Boundary Waters, there are a number of Forest Service supply facilities. There is one that I have known about in the Kekekabic Trail. It has always been hidden from view. It now looks like the Little House on the Prairie. One cannot imagine the destruction until one sees it oneself.

The reason I raise this issue here is that there is no FEMA support for the Forest Service, no Federal agency benefits when a disaster declaration is made, which it will be made, I am confident, by the President. There is a disaster fund for the Department of Agriculture that may be available to bail out the Forest Service.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that they are using some of the rec. fee money for immediate solutions or assistance. The gentleman makes the point that we otherwise would be waiting, and this is a peak visitation time of year. So I am pleased that they are moving ahead and again serving the public, which was the objective of this program to begin with.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, but, ultimately, there is going to be a huge

cost. We do not know what the extent of it is.

I raise the issue now to appeal to the leadership of the subcommittee that, by the time we get to conference, I am hoping my colleagues in the Senate will have the assessment, perhaps offer supplemental appropriations there to cover the cost for the Forest Service who are hiring people with money they do not have to serve time that is available now.

The resort community has lost a quarter of a million dollars business in the first 5 days. They do not have 100 feet of hiking trails opened for their visitors. The winter season is coming. We will not have cross country trails. We will not have snowmobile trails in the area outside the Boundary Waters unless the salvage work can begin promptly.

So, at the appropriate time, I appeal to the mercy and understanding of our colleagues to provide the additional funding. It will be in the few millions. It will not be in the billions or so that we have for Mount St. Helens, but it will be in the several millions.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his leadership, but I know of his great concern about the Boundary Waters in his area in Minnesota.

We also had another storm besides the incredible events at Mount St. Helens, the Columbus Day storm of 1962 when 8 billion board feet went down in both Washington and Oregon from an incredible storm. We have been there and seen that. In fact, that is how log exporting started in our country, because we had all this excess logs. We started exporting them to Japan and other countries. But we will be glad to work with the gentleman as we go through the process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for their understanding.

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

I want to talk about some positive things we observed during our visit to parks and forests in the Northwest. We saw a lot of volunteers there. I think one of the great stories of this bill and of our public lands is how many people, particularly senior citizens, volunteer their time.

One gentleman at Mount St. Helens who was telling the people all about what had happened there said he drove 60 miles each way every day to come up there and lecture, and he did a great job. He is doing this as a volunteer.

We are advised there are almost 300,000 people who volunteer their time, their energy and their knowledge serv-

ing in our public lands. I think that is a great story about the American people.

Secondly, in the number of visitors, we had over 1 billion 225 million visitor days in our public lands. I think this, too, illustrates how much the American people care about these lands.

Lastly, a little vignette that I observed at one of the places where they have the recreation fee demo program. They also had a place one could deposit some extra money if one chose to do so, and the jar was getting pretty well filled up, which said people are not only willing to pay a pretty modest fee, which they knew would stay in the parks or the forests or the wildlife refuges or BLM, as the case might be, but they also want to contribute some extra money.

So I think there are some really positive dimensions to this whole program in terms of how the American people feel about their public lands.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who has been a leader in this Congress on livability and particularly in the Columbia River Gorge where I had a chance to visit with him this last week.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, because I think they started the debate with the proper tone. It is a 50-year vision, and it is just a starting point, I hope, for this Congress.

What the bill talks about today is fundamental infrastructure for livable communities. As we try and deal with the consequences of unplanned growth around the country, the stewardship of our public lands both in wilderness areas and what happens in our developed communities are more and more important.

I wanted to thank the committee for their hard work to diffuse some of the volatile legislative hot buttons, being able to provide at least a stable funding for the arts and minimize the toxic riders that have obscured the important debate that has attended this bill in the past.

Last week, it was my pleasure to watch the hard-working members of this subcommittee and their staff in our region of the Pacific Northwest. I am pleased that they had a chance to look firsthand at the Columbia River Gorge where I am convinced that each dollar that is invested will go further than any place else in America in protecting a critical legacy. We saw firsthand the impact of the subcommittee's efforts to try and make sure that we are maximizing resources and working creatively.

I think it is important that we allow the fee demo program to be able to work its way out and to look at the impacts. I hope that, in the words of the

Chair and the ranking member, that what we are seeing here, although we will not be perhaps debating in heated form some amendments that may come forward, I hope that we will keep in mind what we are trying to do in terms of this being a starting point.

I am hopeful that this Congress will give the subcommittee the resources they need for today and tomorrow to be able to make the investment in protecting this legacy, not just for today but for the next half century.

I appreciate the hard work the committee has done and look forward to building upon it in the course of this Congress to be able to realize that vision.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Ms. McCARTHY), who I know has been a leader on historic preservation issues.

(Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the funding levels in this bill for the National Endowment for the Arts. I am disappointed that this bill is substantially less than the President's budget request.

While I am pleased that the bill requires the NEA to give priority in granting funds for educational projects, I am particularly disappointed that the bill does not include funds for a new program, Challenge America, which includes arts education, youth-at-risk programs, cultural heritage preservation, and community arts partnerships.

As a former schoolteacher, I believe that a key solution to youth violence and a key component to youth development is access to the arts in schools. If we are serious about curtailing youth violence, it is imperative that adequate funding be provided to bring music and art to our children.

If the Challenge America program is funded, state arts agencies would receive 40 percent of these funds, and at least 1,000 communities nationwide will benefit.

Research has shown that arts programs can have a very positive effect on our youth, helping to increase academic achievement and decrease delinquent behavior.

Children who are exposed to arts perform 30 percent better academically. High-risk elementary students who participated in an arts program for 1 year gained 8 percentile points on standardized language arts tests.

The Smart Symphonies program initiated by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences provides free CDs of classical music for infants in response to findings that show, among other things, that early exposure to classical music increases a child's ability to learn math and science.

In Missouri's fifth district, the Young Audiences Arts Partners Program integrates community arts resources into the curriculum of participating school districts, with a focus on

not only teaching students to appreciate the arts, but also on talking about issues that the arts raise in healthy, nonjudgmental ways.

Let us make a commitment to our children to provide them with the tools they need to be responsible citizens in a democracy, to make good, informed choices, to live in peace with their neighbors and coworkers, and to enjoy life to its fullest. Let us begin to show our commitment to our children by prioritizing funding for the arts and encouraging arts programs in our schools and communities.

Later in the debate, Mr. Chairman, an amendment will be offered to increase funding for the NEA, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for yielding me this time, and I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to call attention to an amendment that I will be offering along with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBER-STAR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) later on in this bill.

That amendment deals with the issue of payment in lieu of taxes. As my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, there are some 1,800 counties throughout the United States that have land in them that is owned by the Federal Government. Over the years, the Federal Government has not kept faith with these communities and has not paid a fair payment in lieu of taxes.

In the Congress, especially in recent years, we have been hearing a lot of discussion about what is called devolution, more respect, more authority for local counties and local towns. It seems to me that if we are sincere about respecting our States and our towns that we should be fair with them in terms of providing them the payment in lieu of taxes that they need.

So I would hope that, when this amendment comes up, which affects some 1,800 communities in America, it affects some 49 States, and it is an amendment similar to one that won here on the floor of the House last year, that we will once again support it.

It is unfair, it seems to me, to take advantage of communities all over this country, force them to inadequately fund their infrastructure, education, the services they provide their people because the Federal Government is not properly paying the in lieu of tax payments that it should.

I urge support of this amendment when it appears later.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington

(Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the provision within H.R. 2466 which provides Guam with an increase of \$5 million for Compact Impact aid for next year. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their support on this issue.

This \$5 million is very much needed for Guam, and it should be understood that it is really a kind of reimbursement for the cost of unrestricted migration to Guam as a result of U.S. Compact agreements with the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

□ 1600

For nearly 10 years, financial costs have totaled well over \$70 million, and this year we have \$4.5 million and we want to increase it by \$5 million to \$10 million. This helps defray the costs because the actual cost per year to Guam is around \$15 to \$20 million.

We take the responsibility of helping out our island neighbors seriously, and it is not a wrong thing to do, because it is a Federal responsibility. I know that in the upcoming debate there will be a point of order raised against this issue, and I very much ask all of my colleagues to consider the importance of this issue for a very small jurisdiction and the ultimate fairness of getting the Federal Government to be responsible, even though it only compensates for about half of the costs associated with this issue.

There was no effort on my part to attempt to divert funding from other territories for this issue; but in the final analysis, when we suggested other alternatives, this was the only one that seemed appropriate at the time. I am hoping that in conference all the issues related to territorial issues will be resolved, because there are a number of unmet funding needs that all of the small insular areas have to deal with, and I urge every consideration that the voting Members of this House can give to those who represent districts who cannot vote in this body.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank our distinguished Chairman for his commitment to the natural resources and national treasures of America. Chairman REGULA, his committee and staff have all worked tirelessly to present the legislation before us and they deserve our gratitude for their fine efforts.

In particular, I want to thank the Chairman for his personal attention to the maintenance needs of the Uwharrie National Forest. My constituents in the eighth district, as well as the thousands of frequent users from all over North Carolina, can look forward to safer, cleaner and better recreational experiences at the Uwharrie.

Again, I appreciate the time and thought put into this bill and to the Chairman's commitment to preserving the beauty of our nation.

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for all his efforts on this measure. I request unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the funding levels in the bill for the National Endowment for the Arts. I'm disappointed that this bill is substantially less than the President's budget request.

While I am pleased that the bill requires the NEA to give priority in granting funds for educational projects, I'm particularly disappointed that the bill does not include funds for a new program, Challenge America, which includes arts education, youth-at-risk programs, cultural heritage preservation, and community arts partnerships.

As a former school teacher, I believe that a key solution to youth violence and key component to youth development is access to the arts in schools. If we're serious about curtailing youth violence, it is imperative that adequate funding be provided to bring music and art to our children. If the Challenge America program is funded, state arts agencies would receive 40 percent of these funds, and at least 1,000 communities nationwide will benefit.

Research has shown that arts programs can have a very positive impact on our youth, helping to increase academic achievement and decreasing delinquent behavior. The YouthARTS Development Project is the result of a three-year collaborative effort of the Regional Arts and Culture Council of Portland, Oregon; the San Antonio Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs of San Antonio, Texas; and the Fulton County Arts Council of Atlanta, Georgia; and Americans for the Arts of Washington, DC. YouthARTS is funded in part by the NEA, and the program is implemented through local partners across the country.

The goals of YouthARTS include defining the critical elements and "best practices of arts programs designed for at-risk youth populations, strengthening collaborative relationships among local and federal partners, and leveraging increased funding for at-risk youth programs. YouthARTS has already conducted extensive research, which has shown that arts programs really can have an impact on youth, including increasing academic achievement and decreasing delinquent behavior. Perhaps the most amazing change occurred in Portland, where, at the beginning of the program, less than half of the youth were able to cooperate with their peers, but after participating in the arts program, 100% of these same youth were able to cooperate, and approximately one third of the participants reported a more favorable attitude toward school after participating. In Atlanta, 25% of youth who participated in the arts program reported a more favorable attitude toward school than they did before they began the program, and 50% reported a decrease in their delinquent behaviors. In San Antonio, more than 16% of the youth participating reported a decrease in delinquent behaviors.

Additional studies show that children who are exposed to the arts perform 30% better academically. High risk elementary students who participated in an arts program for one year gained 8 percentile points on standardized language arts tests. The Smart Symphonies program initiated by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS) provides free CD's of classical music for infants in response to findings that show, among other things that early exposure to classical music increases a child's ability to learn math and science.

In Missouri's fifth district, the Young Audiences Arts Partners Program integrates com-

munity arts resources into the curriculum of participating school districts, with a focus on not only teaching students to appreciate the arts, but also on talking about issues that the arts raise in healthy, nonjudgmental ways. Let us make a commitment to our children to provide them with the tools they need to be responsible citizens in a democracy—to make good, informed choices; to live in peace with their neighbors and coworkers; and to enjoy life to the fullest extent possible. Let us begin to show our commitment to our children by prioritizing funding for the Arts and encouraging Arts programs in our school and communities.

Later in the debate, an amendment will be offered to increase funding for the NEA and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment offered by the Gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2466, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for fiscal year 2000.

My support of this legislation is somewhat of a precedent. Too often in recent years in this House, I have been forced not only to speak out in opposition to this important appropriation bill but to actively work to defeat the legislation. Whether it be the riders, non-authorized funding for pet projects, or major policy debates over logging roads and the future of the Northwest temperate rain forests, the Interior Appropriations have annually been a magnet to controversy and the inclusion of extraneous provisions. Fortunately, this legislation has avoided most of those fatal flaws. It isn't always money. But this Interior Appropriations Bill has culminated in a super-imposed untouchable and unacceptable bad policy in recent years. This year's bill is a much better result to this hour.

Such success is due to the bipartisan leadership of Chairman REGULA and Ranking Member Dicks. Under their leadership, the Committee has been able to forestall such controversial riders and policy provisions. Hopefully, that success will continue through today's floor action. A strong vote of support by this House will only strengthen the hands of the conferees in dealing with the inevitable add-ons of the Senate.

While I do support H.R. 2466, the bill does have several deficiencies. The principal shortfall is the anemic funding level provided in this legislation for many important programs. I recognize that this flaw is the result of the spending caps in law that afflict all domestic discretionary programs. The decision by the majority party to bleed dry these programs is a short-sighted decision that will undermine our national conservation efforts in the long run. While some seek to score political points in this legislation, the price of any rhetorical victories will be continued degradation of our national parks, forests and rangelands. Such continued degradation is a tragic political decision that will be exacerbated by the Chairman's amendment to cut an additional \$138 million, 50% aimed at vital components of land management program and BLM land acquisition funding.

Today, this Body will have the opportunity to improve the legislation through the adoption of significant amendments. Such amendments include Mr. MILLER's of California, that will provide \$4 million for the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program (UPARR) and Mr.

McGOVERN's amendment that will fund the state component of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. These programs, UPARR, LWC, Emergency Energy Assistance Authorization, the Sanders Amendment, which tries to improve the Energy Assistance Program, are proven initiatives that provide crucial matching funds for local communities to improve and expand public recreational programs and facilities. With tight budgetary restraints, recreational program funding at all levels of government has suffered year after year. As a result, local parks and playgrounds are falling into disrepair and recreational programs are being closed. Those decisions are unfortunate. While our National Park System is our nation's crown jewels, our local park systems are our local family heirlooms. Our national parks are the place where traditions and memories are made and treasured. Local/State open spaces are the home to family picnics, youth soccer and baseball games, family nature hikes and the local concerts. They are the glue that bind our communities and families together. For this reason, President Clinton sought full funding of the LWC/HPF within the context of the Lands Legacy Initiative 2000. To date, this initiative has unfortunately been sidetracked today's appropriation measure underlines the absolute need to set aside these funds in a trust fund provisions in this measure that are less than one-third the commitment and promise existing in law.

Today, our local parks and recreation programs are more important than ever. Just last month, the House debated the juvenile justice measure seeking punitive actions increasing penalties for juveniles who break the law. Today some amendments give us an opportunity to vote for youth crime prevention. At a time when Congress is acting on policy to put more kids in jail, it's high time we provide recreational opportunities and put more kids in youth sports, arts and other after-school programs and crime prevention activities that positively address the delinquency issue.

Unfortunately, the Committee chose to so inadequately fund the President's Lands Legacy Initiative. This new proposal would be a solid down payment on protecting and preserving our nation's critical lands. It is an initiative which should enjoy bipartisan support and provides a transition basis to rectify the current deficiencies in existing appropriation acts, that continue in this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of serving in this Body with Mo Udall. As Chair of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mo would speak eloquently of our stewardship responsibility to pass on America's natural lands and resources to future generations in as good a condition as we inherited it. This bill takes modest steps to achieve that goal but we can and should do better.

Hopefully by the end of the cycle this year we will be doing be.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today to express his great appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks), the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee, and to all members of the Subcommittee for the inclusion of a \$10 million appropriation for the first phase of construction for a replacement Indian Health Service (IHS) hospital located in

Winnebago, Nebraska, to serve the Winnebago and Omaha tribes. Of course, the Subcommittee is already well-aware of the ongoing situation with this hospital. Indeed, last year the Subcommittee kept the process going by including funds to complete the design phase of the project for which this Member and Native Americans in the three state region are very grateful. Now, construction dollars are needed.

Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget overruled Indian Health Service's FY2000 budget request for the first phase of construction, so there was no request by the Administration. Once the design is completed, it is important to begin funding for the first phase of construction without a delay. If there is a time lapse between completion of design and construction, it is very possible that costs will increase, making this project more expensive. That is why this appropriation action at this time is so critical.

In closing Mr. Chairman, this Member wishes to acknowledge and express his most sincere appreciation for the extraordinary assistance that Chairman REGULA, the Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee staff have provided thus far on this important project.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to congratulate Mr. REGULA, the Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, for his fine work on this legislation. However, I would also like to pay tribute to a provision within this legislation on the Pacific Crest Trail.

The Pacific Crest Trail is a marvelous stretch of land that runs from California, through Oregon, and into Washington state. Established in 1968, this trail operates over 2,650 miles with a large portion of that land owned by the Federal government through the Park Service, Forest Service, or BLM. However, nearly 300 miles of this trail are located on simple right-of-passage easements across public land or along public highways. The land along the highways, it should be noted, were never intended as permanent routes and today have become extremely hazardous for users of the trail.

It should also be noted that during the last 20 years, Congress has appropriated more than \$200 million to the Park Service to acquire private land for the Appalachian Trail, an effort that is now complete. During this same time period, the Pacific Crest Trail, managed by the Forest Service, has received a fraction of that amount for land acquisition. As I stated earlier, the 300 miles of trail that run along dangerous throughways are the result of this failure.

I am pleased to announce that Chairman REGULA has agreed with many of my California Colleagues that this trail needs to become a priority. I am pleased that he saw fit to include a line-item of \$1.5 million for this project in the Interior Appropriations Act. I am more pleased that the report language included will leave no doubt in anyone's mind of the importance that this project now holds.

I would like to thank Chairman REGULA on behalf of myself, my constituents, the many users of the Pacific Crest Trail for his leadership on this important issue.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment printed in House Report 106-228 may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a demand for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$632,068,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$2,147,000 shall be available for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150); and of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be derived from the special receipt account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l-6a(i)); and of which \$2,500,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2000 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to such Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred; in addition, \$33,529,000 for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program; to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than \$632,068,000, and \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities, and of which \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended, for coalbed methane Applications for Permits to Drill in the Powder River Basin:

*Provided, That unless there is a written agreement in place between the coal mining operator and a gas producer, the funds available herein shall not be used to process or approve coalbed methane Applications for Permits to Drill for well sites that are located within an area, which as of the date of the coalbed methane Application for Permit to Drill, are covered by: (1) a coal lease, (2) a coal mining permit, or (3) an application for a coal mining lease: *Provided further, That appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.**

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. McGovern:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 19, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 69, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$29,000,000)".

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to restore \$30 million in funding to the State-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and I disagree on this issue, but I want to thank him for his continuing graciousness as we take up debate on this important issue, and I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for cosponsoring this amendment and for their commitment to preserving open space.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has a proven track record and strong bipartisan support. It is based on a simple idea, that the receipts from nonrenewable public resources, like offshore oil and gas, should be reinvested into a renewable resource: public open space.

Now a trust fund was established over 30 years ago to meet the need for more open space. In that time, tens of thousands of park and recreation projects across the country have been funded. Ball fields, scenic trails, nature preserves, and historical sites all have been saved for future generations.

Unfortunately, in recent years, Congress has chosen to walk away from its commitment to States and local communities. While the Federal funding of the LWCF, which protects Federal lands, has been funded, the State-side program has been zeroed out. By failing to fund the State-side program, we are walking away from an important promise. This amendment proposes to help rectify that mistake by redirecting \$30 million in the bill to the National Park Service for the purpose of funding the State-side program.

This amendment offsets this modest step by reducing funding for the Energy Department's fossil energy research and development by \$29 million and for the Bureau of Land Management's transportation facilities and maintenance by \$1 million. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we should be arguing for much more than \$30 million. It would take literally hundreds of millions of dollars to restore the trust in the trust fund and gives States what they are owed. All we are asking today is a modest step in the right direction.

Critics will argue that the States should take up the slack, that they should fund these projects by themselves. After all, many States have large surpluses, so why should they not foot the entire bill? I would point out the States have been and will be part of the State-side program. The program is a partnership, as States and towns match every Federal dollar.

By passing this amendment, we will urge States to use more of their own money to fund these vital projects; we will help those States leverage money; we can help get open space preservation off the drawing boards.

That is why State and local officials across the country support the State-side program. Those opposed to this amendment should ask their governor, their mayor, their city counselor, their town manager if they support the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Ask them if they could use a little Federal help in preserving parks and open space.

Last year 10 States, 22 counties, and 93 towns voted on open-space initiatives. Almost 90 percent of these initiatives passed, triggering over \$5 billion in preservation spending. Clearly, America is saying something. It is time that Congress listens.

We have all talked about issues of sprawl and livable communities. We have all seen, often in our own congressional districts, space that was once open and green converted into a strip mall or a housing development.

Now is the time to do something about it. Kids in cities need safe green places to play in. Without safe, healthy parks they go home to school and back without ever interacting with a natural area, a few trees, some grass, and a place to explore.

Unused open space in a rural area is nature. Unused open space in a city is a vacant lot with garbage, glass, dirty needles, and crime. In the suburbs, family farms and woodland are being paved over, succumbing to the ravenous appetite of sprawl and development.

Time is running out. For every year we walk away from funding the State-side program, another park disappears, another open field vanishes, another healthy green space is lost forever.

This amendment, as I said, is supported by every major environmental organization in the country. It is supported by our Nation's governors, it is supported by our Nation's mayors, it is

supported by the National Association of Realtors. That speaks clearly to the broad support enjoyed by the State-side program.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort to reinstate the State-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to support a healthier environment for us all.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have to rise and object to this amendment. We are faced with \$15 billion in backlog maintenance in our parks, in our forests, and our other Federal agencies. In 1999 every State had a surplus. All States have a surplus. Forty-nine States had a surplus in 1998. It seems to me it is time for them to measure up in meeting their own needs.

The fact of the matter is they probably ought to send us some money to support our parks, because every national park, every national forest, every fish and wildlife facility, every BLM is in a State, and it is providing recreation. It is providing all kinds of benefits for the people of these States, and I think these facilities need additional support. The States should accept responsibility.

I can remember when there was a State-side program. A lot of the money went into golf courses, marinas, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other facilities of that type. I do not think it is the Federal responsibility to fund these programs for the States. They should meet their own needs. They have the money to do it with.

Thirteen States had a surplus in excess of \$1 billion in 1998. Twenty-one States had a surplus in excess of 10 percent over their annual funding. One State has three times what it needs to manage its annual budget. Yet here we are talking about sending out some of the desperately needed money that we should use for additional land acquisition, where we have inholdings in our parks; to meet the maintenance needs of our parks; to do a responsible job of managing these parks.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think that the States should take their own responsibility and use their surplus funds to meet their needs, because many of these programs are coordinated with the Federal facilities, and certainly it is something that they have the resources to do that with. The responsible position on this amendment is to vote "no," to retain these funds for the Federal challenges that we have.

And, of course, the offset is fossil energy. This is an important program. The fossil energy program guarantees our future in terms of energy. Just this week it was announced that the price of gasoline was going up. How do we know there will not be another OPEC crisis? In this bill we are trying to provide the resources to DOE to ensure that that does not happen. If the States are to continue that kind of prosperity that is giving them these huge bal-

ances, they need to have a strong economy. A strong economy is built on energy all across the board. And to take a bite out of fossil energy research is certainly shortsighted in this day and age, because we have no idea what the needs will be.

Our energy programs are not only useful in terms of developing new techniques to use the resources we have, coal, natural gas, and the other types of energy that is part of the ownership of the United States, but these programs also generate jobs in the United States because we sell this technology to other countries. China, with 1.2 billion people is very energetically trying to get into the 21st century, and they need power. They need to use their coal resources. They will buy the technology that we develop in our fossil programs. That is good for America and good for jobs.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned we take a bite out of the fossil fuel research and development account. My bill takes \$29 million from an account that is in excess of \$360 million. That is 8 percent, \$30 million to go to help preserve parks, to help preserve ball fields and recreational areas for our kids in cities and suburban areas.

We all talk about livable communities, and \$30 million is not that much. Quite frankly, as I said, we should be asking for much more than that, given the promise this Congress made to the American people.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is right, it is not that much. Spread over 50 States, it would barely make a dent. About all we would get done is hire the people to administer the funds. I think it is unrealistic to think about \$30 million, and yet it would cripple some of these important fossil programs.

Furthermore, we have to take care of the maintenance of what we have. We have a Federal responsibility. These funds are generated from Federal lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REGULA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, these are funds are generated beyond the 3 mile limit offshore. The States get the revenues from their own State lands, and they get the revenues from the first 3 miles from offshore.

We asked the National Governors Association to tell us how much the States collect in revenues from their own lands, and they would not tell us. They did not want us to know because that would be something that would not be terribly attractive when they are trying to get their hand in the Federal till.

But I also might point out that the States now get over \$600 million that they share with the Federal Government on royalties and payments to counties and so on. So keep in mind we are already doing a lot, and that coupled with their own State funds from their lands is more than the Land and Water Conservation Fund in total.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, \$30 million may not sound like a lot of money to some people in this chamber here, but it means a lot to some of the communities.

We are talking about towns trying to acquire land that may be only a couple hundred thousand dollars. And every State under this bill would get some money. The State of Ohio would get close to \$1 million. That money would mean a lot to a lot of communities trying to protect open space and park land.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the interior appropriations bill and in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member; and the members of the subcommittee have done an excellent job on the bill, and I applaud them for their efforts.

I am also pleased to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), in support of our amendment to offer additional funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

We in New Jersey see firsthand the benefits of natural resource protection. The citizens of my State have used our collective wisdom, I hope, to voluntarily preserve 40 percent, let me repeat, 40 percent of our land by the year 2010. The Garden State has a national reputation for making consistent efforts to preserve and protect our natural resources.

Between 1961 and 1995, New Jersey voters approved bond issues totaling more than \$1.4 billion to acquire 390,000 acres of open space to preserve historic sites and to develop parks. Last November, there was overwhelming voter approval of a \$1 billion open-space initiative.

□ 1615

Local citizens not only in New Jersey but on a national level keep making the argument that we are losing open lands to housing complexes, to shopping centers and that we need to do something to save our open spaces.

Today, we continue the fight to revitalize the Federal portion of the open space partnership. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, or what has been called the "cornerstone of American conservation and recreation," should be strengthened.

Our Nation is enjoying tremendous benefits from the LWCF. Since 1965,

the LWCF programs have provided New Jersey with over \$145 million in matching funds to acquire open space and develop recreational facilities.

America's favorite park is not one of those big parks somewhere else. America's favorite park is the neighborhood park that America can get to.

For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund supported the first county park to open in Hudson County, New Jersey, in nearly 80 years. It also helped us add nearly 650 acres to Jenny Jump State Forest and to develop Liberty State Park, one of our Nation's most historic attractions.

These tremendous benefits do not stop in New Jersey. LWCF is doing wonderful things across the country. We can make preserving our open spaces a priority, but we need to preserve land. And the need to preserve land exceeds the supply of State and local funds. That is why we must restore the Stateside funding for LWCF. It would help us to acquire lands across the United States that are truly of national significance, from our precious coastal areas in California to the New Jersey highlands region.

It would help our Nation continue to develop urban waterfront parks, a vital part of restoring cities. And each State's growing partnership in preservation with local governments and nonprofit agencies would benefit from a restored Stateside allocation.

Across the United States, local governments are leading the way in the preservation of lands and natural resources, but they need Federal help to build on and complement what the States are already doing. This money could be used to protect our Nation's shorelines, to reduce pollution, to preserve open land, to increase recreational opportunities, and to maintain wildlife.

We are doing our part in New Jersey. Now we are asking that the Federal Government join us in our partnership by restoring Stateside funding for LWCF.

New Jersey's commitment to open space protection has helped increase awareness for environmental concerns throughout the country. We must take action today to protect open space and to provide outdoor recreation facilities across the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment for Stateside funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

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

Mr. Chairman, here is the story: The money comes from a fund. The fund was created out of the leases on offshore oil. And a compromise was worked out. The compromise was in 1965. The compromise said, since there is serious environmental questions about offshore oil leases, nevertheless, there is a serious energy need. We are going to allow those offshore leases

outside the State boundaries, but the money is going to go to create, maintain, preserve environmentally sensitive areas both on the coast and elsewhere.

That was the compromise. That was the quid pro quo which led to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The problem was that the exact expression of the compromise was not written into law and, as so often happens in the Congress of the United States, understandings that were reached at one time that were not reduced to the precise words of the statute were forgotten. As happened ever since we began the process of using trust funds to fund our deficit, the Land and Water Conservation Fund built up; and year after year, we used it just like we did the Social Security trust fund, to make the deficit seem smaller.

That is the story. That is what has been happening.

Now, we are all very proud of the fact that we might be coming to a point where we need not actually any longer borrow from the Social Security trust fund. In fact, we still do borrow from it. I think all of us remember last year we dealt with the borrowings from the Highway Construction trust fund and we said that was wrong, we should not continue to borrow from that trust fund for general revenue purposes to make the deficit seem smaller.

And any colleagues will remember that this year we finally got around to deal with the Airport trust fund, the fund that was created out of the fees charged to airline passengers that that money would not simply be used as a general slush fund to make the deficit seem smaller but that, in each case, we would use the money that we raised from the American people for the purpose that we said we were intending it when we imposed the tax or the charge or the fee in the first place.

So if that is the Social Security, we will put it away in a lock box for social security purposes only. If that is the Airport trust fund, it would only be used for improvements in safety in airports. If it is the gas tax, it would only be used for improvements of our interstate highway system and those systems that connect to it. In other words, keep the promise.

In the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we have not kept the promise. This fund generates over \$900 million each year, this year in particular, and yet we are allocating just over \$200 million for its intended purpose, the acquisition and the preservation of Federal lands.

At this point, I should say, and I should have said at the very start, I have nothing but the highest regard for the chairman of the subcommittee. He has always been very honest and forthright in his dealings with me. And I know that he personally would like to see more money available for the Federal component of preservation, acquisition, enhancement of our natural treasures.

I agree with the chairman that we are underfunding our parks and maintenance thereof. I totally agree with him. I just wish we could find more money for that purpose. But what I do not think is right is to continue a process of using money raised for one purpose for another in order to make the deficit seem smaller. We should not be borrowing, essentially, \$700 million out of the \$900 million that are raised from these offshore oil lifting fees for purposes that were never intended. They are going into the general revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee to engage him in a colloquy if he would like.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague, he understands that we have a moratorium on drilling in the Federal waters offshore California that would normally be generating these revenues?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. REGULA. So I think it is a little bit out of place in a sense for California to want this money.

But, aside from that, am I correct, this is not limited to the purchase of land by the States? They could build marinas. They could build swimming pools. They could build tennis courts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time just to respond, if my colleague believes in federalism, the States should control the priorities set for the resources devoted to the States.

I quite agree with the point of the gentleman that there ought to have been dedication of some of this money, if not all of it, to the Federal side. But I did not control the amendment this year. This year the amendment is a very small one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CAMPBELL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think the point the gentleman made, it is the "Land and Water Conservation Fund." Conservation includes taking care of maintenance. It means conserving the resources. We are using the money in this way. We did not use all of it to buy land, but we use it for conservation of our national resources.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may put a question to the gentleman in return. If I have this wrong, I stand ready to be corrected.

Is it not true that the fund raises \$900 million?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, and yet we are only devoting in the bill of the gentleman \$205 million to this intended purpose?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. But we are also spending a lot

of money on maintenance and conservation, which was part of the intent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman has very good purposes for the money. I just do not think it is the purpose intended in setting up this system.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was to preserve, to acquire, to maintain special land as a quid pro quo for allowing the lifting fee. And when we use it for other intended purposes, it is no different than using the Social Security trust fund or the Airport trust fund or the Highway trust fund.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think it depends on the definition of the gentleman of "conservation."

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words and speak in opposition to the amendment.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we are not against livable space; and we are not against parks. We wish that the authors of this amendment would have sat down and talked to some us who come from areas where fossil fuel is important, and we could have had a discussion with the authors to try to determine how we might have accommodated what they want to accomplish without hurting something that is incredibly important not only to our States and to our region but to this country and, in fact, to the world.

In December of 1997, I was in Kyoto when we passed the Kyoto agreement. I was not in favor of that agreement. I thought that we had made some errors. But I talked to some people from around the world that said, we need cleaner technology; we like what you are doing with cleaner coal technology; we like some of the things are you doing; there is a marketplace out there.

This committee has had to cut fossil energy research by over 20 percent in the past 4 years. To make further cuts at a time when the world is looking to us for new technologies so we can have cleaner air and more fuel efficiency is an irresponsible act.

The United States has large quantities of crude oil within our borders. I can remember the gas lines back in 1973, and I can remember the gas lines in 1979 during those Arab oil embargoes. For every barrel of oil that we produce in this country, we leave two barrels behind in the ground. We need to develop the technology.

I heard somebody mention earlier that we are only talking about 9 or 10 percent of the budget. I have not been in Washington, D.C., long enough to put the word "only" in front of \$30 million. This \$30 million would be crippling to what we are trying to do.

We just had the EPA saying that we are going to go to a particulate matter standard of 2.5 microns. That is going to require an even greater reduction in sulfur and nitrogen emissions. It is just a matter of fact. We have entire regions of our Nation, entire communities, where the workers who devel-

oped that coal, who mine that coal, who brought that oil out of the ground have given us cheap energy to build the economy that we have today. And now the authors of this amendment are causing us to say, because we do not want the States to be partially responsible for more livable space and for more park space and for reclamation of land, that we are going to tell those areas, the heck with you. You have already given us that cheap technology. We are walking away from you, we are turning our back, and we are going to take 10 percent of your money, and we are going to move it over here without having that discussion.

The electric utilities have already made dramatic reductions in their emissions. Sulfur pollutants have been cut in half from the 1990 levels. Our coal reserves in this country are equal to one trillion barrels of oil. At current consumption rates, we can fuel our economy for the next 250 years. Coal is the Nation's most affordable fuel for power generation. It is why the U.S. has the least expensive electricity of any free-market country. We do not want to have to balance livable space and park space and who is responsible for it against a significant portion of that research dollars. And, again, that is what the authors of this amendment are asking us to do.

DOE's research and partnership with industry has focused on technologies that permit us to use the full potential of fossil fuels without damaging the environment.

Some of us who come from, and I hate sometimes to use the word "rustbelt," but for those of us who come from the Northeast and the Midwest where we lost tremendous numbers of jobs, areas where coal was mined, where oil was discovered, where the coal industry and the steel industry have gone down and people have been laid off by the tens of thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands, we are trying to balance reclamation of those brownfield sites, reclamation of those inner city areas that could be used as parks, with the creation of jobs, with the keeping of jobs.

They are causing us now to make Sophie's choice, to decide whether or not we want to be able to reclaim those sites, whether we want to be able to promote livable space, and whether we want to kill what is left of those blue-collar industries that are still in our area.

We still, fortunately, mine some coal in Pennsylvania. We would like to be able to have more fossil fuel R&D so that we can continue to produce more coal and we can find a market for it.

□ 1630

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) said, and I associate myself with his remarks, we want to create future jobs of showing the world how they can better use those carbon-based fuels, whether it is oil, whether it is natural gas, whether it is coal, we can

take that technology and again creating a lot more jobs and new technologies here based on these old technologies.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It just struck me that we visited Mount St. Helens last week and they said that some of the ash from that disaster went all the way around the world and came back to Mount St. Helens. That illustrates how pollution travels worldwide. The point the gentleman makes is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) has expired.

(On request of Mr. REGULA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KLINK was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, it is not just the United States that needs clean energy technology but that the rest of the world have it because otherwise we pay the price along with their own people.

Mr. KLINK. I thank the gentleman. Reclaiming my time, I just want to make a few points.

The kind of research that is taking place with these dollars that they want to shift over, it is not that their program is not important but we are talking about research that would reduce pollutants to 10 times below current Federal requirements, that would boost power plant efficiency to almost double what today's capabilities are, from 33 to 60 percent, so that one power plant of the future can do the work of two of the world's power plants today.

If Members want to burn less coal, if they do not want to have to look at building more nuclear power plants and doing other things that may be distasteful, let us continue that kind of research. I just think that we could find a better way to do this. I think it is unfortunate the offset, again that you are making us take Sophie's choice. I would request and ask all of the Members that are listening to this, Mr. Chairman, to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has a very simple purpose, to revive the State portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Under State law, law that has been in effect for 35 years, States are supposed to get a portion of revenues from offshore oil drilling to use for recreation and conservation projects. This amendment is a first step toward fulfilling that commitment which has been ignored over the past several years.

But this is not just a matter of fulfilling a commitment made to the

States and the public when we allowed offshore oil drilling. This amendment would revive a program that had a proven track record of providing recreational facilities for millions of American families. This is a program that truly improved the quality of life.

There is no shortage of appropriate opportunities for using this money. Every State has a backlog of projects that has been piling up in anticipation of this money being restored. These projects will provide parks and playgrounds and preserve sensitive lands that otherwise would be subject to development.

The momentum for reviving the State portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been growing this year as more Members have learned about the good that has come from this program. My own Commissioner of Parks and Recreation, Bernadette Castro, of New York, has been a real leader in the effort. The various bills to take the program off-budget and guarantee it a stream of funding are evidence of that newfound support. But those bills will not come up for some time and will probably not provide any money next year. We need to act now.

I do not envy the plight of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) who is dealing with a difficult hand because there are so many restrictions on what he can do. I would like to, if I could wave a magic wand, give him and the subcommittee more money to deal with, because I think they deal with it in a very responsible way. But this is a long-standing commitment. This is just an entry to restore a program that has served a very useful purpose.

We talk a lot about family values. What is more important to the family than having these magnificent parks and recreational areas so that they together can enjoy a good life.

I urge support of the amendment. I want to thank the chairman and the subcommittee for being very thoughtful and deliberative in the process. I would point out to the distinguished gentleman that there are some who want to do away entirely with the clean coal technology program under the theory that if we do away with it, that is environmentally responsible because we are dealing with fossil fuels and we all know that they pollute a lot. I am not one who subscribes to that. I have worked with the gentleman as he well knows to protect the clean coal technology program and constantly improve it under the theory that if we have cleaner burning coal in the future, we are going to have a cleaner, healthier, safer environment for all of us.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Does the gentleman have any evidence that any of these 50 States that have surplus balances have given some money to the local commu-

nities to build their tennis courts and swimming pools and marinas?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I only can say, reclaiming my time, what the Governor of the great State of New York, George Pataki, has done. He went to the people of the State of New York and asked them, he put his name and credibility on the line and he got passed, the voters passed, a \$1.75 billion environmental bond issue. That bond issue is used for a whole host of very worthy projects within the State of New York that helps improve the quality of life.

I just want to have this money which is earmarked for a specific purpose, a portion of it used for that specific purpose, because I think the families of America deserve improved parks, I know that is one of the gentleman's primary objectives, and recreational areas. I think we can make a dent in it by what we do here by voting for this very important amendment.

Once again, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

This amendment has a very simple purpose—to revive the state portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Under federal law—law that has been in effect for 35 years—states are supposed to get a portion of revenues from off-shore oil drilling to use for recreation and conservation projects. This amendment is a first step toward fulfilling that commitment, which has been ignored over the past several years.

But this is not just a matter of fulfilling a commitment made to the states and the public when we allowed off-shore oil drilling. This amendment would revive a program that had a proven track record of providing recreational facilities for millions of American families. This is a program that truly improved the quality of life.

And there is no shortage of appropriate opportunities for using this money. Every state has a backlog of projects that has been piling up in anticipation of this money being restored. These projects will provide parks and playgrounds and preserve sensitive lands that otherwise would be subject to development.

The momentum for reviving the state portion of LWCF has been growing this year as more Members have learned about the good that has come from this program. The various bills to take the program off-budget and guarantee it a stream of funding are evidence of that new-found support. But those bills will not come up for some time and will probably not provide money next year. We need to act now. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment and urge its adoption. I listened very carefully to the comments of my friend from Pennsylvania and

understand very well his concern about the fossil fuel research and development program that is being used as an offset for the proposed \$30 million to be directed to the state-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I know that a number of my friends and my mentors from Pennsylvania have a concern about this amendment because of the offset.

It is only a partial answer to say to them that the offset represents 8 percent, certainly not a majority, 8 percent of the fossil fuel funding. A better answer, I believe, is that this amendment is not about fossil fuel research and development. As everyone knows, budgetary rules require us to have an offset. This is about restarting the state-side part of the land and water conservation program. If the fossil fuel program is as good as they say, and I have the belief that if it is as good as they say, then funding will be restored, funding will be provided. They currently receive \$360 million for the fossil fuel program, and the state-side part of the Land and Water Conservation Fund gets zero.

If Members believe in the development of parks at the State and local level, if they believe in the development of recreational opportunities at the State and local level, we must pass this amendment to get this program back into business, and the fossil fuel programs supported by my very good friends will certainly attract their own level of support.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been the most successful of all Federal programs to direct Federal funding toward the acquisition of open space and parkland and to develop recreational opportunities. It is premised on very sound notion that when the nonrenewable resources on the Continental Shelf are developed for profit, that some share of that generated wealth should be given back to the Federal Government and the State governments to enhance recreational opportunities. It is the State part of that equation for 5 years that has not been funded at all. That is what we are trying to generate funding for through this amendment. These recreational opportunities are really the workhorse of our recreational opportunities in this country.

The programs to be funded by this State and Federal share would not be the parks with the grandeur of the Tetons or the vastness of Yellowstone but they would be the parks and recreational opportunities that people would use every day, the ballfields, the local parks, the swimming pools that all Americans need access to and that all Americans use. Even if they cannot afford a vacation out West, even if it is not accessible for them to go to Yosemite or Grand Teton, they can use these local recreational opportunities. That is what we are trying to restore. This State aspect of the Land and Water Conservation Fund worked well for a number of years although the entire

fund has not been allocated the funding that it deserves, but for the last 5 or 6 years the program has not received funding at all.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement and rise in support of this amendment. This is a good amendment. This is a good bill. It does not have all the baggage on it that some of the bills have had in past years with regards to taking one step forward and two back. I commend the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member for their work.

On this particular topic, I think that this is an improvement, a modest improvement in this bill. This bill does not have enough money to go around, that is a problem we have to deal with through the 302(b) allocations and the budget caps that we have in place. The quicker we start facing up to that, the better off we are going to be.

But these dollars come, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has stated, from the Outer Continental Shelf and the fact is that we are pledged to take \$900 million from that, available until appropriated, for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and a goodly portion of that should be going to the States. The fact is this bill has nothing in for that. It has less than a third of the money being appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and a small portion of the Historic Preservation Fund. It is almost over a billion dollars that were pledged using up one resource and investing in another. While this research on fossil fuel is good in itself, the fact is that we have to have a balanced bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) has expired.

(On request of Mr. VENTO, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOEFFEL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on this and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN). I am pleased to rise in support.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would simply conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying it is critically important that we get this State aspect of the Land and Water Conservation Fund back into business so we can provide the matching funds to State governments to provide those local recreational opportunities that are so important to all Americans.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because of the cause that the authors of the amendment have championed but because where they intend to take their offsets from.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be disinvesting in fossil fuel research in this country. We should be reinvesting. Here in the United States we have between 250 and 300 years of a coal supply. That is more recoverable oil than the entire world has. That is correct. That is more than the entire world has in recoverable oil. We should not be disinvesting. We should be reinvesting.

I have the honor and privilege of representing the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), a clean burning coal that meets all EPA requirements, low in sulfur and high in Btu. We should be investing in alternative uses of coal.

I currently have a bill pending before the Committee on Ways and Means to supply incentives, tax incentives so that we can take advantage of technology that already exists, where we can turn waste coal and raw coal into gasoline and into diesel fuel. These are the types of things we should be doing with fossil fuel research.

There is research being done at Penn State and Wilkes and many universities all over Pennsylvania and West Virginia. We should not be cutting research in these funds. We are too dependent in this country on foreign oil already.

I say to my colleagues in the Congress, we go through this fight every year. Every year this program is attacked. It has been cut significantly over the years. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for the number that they have arrived at this year, protecting the research that is in this bill. I encourage all my colleagues to vote against this amendment. It is bad for Pennsylvania, it is bad for West Virginia, it is bad for Kentucky, it is bad for southern Illinois. We should defeat this amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment and add \$30 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund state-side program, a program that funds local community needs, such as purchasing land for parks within a city itself. These funds come from Outer Continental Shelf oil drilling revenues. They are intended to be funded by \$450 million annually for Federal land purchases and \$450 million annually for state-side purchases. However, we only see a small fraction of that money for those intended purposes.

Since its inception in 1995, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been invaluable in protecting wetlands, wildlife refuges, endangered species habitat and creating parks and open spaces as well as providing land for recreation.

□ 1645

Stateside has protected more than 2 million acres of recreational land and helped develop more than 27,000 basic recreation facilities nationwide.

This year the President asked for \$200 million for Stateside, but for the fifth consecutive year Stateside was zeroed out by the committee. It is time we invest in the Stateside part of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This could mean more than \$2.5 million for my State, California, and this amendment would mean a lot to most of the States in this Nation.

As our Nation grows, we must fund preservation because funding preservation is smart growth. If someone has land in one of my colleagues' areas, in their community, that could be purchased in their district for everyone in the district to enjoy, because I know I do, and I bet all of my colleagues do, actually, they should support this amendment. Open space preservation is smart growth, and it is a bipartisan idea that has generated great support across the Nation.

In the last election, there were 148 ballot measures from coast to coast regarding open space. Amazingly, 84 percent of these measures passed, showing the strong support that American people have for open space and for Stateside programs; and hopefully my colleagues will also support the Resources 2000 bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), H.R. 798, which would fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanently.

Please support the McGovern amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the McGovern-Campbell-Holt and Hoeffel amendment, and I rise also to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for the job that they have done with this legislation under very, very difficult circumstances; and those difficult circumstances are one of the reasons that this amendment is here.

I believe that this amendment is an improvement to this legislation. I think it is an important amendment, it is an important amendment about the future of our local communities, about the quality of life, about the recreational opportunities of our families and about the preservation of important lands and important assets that provide the quality of life that most of us want for ourselves and for our constituents.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a fund that was developed out of a bargain between the development of the offshore oil and the preservation of nonreoccurring assets in our com-

munities and throughout our Nation; and in the past, since 1965, we have appropriated some \$3 billion to local governments, States and local governments, to help them protect and provide and conserve these assets. They have matched that with an additional \$3 billion. That tells us the kind of priority that our local communities place upon this program.

But in 1995 it all stopped, it all stopped. One of the most successful programs that we have at the Federal level stopped. Since that time, if we were to put the money that this program was truly entitled to, there would have been an additional \$2.5 billion that would have then been matched by another \$2.5 billion, \$5 billion going into improve the quality of life and to protect and conserve natural resources and assets and local communities based upon the priorities of those local communities.

Many speakers have gotten up here and told about how their States have passed bond issues to help to do this. Local jurisdictions have added to their tax revenues, they have added on to their sales tax, they have added on to their gas tax to try and protect these resources, and this money flows into that in a partnership with not only those local governments but with foundations and private individuals and corporations and others that contributed. This money becomes a catalyst for billions of dollars that benefit our local constituents and our local communities; and it is a very, very important amount of money. It is very important in the sense that the opportunities are being lost in so many of our communities through rapid growth to kind of provide the kind of protection that is necessary so we can have open spaces.

Yes, it might include a swimming pool or two; and, yes, it might include a swimming lagoon on important rivers and important reservoirs in areas that are regional facilities. And it might include trails, and it might include a lot of assets that local communities believe are important if they are going to provide the kind of quality of life that attracts families, that attracts businesses and that allows communities to thrive and to have a thriving economy.

That is what this legislation was set up to do, but the oxygen has been cut off, the money has been cut off for no good reason. Because it was not about this being a bad program or an unsuccessful program or a wasteful program. It was just a decision that was made. And yet the law remains on the books. It says we are supposed to dedicate this money.

This is very similar to the debates that we are having with respect to Social Security and we had with the Highway trust fund. We told the people of America that this money in this fund would be used for this purpose. There is a lot of concerns now that the offset is SPRO, or the offset is one of the energy funds.

Well, let me tell my colleagues the Stateside Land and Water Conservation Fund has been an offset for everything else this government has wanted to do because the money has been pi-rated out of this fund and used for whatever purposes to make the deficit look smaller or for whatever programs the Congress of the United States wanted to do. We owe this fund billions of dollars, and here we have an effort by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) to restore \$30 billion for the next fiscal year so our communities can get on with improving the quality of life and protecting these assets. And as flush as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) will tell us the States are, I do not see people saying we are not going to send them PILT or we are not going to send them money, so this is about priorities.

But as flush as those States are, the list of projects that are essential and necessary to continue the growth; otherwise, do my colleagues know what they get? They get what we have in so many communities now, no growth, no improvements, no transportation improvements, because people see with congestion, the lack of quality of life, that they are not going to engage in that kind of economic growth.

This is one of the buffers that allows our communities to continue to be a decent place to live, a decent place to raise our children and to enjoy and to do business.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

(On request of Mr. REGULA and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the Land and Water Conservation Fund was reduced from 300 million to 25 in a Democrat Congress under the leadership of Mr. Yates, and I believe the gentleman in the well was a Member of the House at that time. I wonder how he felt about it at the time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I disagreed with it then, and I disagreed before that was done. I mean, I think that this fund, and, as my colleagues know, I have introduced legislation to provide for the full funding, the full funding on water conservation, half to the Federal side and half to the State side, and an overwhelming number of Members of this House of Representatives supported either my bill or Mr. YOUNG's bill to do that because they are hearing from their communities and also hearing what my colleagues have been telling us about the backlog in national parks and national lands of this country that needs to be done there.

We have starved these funds. It has been a bipartisan effort to starve these funds. I am not blaming the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). He has come in almost at the end of the show where it is even more difficult to try to get his bill out of committee and meet the demands of this country. But that has been a bipartisan effort, but the time has come to reverse it. The time has come to reverse it, and this amendment is a modest step in the efforts to do that.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman would yield further, would the gentleman agree to lift the moratorium on offshore drilling in California so we could beef up the fund?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Why would I do that when the gentleman is stealing all the money?

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

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. This well-intentioned amendment would increase funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a goal I share. However, the programs proposed to be cut to offset this amendment are equally important and deserve another look.

By this amendment we propose to cut an additional \$29 million from the fossil energy budget, and my friend tells me that is only an 8 percent cut. Well, let me tell my friend this program has seen steady decreases over the past 10 years, decreases of 7 percent, 10 percent, 13 percent depending on the year. Eighty-five percent of our U.S. energy supply currently comes from fossil fuels. This figure is going to go up, not down in the coming years. By the year 2015, 88 percent of the energy we consume will come from fossil fuels. The important research the Department of Energy performs on oil, gas, coal and other fuels is entirely directed at making these fuels burn more efficiently and with fewer emissions. I think these are goals we all support.

The emerging renewables, solar, wind and geothermal, currently supply less than 1 percent of the energy needs in the United States. Research on this small share of our energy supply has increased greatly during the last 10 years, despite its relative unimportance to our energy supply. I am all too aware that the Green Scissors Report, among others, has severely criticized the U.S. fossil energy research program. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, every July the fossil fuel research program becomes a convenient whipping boy for legislators looking for budget offsets. Well, I am sorry to see that these criticisms take no consideration of the fact that renewable energy still supplies a very small percentage of our energy needs.

As we work together towards a future energy-use environment of cleaner,

more efficient fuels, we need to recognize that our energy supply, this country's energy habits, will not and cannot change overnight. Cleaner and more efficient means of accessing oil, gas and coal are sorely needed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would point out to my friends that the fossil energy program has been revamped and retooled in response to input from Congress over the past few years. The fossil energy program has shifted to focus on such exciting new technologies such as fuel cells which are clean burning, relocatable energy sources that fit perfectly into a deregulated power environment; the "Vision-21" clean power plant, which will combine existing technologies to greatly reduce emissions from our utilities; and gas hydrates, an exciting, hidden source of natural gas on the ocean floor that is estimated to offer hundreds or even thousands of times more reserves than all the existing fossil energy supplies combined.

Mr. Chairman, as our energy researchers have pursued this fundamental shift in response to congressional criticism are we governing responsibly and effectively if we continue to take ill-considered cuts out of this program? Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, and I want to salute my colleagues that have written it and brought it forward to us. I think that they have done a very, very important task for us and this is a very important debate.

Before I talk about the amendment and why I think it is a prudent one, I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), who has been faced with enormous challenges, a budget that does not match it, but I think a heart and a mind that has stretched to do magnificent things in our country. He is absolutely right that we are not committing the kind of resources that we should to the conservation and the protection of the lands that we are already responsible for. So in no way do my comments or should my comments be thought of as being critical of what he has done, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate his leadership and what has come from it.

When the Congress created the Land and Water Conservation Fund in 1964 to purchase land and water resources for the creation of open spaces and local and national parks and recreational areas, the Congress then took an enormous important step. One of my distinguished colleagues came to the floor earlier and said, this is Sophie's Choice. It is not. Sophie's Choice is a movie with a marvelous actress in it. This is not Sophie's Choice. This is about the Congress stepping up and really keeping at least part of her word from 1964.

□ 1700

Thanks to that congressional act, nearly 7 million acres of parkland are now protected, and over 37,000 State and local park and recreation projects have been created.

I cannot think of an action that the Congress has taken that meets with the success of this. This is one of the most meritorious cases in our Nation. In my district alone, with one of its great values being the environment and the protection of parklands and open space, nearly 8,000 acres have been preserved since 1964. In fact, it is an area that is one of the envies of our Nation because so much has been protected.

When we enacted the Land and Water Conservation Fund to an authorized level of \$900 million, we continued to fund the program, but not at the levels that we had originally promised. In fact, they have gone lower and lower, and we have continued to divert funds away from land and water and conservation, and that is what this amendment tries to repair in a very small way today.

I think we should take the next step by fully and permanently funding the Act. My good and great friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), along with many others, seeks to do that. I am proud to cosponsor the Resources 2000 Act.

Today we are looking for just a small step. The Miller bill is the final big step. Of course, we know he wears a very large shoe, and that shoe would accomplish a lot if that step were taken. So I support this because I think it is important.

It is not only important because we see what it has done, but we know, as Auntie Mame said, that we have miles to go and places to see in our country. This is an act that gives our local governments and our State governments the right kind of leverage. It attracts, it becomes a magnet for private funds, and it is one of the ingredients for one of the greatest recipes of success in our country.

Going to our parks, I have been very fond of saying, is one of the cheapest vacations for the American people. We want them at all levels. Everyone cannot get to Yosemite. Everyone cannot get to a national park. So let us move on and take a small step of Congress reestablishing her word, the word that was established in 1964, and take this important step today by embracing this amendment. It is a great one, it is a good one. It will do good things for our country.

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

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment which would provide the funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund stateside matching grants program.

If I may begin first by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for the attention they have given to a number of Members who have concerns for some of the projects that are State and local in orientation, I know it has been a difficult task, and everyone has pointed that out, that the money is just not there to certainly fund all these programs. So I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the effort they have made.

By the way, I want to thank the staff, as well. For the most part, in every discussion we have had, the staff has been very willing to discuss options and try to help those of us who are interested in trying to provide some of those projects which are park-related to our constituents back home.

For someone like me who has nothing but an urban setting in his district, I am completely urban, I have nothing but L.A. city territory, I have a concrete forest that I represent, it is difficult sometimes to accommodate the needs, especially the green needs, of my constituents.

Let me give a quick example. While we are spending in this appropriations bill for the Department of Interior approximately \$1.7 billion for the National Park Service, \$1.2 billion for the Bureau of Land Management, and \$840 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service, no money is being allocated at this stage for stateside matching grant programs under the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

For someone like me, that means the following. About 3 years ago I attended a middle school in my district. I asked what I thought was a pretty natural question. We were talking about the environment. I asked some of the kids in this class of about 30 kids, when was the last time they were at the beach. Los Angeles is right next to the beach. I was surprised when no one raised their hand.

I asked, well, how many have been to the beach? And we are talking about kids who are in their teens. About three of the 30 kids raised their hand. I am talking about kids who live no more than 20 miles from the beach. Most of these kids had never been to the beach in Los Angeles.

The closest State park to me is about 45 miles away. The closest national park is more than 60 miles away. Most of these kids have never been to either one of those, and they have not even been to something as close to them as the beach in Los Angeles.

It is difficult for some of our communities sometimes, especially in our very urban settings, the inner cities, to have opportunities to let kids understand what it is to see wildlife, to see nature in progress. For many of us, it is important to be able to help.

There is a project in Los Angeles right now which could use funding from the Stateside matching grant program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In fact, it is a program, a project that right now has a

public and private partnership underway where right now the city of Los Angeles, the State of California, and the business community, along with community groups, have come in and provided 85 percent of the money they need to get a local park going so people can use it.

There is a park in a hilly area of Los Angeles which few people know about and use. If we can get this funding at the Federal level to help just a little bit more, we will be able to help thousands of inner city children who do not have access right now.

I know it is tough and I know the chairman and the ranking member have tried, but this is an amendment that will provide a meager amount, \$30 million of the billions that we will be spending, on something that is so valuable, especially for kids who sometimes do not have access to any of this.

It is a worthy amendment. It came close to passing last year. I hope we have success this time around, because ultimately what we are talking about here is not some big national park or some big local park, we are talking about the smaller projects that reach really close to home where kids could ultimately use these facilities.

If we do not do it, again, we are going to deny these children not just the opportunity to play and recreate, but the chance to get a better sense of what it means to know the greater part of the country and nature as well, because too often, in the inner cities especially, many of these kids grow up not knowing anything but concrete buildings.

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

Mr. Chairman, I see this conversation this afternoon as an effort to restart an important discussion. It is about keeping faith with our commitments with the States, keeping faith with the needs and the programs that they have.

As the gentleman from California mentioned a few moments ago, we rightly owe billions of dollars to the very States under the terms of the 1964 act. There are, indeed, other reasons. Not every State with a surplus, for instance, is responding in a way that deals with the park and recreation and open space needs.

In my own State, I am ashamed to admit, despite the strongest economy in anybody's memory, despite having perhaps the strongest one, in fact, for 2 years running we had the strongest economy in the country, and despite having a large ballot measure majority in support of parks and open space, I am finding our State legislature backing money out that has been approved by the voters, in efforts to shift it elsewhere.

So there are lots of reasons, lots of variations around the country that I have seen as I have worked with communities across the country dealing on livability issues.

But there is something else going on here. There is a massive grass roots ef-

fort where citizens at the State and local level are seizing control. In 1998 there were 184 initiatives on the State and local level. Eighty-seven percent passed, usually with overwhelming majorities. Citizens understand, in the words of our chairman and the ranking member, that it is important to invest in this timeless legacy. The time is now.

There are very complex and intricate funding packages that we are seeing developed across the country that have State funds, that have local funds, that have Federal funds under enhancements and transportation. We have land trusts. We have individuals coming forward, foundations. It is exciting to see people step forward to try and fill in the gap at this critical time and meet this critical need, sometimes moving past the politicians.

This \$30 million is critical, not just because it will leverage literally hundreds of millions of dollars across the country. It is important because it restarts the discussion here about keeping our commitment with the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I think it is going to be the start of something that is very big.

As we discussed at the initiation of the debate on this bill, we want to start the discussion of the budget with a 50-year vision for this country. Everybody in this Chamber knows that we are going to add money to the budget process before we get out of town at the end of the fall, or the summer, or whenever we are finally set free. We are going to add more money. Everybody knows it.

Voting today to keep our commitment to the States, to the localities, to this massive national grass roots movement to try and restore our legacy, is going to give leverage to our subcommittee to be able to fight the good fight, and it is going to give heart to people across the country who are working to try and make their communities more livable.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to share my biases.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be more comfortable if the State of Oregon, which had a surplus balance in 1998 of \$15 million, had spent some of that on local projects? And secondly, would he be more comfortable if this amendment were limited to land purchases and not marinas and tennis courts and swimming pools and any of the other things that they might find desirable?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. As I attempted to make clear, I am embarrassed that my State legislature has broken faith with the voters of Oregon by taking away money that they just approved at the ballot box and using it for other purposes.

So I feel that there is a very mixed record on the part of States. That is

why I support efforts of the Committee on Appropriations to have appropriate guidelines for the disbursement of Federal funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has expired.

(On request of Mr. REGULA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy under the leadership of this subcommittee to look for ways to provide more explicit guidelines to help make sure that we get the most bang for the buck.

I would be loathe, however, to tell some States and localities that have very particular needs for park and recreation that they could not have the restoration of a marina or for some type of open space.

I think we have seen dramatically different projects emerge as a result of this grass roots effort. I think it looks different than some of the things that frankly would raise my eyebrows from a few years ago.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was critical of the legislature for taking the money back, but I would have to point out that if this were to be done on a substantial scale, we ought to take it out of the 378 national parks. It has to come from somewhere. I know initially it is possible, but in setting up priorities, it could very well come out of parks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I just wanted to say that I think it is an inappropriate choice to cannibalize our national parks to keep a commitment that we have to State and local governments for their half of this fund.

I will work with the chairman, with the ranking member, as hard as I can to make sure that the gentleman has adequate resources to invest for the future without making a foolish decision to shortcircuit the next half century of preserving these great national treasures.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment, but first to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for bringing to this floor a very good bill, and given the constraints they were under, bringing to the floor an excellent bill.

Focusing on the amendment, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of today's session I had a chance to watch the floor. There, Member after Member rose to praise the women's soccer team that won the World Cup, to praise our heroes more eloquently than I can here, Michelle Akers, Mia Hamm, Brandi and Briana, so many who filled us with pride.

But will that praise merely be empty symbolism, or are we actually willing to do something? Are we just going to talk about what sports mean to our kids, about teamwork and confidence-building, or are we going to do something?

□ 1715

We who praise what this woman's soccer team has done, to make sure that girls as well as boys fill the clubs, fill the teams and are out there playing sports rather than being distracted by the latest splatter video game or experimenting with sex and drugs and violence, we who are so good at rhetoric need to put this Nation's money where our mouth is.

Likewise, we have to keep faith with the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We promised the people of this country over 20 years ago that the funds obtained from offshore oil drilling would go to preserve open space in our Nation, across the country, for our national parks and also in the State-side program for recreation.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this amendment has been criticized because it means an 8 percent cut to coal research. But, Mr. Chairman, we have had not an 8 percent, not an 18 percent, but a 100 percent cut in the State-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. If this budget has got to be this tight, certainly the damage or the tightness or the inability to spend should be spread more equitably and \$30 million should be found for recreation.

Mr. Chairman, most juvenile crime takes place between 2 p.m. and 8 p.m. What we need are supervised after-school activities, especially sports which build teamwork and which build confidence.

Mr. Chairman, in Montgomery County, for example, there are 1,000 soccer teams trying to play on a hundred fields. In Ft. Lauderdale there is a waiting list of a thousand kids waiting to play soccer. I had the chance to visit the grand opening of the new AYSO headquarters in the Los Angeles area, and everyone there involved in youth soccer said and asked just one question: Mr. Chairman, where will the children play?

The answer is to be found in this bill. It is time for us to expand the recreation facilities available to our youth and to have a vision of tomorrow's kids that involves teamwork outside and not splatter video games inside.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also rise today in support of the amendment of my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) to add \$30 million to the State-side funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is a critical program to communities such as mine where our natural and human resources, in this case our youth, are both in jeopardy.

The funding provided by this amendment will give a tremendous boost to the efforts of our local communities to provide recreational outlets to our young people. Sadly, for the fifth year in a row the Interior Appropriations bill has not provided funds for this program.

Mr. Chairman, the development of new recreational outlets is overwhelmingly supported and needed by our constituents. In my district, the commissioner of parks and public lands has repeatedly called upon me to seek such funding as is found in the increase in the State-side funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

While some do, as we have heard not every community has a large surplus to spend. But even for the communities that do, it is time for the Federal Government to step up to the plate and do something positive for our young people and our communities, and it can do this through providing this funding.

I also want to take this opportunity to join my colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) in urging that all due consideration be given to the needs of all of the U.S. insular areas. While many of the districts of my colleagues are experiencing good fiscal fortunes, the non-State areas of Guam, American Samoa, and my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, are experiencing very tough financial times.

While our local governments are working to do all that they can to reduce spending and get our budgets balanced, we still need the assistance of the Federal Government if we are to be successful.

It is unfortunate and the cause of great concern when the needs of one insular area is pitted against the other, forcing us to choose between accepting financial help at the expense of another sister insular area. I urge the members of the subcommittee to be mindful of this fact as we go forward in crafting the final version of the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and urge my colleagues to support this modest \$30 million allocation for state-side Land and Water Conservation funding.

Since its inception in 1964, the LWCF has been an American success story, enjoying support from both Republican and Democratic administrations.

For the past five years, however, this House has ignored the needs of states and communities that want to preserve open space. Cutting out State-side LWCF funding has handcuffed communities that want to purchase athletic fields, preserve historic sites, and ensure public access to pristine wilderness.

In Maine \$32 million of state side funding has supported more than 700 projects—from the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, to Wolf's Neck Park, to the Deering Oaks Playground.

Today, the need for state-side funding is greater than ever. In just the past year, more than four million acres of Maine's ten million acre north woods has changed hands. Much of this land, which has traditionally been held by Maine-based companies, is now in the hands of out of state and multi-national corporations. A lack of funding has prevented the state from taking full advantage of the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to protect more of Maine's most valuable natural resources.

The Maine state legislature, with strong bipartisan support, recently approved a fifty million dollar bond package for land acquisition. But to have a significant impact, these funds will have to be matched with private and federal dollars.

State-side funding is absolutely critical for Maine, and communities throughout this country, to achieve their land preservation goals.

It's time for Congress to right the wrong of the past five years and fulfill its promise of funds for states and communities to preserve open space.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and empower local communities to preserve their natural resources for generations to come.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, as co-chair of the House Livability Communities Task Force I strongly support the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. McGOVERN.

Over the past several months I have been receiving letters from city and town planners, mayors, and town council members across Rhode Island expressing the importance of the Land Water Conservation fund to their communities.

Since 1966 the LWCF has provided more than \$33 million, in grants, to the State of Rhode Island to preserve and protect open space and parks.

These funds have been used to make improvements to state beaches, in particular Misquamicut, Roger Wheeler, and East Matunuck all of which attract tourists from across New England.

The LWCF has also played a key role in the development of the State's park system. It is likely that without the LWCF Colt State Park, Lincoln Woods State Park, Fort Adams State Park and Goddard State Park would not exist as we know them today.

This amendment would provide the State of Rhode Island with approximately \$308,000 for projects this may seem like a small amount of money but I can tell you from experience that money would go a long way to making improvements in Rhode Island's communities.

As a landscape architect, in both my professional and public careers I have seen first hand how these funds improve our communities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the McGovern amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation and hazardous fuels reduction by the Department of the Interior, \$292,399,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$9,300,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: *Provided*, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the "Fire Protection" and "Emergency Department of the Interior Firefighting Fund" may be transferred and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., Protection of United States Property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended without further appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums recovered from or paid by any party are not limited to monetary payments and may include stocks, bonds or other personal or real property, which may be retained, liquidated, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary and which shall be credited to this account.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, \$11,100,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901-6907), \$125,000,000, of which not to exceed \$400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than \$100.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to tell the Members that the plan is to roll any votes on amendments to about roughly 6:30 to 7 o'clock. Then the votes will occur on whatever amendments are pending. And we may continue some further action tonight, but there will be no more votes after that block that we do at that time.

So for purposes of planning, Members can count on that as being the format for the rest of the day.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 6, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 69, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this tripartisan amendment is supported by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK). I should mention that last year a similar amendment passed this House by a vote of 241 to 185.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the very serious problem of underfunded mandates. It is an issue that we have heard a whole lot about in this body, of forcing citizens in close to 1,800 counties and 49 States to pay more in local property taxes than they should be paying because the Federal Government has fallen very far behind in its payment in lieu of taxes on federally owned land. In other words, the Federal Government is not paying its fair share and is doing a disservice to local communities all over this country.

Just as an example, in my own small State of Vermont, over 50 towns in our southern counties are affected: Bennington, Rutland, Addison, Windham, and Windsor Counties. This amendment addresses the overall problem of underfunded payment in lieu of taxes by increasing funding for this program by \$20 million from \$125 million to \$145 million.

Although this same amendment passed last year with broad bipartisan support, the conference committee only increased payment in lieu of taxes by \$5 million instead of the \$20 million increase that my amendment would have provided, which is why we are back this year.

Mr. Chairman, in real dollars, inflation-accounted-for dollars, PILT payments to counties and towns all across this Nation have been decreasing for a very long time. In real dollars since 1980, appropriations for payments in lieu of taxes have decreased by nearly \$60 million, a 37-percent decline in value.

And while this amendment will not rectify by any means the entire problem, it will at least allow communities around this country to know that we understand their problems and that we are making some real attempts to address those problems by appropriating this \$20 million. In fact, even if this increase is approved, it would still represent a 26.3-percent decline in value since 1980.

Mr. Chairman, I should add, and this is an important point, that the authorization for PILT today is approximately \$260 million, over twice the appropriation level. In other words, the authorizers understand the problems facing the communities all over this country; but unfortunately in recent years for a variety of reasons, the appropriation process has not followed suit.

Mr. Chairman, the PILT program was established to address the fact that the Federal Government does not pay taxes on the land that it owns. These Federal lands can include national forests, national parks, Fish and Wildlife refuges, and land owned by the Bureau of Land Management. Like local property taxes, PILT payments are used to pay for school budgets, law enforcement, search and rescue, firefighting, parks and recreation, and other municipal expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the important point has to be made. In recent years in this body, there has been a lot of talk about devolution, a lot of talk about fiscal responsibility, a lot of talk about respect for counties, towns and cities. And yet what we are saying after all of that talk is, gee, we do not have to pay our bills. We talk about respecting local governments, but yet we do not have to own up to the fact that we owe them substantial sums of money.

I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is operating under real budget restrictions, and I happen to believe that we should do away with those budget caps and address many of the issues that we face. But I think when we deal with basic priorities, how do we talk about devolution and then turn our back and then say oh, yes, we will continue to owe counties, cities, and towns substantial sums of money?

Mr. Chairman, the \$50 million that we are using for these purposes include \$20 million in payment in lieu of taxes and \$30 million for deficit reduction. Our national debt is still over \$5 trillion. This amendment begins to address that issue. The funds would be transferred and offset from the Fossil Energy Research and Development Program, a program we have heard a whole lot about in the last few minutes. But let me say this in regard to that program. Let me quote from the report of the fiscal year 1997 Republican, underlined Republican, budget resolution. And I quote: "The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SANDERS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this is the Republican budget. "The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars on research and development since the oil crisis in 1973 triggered this activity. Returns on this investment have not been cost effective, particularly for applied research and development which industry has ample incentive to undertake. Some of this activity is simply corporate welfare * * *."

This is not the gentleman from Vermont; this is the Republican budget resolution. " * * * corporate welfare for the oil, gas and utility industries. Much of it duplicates what industry is already doing. Some has gone to fund technology for which the market has no interest."

Mr. Chairman, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the beneficiaries of the fossil fuel program are some of the largest multinational corporations in the world including Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips Petroleum, ARCO, and Shell. These companies in fact are making large profits. They do not have to come to the taxpayer for all of this support.

So I think the time is now to be fair to communities all over this country, and I would urge support for this important amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is a temptation to dip into the fossil program. It is a little bit ambiguous. If this were the late 1970s, we would not have any such amendments. We would have amendments increasing the fossil research, because when people were sitting in gas lines in the 1970s, when schools were closed down, hospitals were suffering for lack of fuel, we could not give enough money for fossil energy research. Now at this moment we have an adequate supply, so some say let us not worry about next week or next year, just cut the programs. And then if we have another crisis, we will dump a lot of money in.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) one of the reforms we instituted is that on any of these programs, there has to be a match. We are not saying give them the money. That is what happened in the 1970s, when we shoveled money out with no requirement for matching funds. Now companies that want to do research on new fuels, California of course has reformulated gasoline which came out of the fossil program, they have to put up their own money to show that they believe in the program and that it is effective.

So I think to just take a cut at fossil is not the right policy for the future of this Nation. And I think some of the arguments that were made earlier are clearly along those lines.

We have reduced fossil by 20 percent over the 4 years of our watch in this

committee. At the same time, we have increased PILT funding by 23 percent. And I would point out that this bill is flat funded.

□ 1730

So if we go to PILT for more money, we have to do less for something else.

I understand that communities would like to have this money. But one of the things they do not take into consideration is that when we develop Federal facilities it energizes the visitor base, it energizes a lot of activity that does bring money into the communities other than just from PILT, because they have a lot of tourism, they have those kind of activities that are important to the communities that have Federal facilities.

It would be nice to put more money in PILT if we had more money. But given the fact that we have a very tight budget, given the fact that we had 2,000 requests for projects from the Members of this House, we have done the best we could.

We recognize that fossil research is important for the future of this Nation and to maintain energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me.

Once again, let me point out, I know the gentleman's job is a difficult job, and he has to balance a whole lot of needs.

I guess what I am arguing, and I am glad to hear that companies like Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips Petroleum, some of the largest conglomerates in the world, are contributing something into the program. I am glad to hear that.

But the bottom line is, do my colleagues not think these companies, many of them, are enjoying record-breaking profits? Do my colleagues not think they can pay for their own research and developments rather than stick it to local communities, many of whom have got to raise their regressive property tax to fund their basic needs? That is the only point that I would make.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is easy to pick out the big ones and point to them, but a lot of this money goes to very small companies that have innovative ideas. Every company started with an idea that one person had, whether it is Bell Telephone, Graham Bell or whomever. We find that most of this research is being done by small companies. They come up with their 50 percent. It is not easy for them to do it, but they believe in their ideas.

A very small amount, relatively, is going to the large companies. They are doing a lot of research on their own.

But my concern is that we as a Nation do not want to become dependent for energy on other outside sources. We are going to spend \$265 billion on defense. One of the most important elements of the defense of this Nation is

to be energy independent. We found out in the late 1970s what it means to be dependent, in that case on OPEC. They called the tune, and we had lines for over a mile at our gasoline stations. We are trying to avoid that by looking to the future.

We have cut it 20 percent over the last 4 years. At the same time, we increased PILT 23 percent. I have to say to the gentleman, I think that is responsible management, given the amount of resources we have.

I know it is easy to take a whack on the fossil program. We have a prior amendment that has taken a whack on fossil. It is becoming the bank for every amendment that comes down the pike because it is sort of easy to attack because it is hard to visualize the benefits of a program like fossil energy research.

But the State of the gentleman from Vermont, I am quite sure, is very dependent on outside sources for energy. He would want his State to be energy independent for his industry and his other base to have the energy it needs. So I hope that the Members will reject this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) for their hard work and diligence on this issue.

I would like to note that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of Subcommittee on Interior who is running this bill here today, has been a friend of the PILT program.

While it is true this appropriations bill is flat funded, it requires difficult choices between many worthwhile projects and many worthwhile programs. But our amendment here, this amendment I am pleased to cosponsor with my friends, is really an amendment to help one of our local units of government, the local folks all across this Nation. The gentleman is right, we have to make priorities. Today I am going to stand with local units of government and ask for an increase in the PILT spending.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor and strong supporter of this amendment, it would only restore desperately needed funding to the PILT program. Each year, thousands of counties across this Nation lose out on millions of dollars of property tax revenue simply because the Federal Government owns the land.

In my district, the Federal Government owns large portions of land. For example, approximately 70 percent of the land in Gogebic County is in the Ottawa National Forest and owned by the Federal government. Since the Federal government does not pay property taxes on its own land, the PILT program was established to compensate counties for land the Federal government owns.

Since its adoption in 1976, however, the PILT program has neither kept

pace with its authorized funding levels nor with the true costs of providing services in support of Federal lands. In fact, the PILT program is currently funded at less than half its authorized level.

Rural counties rely on PILT payments to provide essential services such as education, law enforcement, emergency fire and medical, search and rescue, solid waste management, road maintenance, and other health and human services. Without adequate funding for this program, rural counties struggle to provide these vital services.

Mr. Chairman, if the Federal government was required to pay taxes on the property it owned like any other individual or corporation, it would have been delinquent a long time ago for failure to pay taxes. The Federal government owned so much land in some of these counties, some school districts in my congressional district cannot even bond for school improvements, for school repairs or to build new schools because there is not a large enough tax base in the county for the bond marketers to loan them the money.

So this decision and the decision we will make here tonight goes a long way in not only trying to bring some equity into the PILT program but the effects are much greater than just simply government paying its share of taxes. It is allowing communities to exist, to make improvements, and to have an equitable economic base to exist.

The Federal government has decided that it is in the best interest of the Nation to own and protect certain lands. I do not think anyone would argue with that. What we are arguing here tonight, what our amendment says, is that we must not penalize our local communities because they have the good fortune to have the Federal government have jurisdiction over land within their counties. It is irresponsible for the Federal government to take these lands off the tax roll and then not provide just compensation.

Again, since 1976, the value of that program has shrunk by more than 50 percent. Mr. Chairman, this request is only for a small increase in the PILT program, but its impact and importance on the rural counties is large.

I urge my colleagues to cast a vote in favor of equity by voting in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues who have previously spoken about the amendment in offering our praise to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, for the consideration that he has given in providing the funding for payment in lieu of taxes. It is reassuring and comforting to know that the committee has time and again kept faith with county governments across this country in recognizing the obligation of the Federal government to

those areas of this Nation from whom land has been taken and put in public trust.

I understand the very difficult balancing act that the chairman has had to engage in. I was an original author with our former colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, Frank Evans, 25 years ago of this language. We started out with a provision that would have provided full tax equivalency, a great idea, great goal. I see the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) smiling about that, and I think he was, in principle, agreeing with us.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I can remember when Frank Evans offered the amendment in the Subcommittee on Interior that created PILT and was legislating on the appropriation. But I gather the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) did not object.

Mr. OBERSTAR. No, we did not object then.

A lot of things we do not object to legislating on appropriations bills, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio.

But we realized that that was not going to work when it turned out that one county with 1,500 people was going to get \$4.5 million under this bill. So we agreed to limitations. But we also thought that successive governments, successive administrations would agree to increase the funding to keep pace with inflation. That has not happened in 20 years.

What we are doing here is helping the committee with a reallocation of priorities within its jurisdiction. We are in no way criticizing or increasing the total dollar amount but saying this should represent an adjustment of priorities within the committee's jurisdiction.

One simple down-home example, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has already cited, Cook County, Minnesota, 900,000 acres, 9 percent is in private ownership. Nine percent of the land has to support 100 percent of the demands and 91 percent of the rest of the property. Three thousand six hundred people have to support all of that territory.

In the summer, there are 15,000 tourists that come into that area. Those tourism dollars do not pay for the cost of ambulances. They do not pay for the cost of emergency helicopters to go into the remote areas to rescue people who have been injured in canoe trips. They are not paying right now for the disaster that has swept through this area that I described earlier this afternoon with the July 4th storm that blew down 250,000 acres of trees, 6 million cords of wood on the ground now. This is going to be devastating for Cook County.

But they need this little bit of increase in funding to be able to meet the requirements of serving the public. They do not do it just in the summer

months. They do not do it just now and then. Every day of the year that county government has to, with only 9 percent of the land, provide 100 percent of the cost, and we have not given them the resources. They cannot develop those public lands. So this little bit of payment helps make the adjustment.

The investment that the county has made, I have looked at these funds over the years, Mr. Chairman, they invested in capital equipment. They invested in capital improvements, in facilities that served the public. They are not using this money to cover the operating costs of the county, in the case of Cook County, nor in the case of Lake County or Saint Louis County. They are making permanent capital improvements to better serve the public. That is where these dollars go.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman's remarks. I just mention to the Members that this amendment was endorsed by the National Association of Counties, by the Taxpayers for Common Sense, by Friends of the Earth, by the Rural Public Lands Council, by the Sierra Club, by U.S. PIRG, and by Public Citizen.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, just in conclusion, for all those who, and most of us do, support holding land in public trust for the use of all of our citizens, the common heritage of all Americans, these forest lands and park lands and wilderness lands, think of those who live on the perimeter whose lifestyles and livelihoods depend on that land held in public trust for all Americans and realize that, were they given the opportunity, they could have made some investments.

The payment in lieu of taxes helps replace the lost dollars. Support this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, last year two hundred forty-one of us voted for an amendment to increase Payments in Lieu of Taxes by \$20 million. Unfortunately, this addition for PILT was left out of the conference report.

This year we are again asking Congress to address the Federal Government's responsibility to help support local governments in areas where the Federal Government owns the land, removing it from the local tax base.

Federal landownership may not be as large an issue in my State of Kentucky as it is in others; however, for fiscal year 1998, local governments in Kentucky experienced nearly a \$70,000 PILT loss from the previous year.

I support fossil fuel research and development projects, as these investments help make our energy more efficient, affordable and clean. However, the standard rate of PILT payments is authorized to increase from \$1.47 per acre to \$1.65 for this fiscal year. Full appropriation to meet this amount would have to more than \$200 million at minimum.

This amendment to provide a 16 percent PILT increase helps us to begin to reduce the continued shortfall between PILT authorization and appropriations.

Kentucky county governments that receive PILT payments depend on these funds to help provide basic services, from education to waste removal.

Edmonson County in my district is home to Mammoth Cave National Park. With a population of just 11,000 and a per capita personal income of \$12,000, the importance of PILT payments to the continuation of county services at a bearable cost to the taxpayers can not be understated.

PILT funds help pay salaries and administrative expenses of the county. They help support a 24-hour ambulance service for the National Park, as well as county residents. Federal land control has contributed to the isolation of many areas in Edmonson County. When major transportation routes expanded, the county was bypassed, in favor of areas with a larger tax base to support the projects. Equitable PILT payments are needed to make up for the tax base Edmonson County has given up for the National Park.

The concerns of Edmonson County are not unique. As the Federal Government continues to place responsibilities on local governments, PILT increases are necessary to relieve taxpayers nationwide.

The Bureau of Land Management reports property taxes would provide local governments with \$1.48 per acre on average. PILT payments amount to just more than 17 cents an acre.

Last year's PILT payments were 54 percent less than authorized by the Payment In Lieu of Taxes Act. This law requires the Federal Government to compensate local governments as an offset in lost property taxes due to Federal ownership.

A majority of us voted to increase PILT payments last year. Please join me again in a vote to add \$20 million to PILT to help often-struggling rural areas provide vital services to their residents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94-579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, \$20,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant

lands; \$99,225,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY FUND

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 102-381, funds made available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities such as release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1 et seq., and Public Law 103-66) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under Public Law 94-579, as amended, and Public Law 93-153, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this Act by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys collected from each such action are used on the exact lands damaged which led to the action: *Provided further*, That any such moneys that are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which funds were collected may be used to repair other damaged public lands.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby

appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to \$100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigations, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, \$710,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, except as otherwise provided herein, of which \$11,701,000 shall remain available until expended for operation and maintenance of fishery mitigation facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers under the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan, authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, to compensate for loss of fishery resources from water development projects on the Lower Snake River, and of which not less than \$2,000,000 shall be provided to local governments in southern California for planning associated with the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$1,000,000 for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$6,532,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, for species that are indigenous to the United States (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsections (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii): *Provided further*, That of the amount available for law enforcement, up to \$400,000 to remain available until expended, may at the discretion of the Secretary, be used for payment for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activity, au-

thorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for environmental contaminants, up to \$1,000,000 may remain available until expended for contaminant sample analyses: *Provided further*, That hereafter, all fines collected by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for violations of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1362-1407) and implementing regulations shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, to be used for the expenses of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in administering activities for the protection and recovery of manatees, polar bears, sea otters, and walruses, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, sums provided by private entities for activities pursuant to reimbursable agreements shall be credited to the "Resource Management" account and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, heretofore and hereafter, in carrying out work under reimbursable agreements with any State, local, or tribal government, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service may, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 1341 and notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, record obligations against accounts receivable from such entities, and shall credit amounts received from such entities to this appropriation, such credit to occur within 90 days of the date of the original request by the Service for payment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:
Page 11, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,130,000)".

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we do not have a copy of the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington reserves a point of order.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard a debate over why we should transfer money out of clean coal technology to a fund that was designed for conservation and protection of land and environment.

□ 1745

And we heard several people say that we ought to live up to that commitment, that that is the purpose for that fund. And we are going to vote on that in a little bit. This bill, in conjunction with the rest of the bills, has just as much commitment that should be attached to it.

I wanted to take a minute first and say to the chairman and the ranking member how much I appreciate the cooperation that they have given us this year in working on this bill, in taking our suggestions towards savings and the collegial manner in which they accepted some of our ideas and did not accept others. I am appreciative of the hard work they have done and the attitude with which they have accepted some of our ideas.

The purpose behind this amendment is to show the disparity when we look at just administrative accounts for the Fish and Wildlife Service. This bill, as

it is presently written, has a 6.6 percent increase in administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service for a total of \$114.7 million. And out of this, the central administration, that here in Washington, is increased by 6 percent; but the regional administration, those areas outside of Washington, are increased by only 3.5 percent.

So what, in effect, this bill does, besides the fact that it increases at three times the rate of inflation the bureaucracy associated with Fish and Wildlife, not touching any of the programs but just simply the administrative portion of this, it increases Washington-based bureaucracy at almost twice the rate at which we give increased funds for administration outside of Washington. The committee also increases the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation by 16.6 percent and increases the international affairs administration by 32 percent.

There is no question we should adequately fund these organizations, but I think there is a legitimate question that should be asked, and there should be an explanation by the committee as to why a bureaucracy here in Washington needs an increase in its administrative costs of 6.6 percent when, in fact, our seniors who are going to receive a Social Security increase in terms of cost of living are going to receive somewhere around 1.8 percent.

So we are going to recognize that it takes 3½ to four times to do in Washington what we are going to recognize that is needed by the members of our society who are receiving Social Security, not to mention the fact that this money is going to come out of Social Security, this increase in spending.

So the real question is, are we going to increase bureaucracy costs at a rate far above inflation and at the same time take the money to do that from the Social Security fund; or can we not pare it back to a 2 percent increase? Can we not realistically ask the employees of the Federal Government to live within the constraints we are asking the rest of the country to live within? So the purpose of this amendment basically brings us back down to a legitimate cost-of-living increase in terms of administrative costs.

I understand that Federal employees are going to have a pay increase out of that, but that is not the far and greater portion of this increase. And I would compare also the increases that were in the House-marked bill with what the Senate has marked up. And when we look at the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, they gave them an 8.3 percent increase. We have given them a 16.6 percent increase. In international affairs we gave them a 32 percent increase and the Senate gave a 4.7 percent increase.

Overall, the Senate increased 4.9 percent the cost of administration of the National Fish and Wildlife administrative overhead budget, and we have done them one better: we have increased it

6.6 percent. So all we are asking is simply give the American people a justification of why we should have this kind of increase in the administration of this agency and at the same time not be able to fund adequately some of the things that those that are dependent in our society are so desperately in need of.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, one point I would make is that the Fish and Wildlife Service, as the gentleman knows, has been called upon here with an incredible number of habitat conservation plans all over the country, but particularly in the Pacific Northwest, California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. COBURN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would just say that there are requirements for them to have personnel. And I am very sensitive to what the gentleman said about the increase in personnel in the regions, because it is in the regional offices where most of these negotiations are under way; but there is tremendous pressure on them to be involved, for example at Pacific Lumber company on the big settlement in California, where they had to have people there who could negotiate with the State and with the private parties in order to reach these agreements, which involve thousands and thousands of acres of incredibly important habitat.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes my point. Why do we fund at a very small increase the district regional offices and we are doubling that amount for the bureaucracy here in Washington?

The point is there is no question they have a workload, and there is no question we have good employees in this agency. The question is can we afford at this day and time to grow the Federal bureaucracy here in Washington at a rate twice at which we are growing the regional bureaucracy.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would support the gentleman if we were taking the money from out of D.C. and transferring it to the regions. That is the point I was trying to make. But as I understand the gentleman's amendment, we are not doing that. We are cutting the overall amount of money rather than transferring it from D.C. out to the regions.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time once again, the gentleman's position is whether we are taking it out of there or not, he favors a 6.6 percent increase for the bureaucracy here in Washington at the same time he is limiting the regional increase to 3.5 percent?

Mr. DICKS. No, I am not saying that. I am just saying the Fish and Wildlife Service, and also people back here, are called upon all the time to make judgments about what the regions are doing on these plans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. COBURN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, one of the problems here is the private sector are the people who enter into these HCPs under the ESA, and they need to have somebody to deal with. Now, some of those people are in D.C. as well. These issues get raised up to the national level to be decided.

So I am just trying to explain that there has been a tremendous increase because of all of the listings under the endangered species act. I could tell the gentleman about my own area, of the salmon listings, the Marbled Murrelets, the Spotted Owl, and the pressure not only on Fish and Wildlife but NMFS as well to work with the private sector.

Mr. COBURN. I would be happy to support the gentleman if he would offer an amendment that would move the differences in the increase from Washington to the regional offices. I would support that.

I plan on withdrawing this amendment because I have another amendment to follow it that is much less severe and brings us back in line with the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COBURN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COBURN. If we are going to enhance the ability of the Fish and Wildlife to do their job, the best way we enhance it is at the regional offices and not in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I realize the gentleman has withdrawn his amendment, but I would point out a couple of facts, and that is that all we gave in the Washington office were for fixed costs, nothing more. There are no more people. It is a summary alignment that sort of distorted the numbers. So, in reality, we were just trying to get the fixed costs.

Also, I would mention to my colleagues that they have a wide range of responsibilities that do not always appear to most of us. When we were on the committee trip, we visited the forensic lab of the Fish and Wildlife

Service, one of the finest facilities in the world, and they are called upon to provide assistance in many areas other than the United States, and of course they are compensated.

They deal with the problem of illegal taking of species. We have a treaty, the so-called Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species, and 150 nations are signatory to this treaty. It involves preventing the importation of endangered animals. They work with the Customs Service, a very impressive facility to say the least. And that of course comes under the administrative budget.

It is something that most people are not aware of, and yet it is a very vital part of having responsible enforcement of the Endangered Species Act and to ensure that we are not getting contraband in terms of furs or in terms of ivory that puts a burden on species in other parts of the world.

So I am pleased that the gentleman is going to withdraw this amendment, but I did want to mention these things because it is part of the Fish and Wildlife Service that does not get a lot of attention, but which is very important in terms of preserving species that I think are valuable to all of society.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman explain why our large increase in the international affairs is a \$2 million increase in the budget for the administration of that one program and that is all here in Washington?

Mr. REGULA. I think I would respond to the gentleman by saying this is the program. It is not just administration. The number we have is the program. We had a lot of requests from Members on both sides of the aisle to give some additional assistance here.

I think, on balance, Fish and Wildlife has tried to be very responsible in the use of the monies we provide.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I am sort of sorry the gentleman withdrew his amendment because I share with him some concern about Fish and Wildlife, although I appreciate his doing that because I think that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the committee, as well as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), has certainly worked hard to develop a bill that can be acceptable both to the minority and to the Senate and to the administration.

My purpose in rising today is really to enter into a colloquy with the chairman and to remind him and to remind the minority that during the recent conference committee we had on the Kosovo monies there came an issue before the committee that we had ample votes to put forth and to attach to the Kosovo legislation and it had to do with an endangered species, the Alabama sturgeon.

If my two colleagues will recall that night, and Senator BYRD was there,

calling me a rock for standing by him on a steel issue and he stood by me too on this sturgeon issue, and I appreciate Senator BYRD's doing that, but I am sure that my two colleagues are going to be upset and so is Senator BYRD when he finds out that, contrary to what we were told that night, that if we would withdraw our amendment that Fish and Wildlife would not proceed further on the endangered species program; that they are on until such time as the Senate had an opportunity to have a hearing on this prior to October of this year.

Well, contrary to the promise that we got that night, that was given to the chairman and the ranking member, and was given to me and Senator SHELBY, Fish and Wildlife ignored what they told us and proceeded almost a week later with calling for a public hearing on the sturgeon situation in Alabama, and called it at a time when neither Senator SHELBY nor I or any other member of the Alabama delegation could be there to testify.

So contrary to the wishes of the conference committee that night, they just are pressing right ahead. They simply ignore what they told us they were going to do. And I am here to tell my colleagues that we are going to have to address this once again during this process.

Not today, but sometime during this process we are going to have to teach Fish and Wildlife a lesson that they cannot come before a conference committee of the United States House and Senate and tell us they are going to do one thing, have us withdraw some proposal that is presented before us, and then turn around and do just exactly contrary to what they promised us they would do and what they backed up with a letter from the head of Fish and Wildlife.

□ 1800

So, Mr. Chairman, I know that you have already cut Fish and Wildlife somewhat this year. We may have to go deeper than this. But this issue of the sturgeon is going to come back in this process because we cannot tolerate a Federal agency doing this to such a prestigious committee chairman as my colleague and his ranking member.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I have two comments.

First of all, we as a committee have a difficult time making judgments on listings because of hundreds of them, as my colleague well knows.

Secondly, we do have a meeting scheduled next week on the very issue brought up. I would like to invite the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) to come to that meeting. We will be in touch with him. I plan to be there. We will have people from Fish and Wildlife, and I think we should raise the very issues that my colleague has pointed out here today.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his comments.

The chairman is right, too. We cannot have this committee saying which species are going to be listed as endangered. And we did not ask that.

There is a 5-year study under way. We have found one of these endangered Alabama sturgeons that looks remarkably like the Mississippi sturgeon. And there are billions of them. But, in any event, we found one. We, through a grant from the U.S. Interior, have now established a program of breeding a sturgeon that looks like what they say is endangered. So we are right in the middle of a 5-year study.

Fish and Wildlife, knowing this, just suddenly decided that they wanted to go ahead and list it before we were successful in our endeavor. So I am not recommending that we start denying the Service the ability. All we asked for was a delay in order that we could have a hearing on this in the Senate.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, the meeting is scheduled for next Thursday. I was there the night when the commitment was made. We will raise all the issues that the gentleman has outlined today with Fish and Wildlife.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 11, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will not go through the details of the last amendment, but I would make a pleading to the chairman of this committee and the ranking member that the amount of increases that we have put in administration of the Fish and Wildlife far exceeds that which the Senate committee have put in and far exceeds that which is necessary on a routine basis for all of the bureaucracies within this government.

I know that we can probably come up with a justification for why we need to increase this 6.6 percent. But I would ask the ranking member and the chairman for us to really consider where this difference between the 4.9 percent increase that the Senate has and the 6.6 percent, where is the money going to come from?

We all know where it is going to come from. The money is going to come out of the Social Security trust fund in the year 2000. And if in fact we will pare back this \$2 million, this \$2 million is enough for 2,000 seniors to get Medicare for a year.

I am not saying the Senate is better at these than we are. What I am saying is, if we went out and asked the American public what kind of increase did they get in their operating budget to administer programs, whether it is State, local, municipal or if it is Federal, to see a 6.6 percent increase in a time when we are bound by the 1997 budget agreement, I know many of us

do not feel bound by it, but I believe we should honor our commitments on this and live within the budget agreement that we voted for and passed and is a matter of law with the President, that increasing it 4.9 percent is a large increase in terms of administrative overhead and costs.

So my plea to my colleague is to at least consider this very small reduction in costs from 6.6 to 4.9 percent, saying, you know what, we really can be more efficient in the Federal government. We really do not have to spend this \$2 million. We really can get by.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, we had extensive hearings on these issues; and in this bill he is going to see hundreds of puts and takes. We made cuts all over this bill, and a lot of programs were reduced. But in some cases we went along with what we considered legitimate increases. And we have got fixed costs. We have got pay. We have got GSA for the building space. I mean, these are all the costs of administration, and they do go up.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the costs for these services last year in 1999, according to the committee print, was \$109,363,000. The recommendation of my colleagues is to increase that to \$116,680,000, or an increase of \$7,000,317. I do not know about California, but I know about Oklahoma, and that is a big increase.

My question is, I am not saying that my colleagues could not come up with a justification. They could probably come up with a justification for raising it 10 percent or 15 percent. I will give my colleagues that, that they can come up with that. What I am saying is, realistically, they are going to go to conference with the Senate level that is well below them.

So my point is, will my colleagues consider trimming this \$2 million to put it in line with the Senate, to put it in line with the realistic growth in it, and also to recognize that the \$2 million is going to come out of the Social Security surplus?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to go along with this. I think the recommendation of the committee is a sound recommendation.

Certain agencies, especially the Fish and Wildlife Service, with all the work that they have to do under the Endangered Species Act, I simply disagree with the gentleman respectfully. I think this is a justified increase.

I know the workload of these people because I am one of the people that is demanding that they increase their efforts. We need them to put in good people, and we want them to have good

people in D.C. We want them to have good people in the regions who can make decisions and not hold up the private sector when they come up on HCPs, which happens to be something I happen to be very familiar with.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

So, therefore, for the record, the position of the committee is that we will increase the bureaucracy in Washington at twice the rate we increase the bureaucracy in the private sector.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interest of the gentleman and his concern about this. As we all know, our bill is underneath our allocation. So it fits into the budgetary scheme that has been created by the majority, one that I have serious reservations about, but it does.

So I would say to the gentleman, we do meet all the guidelines of the 1997 budget agreement, as far as I know. And we have tried to do the best job we could after hearing all of these witnesses. I mean, I would show the gentleman all of the books of testimony that we have. We have listened to these people go into great detail about the workload increases. I am a demon on administration, too.

Now, if this were another agency, let us say it was the National Endowment for the Arts or Humanities, I would insist that we hold down D.C. But in this case, because of the explosion of work that is being required of these agencies because of all of these listings, I must tell my colleague, I think 6 or 7 percent is very reasonable.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, he might not have heard the first portion of my statement. I did thank him and the chairman for the work they did and recognizing that this is a good bill. I am not saying this is not a good bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, but now the gentleman wants to come in and try to nitpick it a little bit.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, yes, I want to save \$2 million for senior citizens for the Social Security system. There is no question I want to do that.

Mr. DICKS. But it is not going to do that. My colleague knows full well as I do that all it is going to do is get us underneath the allocation further and then the Senate or somebody else will say, well, let us increase something to get back up to the level that the majority has authorized under the Budget Act. We do not take the money from here and move it over to somewhere else.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I am just trying to get us down to the

Senate. It is ironic that we are above the Senate, but I am trying to get us down to the Senate.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, with all due respect, I think the gentleman should refer to it as the "other body" under the rules. I call upon the Chair to enforce the rules.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would take that correction.

Mr. DICKS. And in good spirit.

But the other body, especially some of the leadership of the other body, may not support the Endangered Species Act and would like to see it undercut a little bit. So I would not be surprised if the other side cut back funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service because they are not as enthusiastic about it as maybe we are.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I would just note from the committee print that the committee cuts ESA \$5 million over last year, the Endangered Species Act in terms of the funding for it. So what they have done is cut the money for the Endangered Species Act but grow the bureaucracy. And to me I find that fairly contrary in terms of the idea.

Regardless of what the other body has done, my contention is I think that we can lead in the House over the other body and set an example.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out here that part of this cut would come out of the money we give to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, which is a very responsible organization. They leverage these dollars three to one. For every one we have, they raise three in the private sector. They have a limit of 5 percent on administrative costs. They are extremely helpful in developing the habitat conservation programs.

I know that the HCPs would be something the gentleman, I believe, would strongly endorse. Because it basically takes the private sector, lays out an area for economic growth in an area for habitat, and I think it is, from what I have observed, a very positive program.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is a voluntary program. That is the great thing. The companies like Waterhouse, Plum Creek, Murray Pacific, they all come in, they negotiate with the Feds. But they have got to have somebody to negotiate with it.

Again, I say this, if the amendment of the gentleman were to take it out of the administration nationally and give it to the regions, I could probably support that. But just to cut it out.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, would the gentleman agree with me that at the end of this bill we would have a conforming amendment to do that?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, well, we will consider that. We will think about that. I believe we have got some time between now and the end of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EHLERS:

Page 13, line 8, after the period add the following: "In addition to the other amounts made available by this paragraph, there shall be available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service \$422,000 to carry out section 1005 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941c)."

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) reserves a point of order.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, the gist of this amendment is to fund an authorization which was adopted last year by the Congress and has been signed into law by the President.

I am speaking at this point on behalf of the Great Lakes. I recognize the work of the chairman of this committee, who has been very supportive of these efforts. I also recognize the activities of the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, who has instituted some legislation in this regard. And, in fact, this amendment is an attempt to fund some activities that were sponsored by the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House.

Many Americans fail to recognize the significance of the Great Lakes. They constitute 20 percent of the world's fresh water. They constitute 95 percent of the United States' fresh surface water. They contain six quadrillion gallons of fresh water.

I find it ironic that this country has spent hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars, in fact, billions of dollars developing dams and other waterways in the West to provide fresh water and yet we often are stingy in providing funding for the Great Lakes, which is the greatest freshwater system in the world.

□ 1815

Last year, Congress unanimously passed and the President signed into

law the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act which reauthorized the original 1990 act. This act provides for the continuation of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife coordination offices, which are very important to the entire Great Lakes basin but importantly, as it relates to this amendment, the act creates a new grants program for implementation of fish and wildlife restoration projects. This structure provides a unique opportunity for enhancing coordination of restoration activities in the Great Lakes region, leveraging funds for restoration efforts and making real progress on the highest priority restoration activities needed in the region.

Enthusiasm for getting the program off to a rapid start is high in the region. In fact, interested parties have already drafted several proposals for the grant program, and the Council of Lake Committees has begun discussion of priorities.

I understand that no new grant programs were funded in this bill due to the tight budget cap and the chairman's desire to create a fair Interior appropriations bill. I also understand full well the difficulty of the appropriations process while in particular the difficulty the subcommittee chairman faced in trying to deal with this appropriations process while remaining within the caps in the 302(b) allocations.

I have a great deal of respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. REGULA. Because of that respect, I do not plan to pursue this amendment but plan to withdraw it. However, I did want to offer the amendment and debate it so that, if additional funds become available later in the appropriations process, the chairman and the subcommittee will look kindly upon funding this particular grant program. The amount of money is \$422,000, which is relatively small compared to the total of the bill, and I believe it would go a great distance toward renewing the restoration efforts in the Great Lakes. It will provide sufficient funds to leverage a great deal of State money to be put into this effort.

I would appreciate any comments the chairman might make upon this issue before I officially withdraw it.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes a good point. We would hope that if there are additional funds available, that we might be able to do this. The Great Lakes are a very precious resource. Water, I think, generally is going to grow in its importance. Therefore, one of the great efforts we should make as a Nation is to preserve freshwater supplies. We have heard the stories that some States want to build pipelines up to the Great Lakes to tap into that water supply, and we have a responsibility to this

Nation to maintain and improve the quality of our freshwater lakes and supply that is part of our Nation's resources.

Mr. EHLERS. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his willingness to consider this issue. Not only are other states hoping to tap into Great Lakes Water, but other countries are also seeking to tap into this supply and hope to ship water out of the Great Lakes to fulfill their own water needs. It is very important for us to maintain the purity of this water, make certain that it remains in this country, is used properly, and remains drinkable for our population. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his support and for his commitment to completion of the Parker River Wildlife Refuge headquarters complex and its visitors center in Newburyport, Massachusetts. I understand that we are waiting to reach a final agreement on the total cost of the project. My current understanding is that sufficient funds from previous years exist to move this project forward in fiscal year 2000. Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The Fish and Wildlife Service has told the committee that funds for planning and design are sufficient to continue this project through fiscal year 2000 and that further construction funding will not be needed for obligation until 2001. Let me assure the gentleman that the committee is committed to completing this project and to providing additional funding in the future when it is needed.

Mr. TIERNEY. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman and ask should new information come to light and should we reach resolution on the total cost of the project and additional funds are made available in the Interior allocation, would he consider some funding for the project in fiscal year 2000 as part of his conference negotiations?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield further, again let me assure the gentleman that the committee considers this a worthy project and I will be happy to work with him as we move forward in conference negotiations with the other body.

Mr. TIERNEY. Again I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the con-

servation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; \$43,933,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT:

Page 13, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$250,000)".

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$250,000)".

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio reserves a point of order.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, recently the President announced from the White House that the American bald eagle, a symbol of our Nation and the freedom we cherish, is no longer on our country's endangered species list. We can be proud of this accomplishment and acknowledge the efforts and the vision of the individuals who have helped save this majestic raptor from extinction.

Today, I come to the floor to ask this body's support for what I believe to be an exceptional opportunity to help one community's dream become a reality. But more importantly I believe this Congress can make a modest investment in providing an exceptional site where millions of Americans will be able to enjoy viewing the American bald eagle in its natural habitat. I am proud to report that the city of Wabasha, Minnesota, has made a real commitment to building a first-class facility where visitors can do just this.

But first I want to say that I am fully aware of the very difficult task before the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), his subcommittee and staff in developing this bill that addresses the stewardship of our Nation's natural and national resources in a responsible and balanced way. I appreciate their hard work and many worthy funding projects they have been asked to consider. Despite the subcommittee's support for the eagle center last year, I regret that the budget constraints within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife precluded the agency from extending financial support for the construction of the center.

Rather than asking the agency to draw on its limited operations budget, my amendment transfers \$250,000 from the Energy Information Administration to the construction account within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. With the EIA receiving an increase of \$2.1 million over last year's budget for a total of \$72.644 million, I would suggest that my proposed reduction would have a minimal impact on its operations. Indeed, the CBO has scored it to have a neutral budget impact. Again, this amendment requests a very modest contribution from the Federal Government for a project that will generate benefits that far exceed the costs.

For the past 9 years, 70 volunteers, people who live in Wabasha, Minnesota, have shared their riverfront with thousands of visitors who come to see a bald eagle in the wild. These visitors leave with a tangible connection to the eagles and a newfound interest in preserving our wildlife heritage and vanishing wild places.

But, Mr. Chairman, winters in Minnesota are very cold. An average visitor spends only about 10 minutes on the riverfront. An indoor eagle viewing and education facility would enhance the visitor experience. To get this incredible project moving forward, the city of Wabasha and the Minnesota legislature have already contributed over \$1.9 million, about half of what the cost will be to build the national eagle center in Wabasha, Minnesota. Now the community is looking for a little support from Congress. I cannot think of a better way to celebrate the recovery of the once threatened American eagle.

Two years ago, CBS News reporter Harry Smith joined the ranks of America's wildlife watchers. He became a birdwatcher when he visited rural southeastern Minnesota to shoot a story about Wabasha's bald eagle center. He said, "It makes the heart quicken to see the splendid symbol of our Nation, hundreds of them, in their natural environment sitting in the cottonwoods and fishing, along the banks of the upper Mississippi River."

CBS News officials said the network received more phone calls requesting copies of Smith's eloquent story about the bald eagle's success in Wabasha than any story he has ever done.

Nowhere else in the lower 48 States can you and your family get a better view of our natural symbol. And there is nowhere else you can go to see so many bald eagles on any Sunday from November through March knowing that trained staff will be there to help you spot the birds and share information about them. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no admission charge.

Recently, the Minnesota Audubon Council and the Upper Mississippi River Campaign agreed to team up with the city to support the development of the project. They, too, recognize the eagles center as a unique visitor and teaching facility. In fact, Audubon is planning to use the center to be a key stopping point for the Great Rivers Birding Train which will run from the headwaters of the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis.

Nationally and locally, investments in wildlife and wild places are an investment in this country's natural resource legacy and its economic future.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the chairman and my colleagues for their support of this very important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio insist on his point of order?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that this is a great project for the people that have a chance to view it, and I am pleased to note that the State and the local community is supporting it. But I would have to point out to the gentleman that this is not Federal land and we cannot meet all the operational and maintenance needs of the refuge system, the Federal refuge system.

We have requests in our committee for \$175 million worth of non-Federal projects. We just simply had to take a position that we cannot do any because if we do one, then we have to perhaps try to do a lot of others. There is a waiting list of construction and maintenance projects within the Fish and Wildlife, projects that are on existing Federal lands.

I would suggest to the gentleman that he might consider trying to get this authorized as a Federal site and then it would be easier for us to consider it. But under the present circumstances, we simply cannot start down the road of funding non-Federal projects. I would hope the gentleman would withdraw the amendment. We do have to oppose it on the basis that we have rejected \$175 million worth of other projects.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will yield, I think the difference here is that we are not going to be coming back every year for additional maintenance costs.

Mr. REGULA. I understand.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The point here is that we have recognized this is the national eagles center. The city has contributed already almost \$1 million, the State of Minnesota has contributed almost \$1 million. They intend to raise in addition to that perhaps as much as \$2 million in private resources. We are asking for a very modest investment, because it is important, it is our national symbol, it is the national eagles center. So we are asking for a very modest amount to be transferred out of a department budget that was increased by over \$2.5 million.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to have to come back for maintenance expenses every year. This would be just one way that the Federal Government could pick up a small portion of the overall cost.

Mr. REGULA. I understand what the gentleman is saying, but I have to point out, it is not an authorized Federal project and once we start funding these, this may be not a lot but the total of all of these projects is \$175 million. We do not have it to begin with and we do not feel that we should be doing non-Federal projects when we have such a backlog of maintenance and high priority projects that are Federal lands.

I feel that the proper way would be either to get it authorized or, and I congratulate the communities, if they continue supporting this as either a State and local cooperative facility.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. With all due respect, I would hope that we can have a

vote on this. We would like to have the gentleman's support. If in the end assuming that we may not prevail in this vote, it is something that is important, it is not just important to the people in Wabasha, Minnesota, it is really important to all Americans. As I say, it is one of the few places in the lower 48 United States where you can actually see eagles in the wild and I think it is going to be a tremendous resource not only for the upper Midwest but for all Americans.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, I would ask the question of the gentleman, has there been any conversation with Fish and Wildlife as to whether or not they would like to have this in as part of their portfolio?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes, I have talked to Fish and Wildlife. They very much would like to be a part of this. They did not make it a priority item on their budget list this year, but they asked me if perhaps I could get it included individually in this particular manner.

Mr. REGULA. Again reclaiming my time, I would strongly urge the gentleman to consider getting it authorized so it could be a Federal project. I realize he does not want ongoing funds, but these do have a way of needing some additional funding in future years.

□ 1830

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

The amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would note that the use of cellular telephones is not permitted either on the floor of the House or within the gallery, and the Chair would ask the visitor within the gallery to cease use of a cellular telephone.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, \$42,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Could I ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) what his intentions are now about how long we are going to go here before we are going to have the votes?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we have two additional amendments that I think we can dispose of very quickly, and then it would be our intent to go to

the vote on the amendments that have been rolled, and those would be the last votes for today. We might continue. We will discuss that afterwards as to whether we want to continue any further debate on some of the amendments and roll them until tomorrow morning.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, does that include UPARR or not? Because we understand that is going to take 30 or 40 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague likes, we have one, an amendment from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY), which I will offer; and we are going to accept it. And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has an amendment he wants to offer, and we could do UPARR.

Mr. DICKS. Then we will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES
CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543), as amended, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), \$10,779,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION
FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 101-233, as amended, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION
FUND

For necessary expenses of the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund, \$800,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201-4203, 4211-4213, 4221-4225, 4241-4245, and 1538), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-96, 16 U.S.C. 4261-4266), and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301-5306), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds made available under this Act, Public Law 105-277, and Public Law 105-83 for rhinoceros, tiger, and Asian elephant conservation programs are exempt from any sanctions imposed against any country under section 102 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. aa-1).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 70 passenger motor vehicles, of which 61 are for replacement only (including 36 for police-type use); repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: *Provided*, That

notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: *Provided further*, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not spend any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the purchase of lands or interests in lands to be used in the establishment of any new unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System unless the purchase is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in Senate Report 105-56.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general administration of the National Park Service, including not less than \$1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706, \$1,387,307,000, of which \$8,800,000 is for research, planning and inter-agency coordination in support of land acquisition for Everglades restoration shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201 of Public Law 100-203.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in a brief colloquy with the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the National Wildlife Refuge Fund, also known as the Refuge Revenue Sharing Fund, and this fund reimburses local governments for the burdens that the presence of the U.S. Wildlife and Fisheries Service acquired lands place upon them. Since Fiscal Year 1996, Congress has appropriated only \$10 million for this fund, while at the same time has increased funding for the Service to provide for increased land acquisitions. These actions have caused a reduction in the funding for local governments, resulting in the loss of much-needed and very critical services.

Let me be very clear that I do support our Nation's refuges and the benefits that they provide. In fact, I have several refuges in my district alone. However, I do not believe that this is good policy to continue this trend that ultimately places an undue burden on our local governments across America.

Last year I testified in front of the Subcommittee on Interior regarding how initial transfers within local government accounts led to significant

erosions of services in a parish which I represent, Cameron Parish, which is one-third owned, it has Federal refuges on them. When I testified last year, I also predicted that the percentage paid to local governments would fall below 70 percent of what we owe, of what Congress owes, unless Congress steps up to the plate. If enacted today, counties and parishes across America will receive only 56 percent of what they are entitled to through the National Wildlife Refuge Fund of Fiscal Year 2000.

I appreciate the subcommittee chair and ranking member and all the budget pressures that they are under when they are drafting and crafting this bill, but I respectfully request that during the conference committee that they be mindful of the impact that this trend has had on our local governments and work to seek additional funds for the National Wildlife Refuge Fund during the conference negotiations.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I am speaking only for myself. I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue on the floor.

As my colleagues know, the committee expressed its concern regarding this trend in House Report 106-222. I assure my colleagues that we will continue to work with the gentleman and in conference to attempt to find additional resources.

The committee report says that the committee is concerned about the priorities of the Service with respect to how they relate to meeting its obligations under the National Wildlife Refuge Fund. In particular, the committee questioned why this Service has continued to acquire appreciably more land over the past few years and yet has not requested additional funding for the National Wildlife Refuge Fund. This issue should be addressed in the next year's budget request, and we will continue to work with the gentleman on this issue.

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate his raising it with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, statutory or contractual aid for other activities, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, \$45,449,000: *Provided*, That no more than \$100,000 may be used for overhead and program administrative expenses for the heritage partnership program.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

Page 17, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

Page 36, line 23, after each of the two dollar amounts, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. Currently, the CNMI territories have a built-up account of unspent Federal moneys in excess of \$80 million that they have been unable or unwilling to match that we have appropriated to them. That is over 5 years of funding under the current regime that we have for these purposes. Because they have been unwilling or unable to match that funding, I am suggesting that we take \$4 million out of that and put it into the very important and bipartisanly supported Urban Parks and Recreation amendment known as the UPARR program for recreation recovery. This \$4 million would allow a number of States that had had their proposals for grants turned down because funding was not provided: Alabama, 200,000; California, 630,000; Florida, 288,000; Georgia 569,000; Maryland, 249,000; Massachusetts, 600,000; Texas, 330,000; North Carolina, 88,000; Ohio, 500. These are States that have come forward and have programs to provide for the recovery of recreational facilities, worn-out facilities.

We heard earlier today about the problems that soccer teams and Little League teams and Pop Warner teams are having to find facilities to offer recreational opportunities. That is why this legislation is supported by the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues. The police associations understand the importance of giving young people constructive activities to participate in from 3 to 6 in the afternoon, but if they do not have these opportunities, unfortunately some of them go into crime and other destructive behavior.

We believe it is important to fund these efforts. There is so many, there is such a backlog of need, it will not harm the CNMI due to the fact that they have a tremendous backlog of appropriated moneys that this committee has appropriated and that they have been unable to spend.

This committee has made essentially the same decision in removing \$5 million from that amount of money for the purposes of giving it to other territories who are in need of this, who have programs, who have the demand, are willing to come up, in many instances, with the money that is to be spent with a match by the local effort. I would not support this effort if this money was to come out of the other territories' budgets for that purposes, but because of the way the rules changed, I have to offer it in this fashion, but it is my intent to keep consistent with what the committee did with respect to other funds with regard to CNMI, and I would hope that the committee could support this amendment.

As my colleagues know, there has been a dramatic resurgence in support

from environmental organizations, from the Conference of Mayors, from the League of Cities and from the Police Athletic Leagues, from the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, all of which are prepared and are raising money to help in this effort; and this Federal money, again, is used on a matching basis. Local governments must make this a priority, they must put up their own money, and this money is used to help out so many of those States like Ohio and Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are going to accept this amendment, but let me have some qualifiers. I think that we need to explore this more clearly, but I believe the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands is mandatory payment, and I do not believe that we can take money out of that as proposed in the amendment. And, therefore, in the absence of having access to the CNMI money, the money would therefore have to come out of the Office of Insular Affairs. And that means American Samoa operations. It means from Brown Tree Snake control, from technical assistance to the territories and other vital programs. And these are poor areas, and I do not think the gentleman would want to do that, given his concern for people.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that qualifier, and I tried to say that in my rushed opening statement here. That would not be my intent.

As my colleagues know, this UPARR money is part of the President's request that my colleagues have tried to deal with, and I guess what I am counting on is, just as the gentleman tried to find additional moneys for the territories out of this account, that his creative talents would also find money perhaps for UPARR, which has such tremendous support on both sides of the aisle. If that is not able to happen, then I would not expect my colleague then to go to the next step, which would be to take money from the territories.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and based on that we accept the amendment.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment. We accepted it last year, we continue to work with him, and hopefully it will go further this year than it did last year.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, it is a very strong endorsement. I support it. I think it is a good program.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

I will not use the full time. I was very disappointed the chairman accepted the amendment. It is a bad amendment. See, my money is, in fact, guaranteed money to the CMI. I am sure he pointed it out. This is a mischievous amendment. It should never have been offered. I would suggest respectfully that the amendment should be soundly defeated. We will not vote on it because the gentleman has accepted it. But it better not be in the conference when it comes back to this House floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), and the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333), \$46,712,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2001, of which \$11,722,000, pursuant to section 507 of Public Law 104-333 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 1999 and thereafter the National Park Service may recover and expend all fee revenues derived from providing necessary review services associated with historic preservation tax certification, and such funds shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That section 403(a) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470x-2(a)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REGULA

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGULA:

Page 18, beginning at line 5, strike "*: Provided further*," and all that follows through line 8 and insert a period.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we were unaware of local opposition to this language when it was inserted in the bill in the other body last year, and we included it this year, and we accept the amendment to strike the provision, and this will enable the parties to negotiate on the issue of moving this facility.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1845

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, including the modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, \$169,856,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter all franchise fees collected from Statue of Liberty National Monument concessioners shall be covered into a special account established in the Treasury of the United States and shall be immediately available for expenditure by the Secretary for the purposes of stabilizing, rehabilitating and adaptively reusing deteriorated portions of Ellis Island grounds and buildings: *Provided further*, That, beginning in fiscal year 2001, expenditure of such fees is contingent upon a dollar-for-dollar, non-Federal cost share: *Provided further*, That the National Park Service will make available 37 percent, not to exceed \$1,850,000, of the total cost of upgrading the Mariposa County, CA municipal solid waste disposal system: *Provided further*, That Mariposa County will provide assurance that future use fees paid by the National Park Service will be reflective of the capital contribution made by the National Park Service.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(RESCISSON)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2000 by 16 U.S.C. 460l-10a is rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, \$102,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended, of which \$500,000 is to administer the State assistance program, and of which \$42,400,000 for Federal land acquisition for the Everglades National Park, Big Cypress National Preserve, Biscayne National Park, and State grants for land acquisition in the State of Florida are contingent upon the following: (1) a signed, binding agreement between all principal Federal and non-Federal partners involved in the South Florida Restoration Initiative which provides specific volume, timing, location and duration of flow specifications and water quality measurements which will guarantee adequate and appropriate guaranteed water supply to the natural areas in southern Florida including all National Parks, Preserves, Wildlife Refuge lands, and other natural areas to ensure a restored ecosystem; (2) the submission of detailed legislative language to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, which accomplishes this goal; and (3) submission of a complete prioritized non-Federal land acquisition project list: *Provided*, That from the funds made available for land acquisition at Everglades National Park and Big Cypress National Preserve, after the requirements under this heading have been met, the Secretary may provide Federal assistance to the State of Florida for the acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, within the Everglades watershed (consisting of lands and waters within the boundaries of the South Florida Water Management District, Florida Bay and the Florida Keys) under terms and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary, to improve and restore the hydrological function of the Everglades watershed: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading to the State of

Florida are contingent upon new matching non-Federal funds by the State and shall be subject to an agreement that the lands to be acquired will be managed in perpetuity for the restoration of the Everglades: *Provided further*, That lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91-646) except for condemnations, declarations of taking, and lands with appraised value of \$50,000 or less.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. MICA:

Page 19, line 20, before the dollar amount, insert "\$9,000,000 is for grants to the State of Florida for acquisition of land along the St. Johns River in Central Florida, and of which".

Page 19, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000)".

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief.

First of all, I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the ranking member, and others, staff that have been so courteous to me in the past in trying to meet some of the concerns relating to protection of lands, endangered lands in Florida and other projects.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with this amendment not to ask for any more money, we have \$114 million for Everglades restoration, but asking for consideration as we move forward in this process to take a small amount, approximately \$9 million, about 8 percent of this total, for use in preservation of the land along the St. John's River.

We cannot just put all of our dollars and all of our money into restoration projects in Florida. It is critical that we do not repeat the mistakes of the past. I was raised in south Florida, and now we are spending somewhere, in the Chairman's estimate, and the Corps of Engineers brought first on July 4 a proposal to spend somewhere between \$7.8 and the chairman has estimated this may cost us \$10 billion, between \$8 and \$10 billion to restore the Everglades.

What I am asking for here is consideration not to make the same mistake in central and north Florida, that we must preserve that land along John's River.

We have been successful today in acquiring 16,000 of 18,000 acres, which will connect the Ocala National Forest with the State Park just north of Orlando. That area is being inundated by growth that we saw years and years ago in south Florida, and we cannot make the same mistake now.

My plea this evening, Mr. Chairman, is that we take a few dollars and wisely set them aside for preservation of that precious St. John's River area that needs to be preserved, so we will not be

coming back in 10 or 20 years and asking for billions and billions in restoration when we can spend a few million now for preservation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment so we can proceed with the business. I know the chairman will acquiesce to my request in conference.

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

There was no objection.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN); amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS); and an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 202, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—213

Abercrombie	Cook	Gilchrest
Ackerman	Crowley	Gilman
Andrews	Cummings	Gonzalez
Baird	Danner	Goode
Baldacci	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Barrett (WI)	Davis (IL)	Goss
Bass	DeFazio	Greenwood
Becerra	DeGette	Gutierrez
Bentsen	Delahunt	Hall (OH)
Bereuter	DeLauro	Hansen
Berkley	Deutsch	Hayworth
Berman	Dicks	Hilleary
Biggert	Dingell	Hinchey
Bilbray	Dixon	Hinojosa
Bishop	Doggett	Hoefel
Blagojevich	Ehlers	Holt
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Hooley
Boehlert	Engel	Houghton
Bonior	Eshoo	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Etheridge	Hulshof
Brown (OH)	Evans	Inslee
Campbell	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Filner	Jackson-Lee
Capuano	Foley	(TX)
Cardin	Forbes	Jenkins
Carson	Ford	Johnson, E. B.
Castle	Fossella	Jones (OH)
Clay	Fowler	Kaptur
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kelly
Clement	Franks (NJ)	Kennedy
Clyburn	Frelenghuisen	Kildee
Collins	Gallely	Kilpatrick
Condit	Gederson	Kind (WI)
Conyers	Gephardt	King (NY)

Klecza Moran (KS) Shays Stump Traficant Whitfield Cook Johnson (CT) Portman
 Kucinich Morella Sherman Tancredo Vitter Wicker Cox Johnson, Sam Price (NC)
 Kuykendall Nadler Shows Taylor (NC) Walden Wilson Crane Jones (NC) Quinn
 LaFalce Napolitano Skelton Terry Wamp Wise Crowley Jones (OH) Radanovich
 Lampson Neal Slaughter Thomas Watkins Wolf Cubin Kaptur Rahall
 Lantos Nethercutt Smith (NJ) Thornberry Watts (OK) Young (AK) Cummings Kelly Ramstad
 Larson Obey Smith (WA) Thune Weldon (FL) Young (FL) Cunningham Kennedy Rangel
 Lazio Olver Snyder Tiahrt Weller Weller Davis (FL) Kilpatrick Kind (WI) Reynolds
 Leach Owens Spence Toomey Davis (IL) Davis (NY) King (WI) Roemer
 Lee Pallone Spratt Stabenow Allen Hastings (FL) Sununu DeFazio Klecza
 Levin Pascrell Stark Baldwin Kasich Sweeney DeGette Kolbe
 Lewis (GA) Pastor Stupak Talent Brown (CA) McDermott Tauzin Delahunt LaFalce
 LoBiondo Payne Pelosi Tanner Chenoweth Meek (FL) Thompson (CA) DeLauro LaTourette
 Lofgren Pease Tauscher Combest Rivers Thurman DeLay Levin Royce
 Lowey Pelosi Porter Cox Scarborough Simpson DeMint Lewis (GA) Ryan (WI)
 Luther Porter Thompson (MS) Davis (VA) Simpson Deutsch Lewis (KY) Salmon
 Malone (NY) Price (NC) Taylor (MS) Davis (VA) Dicks Linder Sanders
 Markey Quinn Thompson (MS) Simpson Dooley Lucas (KY) Sanford
 Matsui Rahall Tierney Towns Dixon LoBiondo Sawyer
 McCarthy (MO) Ramstad Turner Reyes Udall (CO) Dooley Lucas (KY) Saxton
 McCarthy (NY) Rangel Udall (NM) Udall (CO) Doolittle Luther Schaffer
 McGovern Reyes Reynolds Upton Velazquez Roemer Manzullo Sensenbrenner
 McHugh Reynolds Rodriguez Vento Visclosky Roemer Markey Serrano
 McInnis Rodriguez Upton Velazquez Rogan Vento Dunn Martinez Sessions
 McIntyre Roemer Visclosky Walsh Waters Ehrlich Matsui Shadegg
 McKinney Rogan Vento Waters Rush Watt (NC) Emerson McCarthy (MO) Shays
 McNulty Rothman Visclosky Waxman Wexler Engel McCarthy (NY) Sherman
 Meehan Roukema Roybal-Allard Sanchez Weiner Sanders Filner McIntosh
 Meeks (NY) Roybal-Allard Rush Wexler Sawyer Fletcher McIntyre
 Menendez Rush Wexler Weygand Sawyer Foley McKeon
 Metcalf Sabo Waxman Weygand Wexler Ford McKinney
 Millender- Sanders Wexler Weygand Weygand Fossella McNulty
 McDonald Sanders Weygand Weygand Weygand Franks (NJ) Meehan Stabenow
 Miller, George Sanford Weygand Weygand Weygand Frelighuyzen Menendez
 Minge Sawyer Weygand Weygand Weygand Frost Metcalf Stump
 Mink Saxton Wu Weygand Weygand Weygand Gibbons Millender-
 Moakley Schakowsky Wynn Weygand Weygand Gilchrest McDonald
 Moore Serrano Wynn Weygand Weygand Goode Miller (FL) Tanner
 NOES—202 Everett McCrery McIntosh Goodlatte Minge Taylor (NC)
 Aderholt Ewing McKeon Goodling Mink Goss Moore
 Archer Fattah Fletcher Goodling Ney Goss Moore
 Armey Fattah Fletcher Goodling Ney Goss Moore
 Bachus Fletcher Mica Miller (FL) Graham Morella
 Baker Frost Miller (FL) Miller, Gary Northup Hefley Norwood
 Ballenger Ganske Miller, Gary Northup Hefley Oberstar
 Barcia Gekas Mollohan Hayes Hooley
 Barr Gibbons Moran (VA) Packard Paul Hostettler
 Barrett (NE) Gillmor Murtha Oberstar Hooley
 Bartlett Goodlatte Myrick Peterson (MN) Pastor
 Barton Goodling Ney Peterson (PA) Paul
 Bateman Graham Northup Hayes
 Berry Granger Norwood Hefley
 Bilarakis Green (TX) Nussle Oberstar
 Bliley Green (WI) Oberstar Hill (MT)
 Blunt Gutknecht Ortiz Ortiz
 Boehner Hall (TX) Ose
 Bonilla Hastings (WA) Oxley
 Bono Hayes Packard
 Borski Hefley Paul
 Boswell Herger Peterson (MN)
 Boucher Hill (IN) Peterson (PA)
 Boyd Hill (MT) Petri
 Brady (PA) Hilliard Phelps
 Brady (TX) Hobson Pickering
 Bryant Hoekstra Pickett
 Burr Holden Pits
 Burton Horn Pombo
 Buyer Hostettler Pomeroy
 Callahan Hunter Portman
 Calvert Hutchinson Pryce (OH)
 Camp Hyde Radanovich
 Canady Isakson Riley
 Cannon Istook Rogers
 Chabot Jefferson Rohrabacher
 Chambliss John Ros-Lehtinen
 Coble Johnson (CT) Royce
 Coburn Johnson, Sam Ryan (WI)
 Cooksey Jones (NC) Ryan (WI)
 Costello Kanjorski Ryan (KS)
 Coyne Kingston Salmon
 Cramer Klink Sandlin
 Crane Knollenberg Schaffer
 Cubin Kolbe Scott
 Cunningham LaHood Sensenbrenner
 Deal Largent Sessions Abercrombie Berman Capps Bono Frank (MA)
 DeLay Latham Shadegg Ackerman Berry Capuano Bono Gallegly
 DeMint LaTourette Shaw Andrews Bilbray Carson Borski Ganske
 Diaz-Balart Lewis (CA) Sherwood Archer Bishop Castle Boucher Gederson
 Dickey Lewis (KY) Shimkus Armey Blumenauer Chabot Brady (PA) Gekas
 Dooley Linder Shuster Baird Boehlert Chambliss Brady (TX) Gephardt
 Doolittle Lipinski Siski Berry Boyd Clay Burton Gillmor
 Doyle Lucas (KY) Skeen Barr Brown (FL) Clayton Gilman Klink
 Dreier Lucas (OK) Smith (MI) Barrett (WI) Bryant Coble Callahan Gonzalez
 Duncan Maloney (CT) Smith (TX) Bass Buyer Coburn Calvert Gordon
 Dunn Manzullo Souder Bryant Coble Camp Granger LaHood
 Edwards Martinez Stearns Becerra Campbell Collins Cardin Green (TX)
 Emerson Mascara Stenholm Bereuter Canady Condit Clement Cooksey
 English McCollum Strickland Berkley Cannon Conyers Green (WI)
 Greenwood

NOT VOTING—19
 Stump Vitter Wicker Cox Johnson, Sam Portman
 Sherman Tancredo Welden Wilson Crane Jones (NC) Quinn
 Shows Taylor (NC) Terry Wamp Wise Crowley Jones (OH) Radanovich
 Skelton Terry Watkins Wolf Cubin Kaptur Rahall
 Lampson Neal Slaughter Thomas Watts (OK) Young (AK) Cummings Kelly Ramstad
 Lantos Nethercutt Smith (NJ) Thornberry Weldon (FL) Young (FL) Cunningham Kennedy Rangel
 Larson Obey Smith (WA) Thune Weller Weller Davis (FL) Kilpatrick Kind (WI) Reynolds
 Lazio Olver Snyder Tiahrt Weller Davis (IL) Davis (NY) King (WI) Roemer
 Leach Owens Spence Toomey Davis (VA) DeFazio Klecza
 Lee Pallone Spratt Stabenow Allen Hastings (FL) Sununu DeGette Kolbe
 Levin Pascrell Stark Baldwin Kasich Sweeney Delahunt LaFalce
 Lewis (GA) Pastor Stupak Talent Brown (CA) McDermott Tauzin DeLauro LaTourette
 LoBiondo Payne Pelosi Tanner Chenoweth Meek (FL) Thompson (CA) DeLay Levin Royce
 Lofgren Pease Tauscher Combest Rivers Thurman DeMint Lewis (GA) Ryan (WI)
 Lowey Pelosi Porter Cox Scarborough Simpson Deutsch Lewis (KY) Salmon
 Luther Porter Thompson (MS) Davis (VA) Dicks Linder Sanders
 Malone (NY) Price (NC) Taylor (MS) Davis (VA) Dingell Lipinski Sanford
 Markey Quinn Thompson (MS) Simpson Dooley Lucas (KY) Saxton
 Matsui Rahall Tierney Towns Dixon LoBiondo Sawyer
 McCarthy (MO) Ramstad Turner Reyes Udall (CO) Dooley Lucas (KY) Saxton
 McCarthy (NY) Rangel Udall (NM) Udall (CO) Doolittle Luther Schaffer
 McGovern Reyes Reynolds Upton Velazquez Roemer Manzullo Sensenbrenner
 McHugh Reynolds Rodriguez Vento Visclosky Roemer Markey Serrano
 McInnis Rodriguez Upton Velazquez Rogan Vento Dunn Martinez Sessions
 McIntyre Rodriguez Vento Visclosky Walsh Waters Ehrlich Matsui Shadegg
 McKinney Rogan Vento Waters Rush Emerson McCarthy (MO) Shays
 McNulty Rothman Visclosky Waxman Wexler Engel McCarthy (NY) Sherman
 Meehan Roukema Roybal-Allard Sanchez Weiner Sanders Filner McIntosh
 Meeks (NY) Roybal-Allard Rush Wexler Sawyer Fletcher McIntyre
 Menendez Rush Wexler Weygand Sawyer Foley McKeon
 Metcalf Sabo Waxman Weygand Weygand Ford McKinney
 Millender- Sanders Wexler Weygand Weygand Fossella McNulty
 McDonald Sanders Weygand Weygand Weygand Franks (NJ) Meehan Stabenow
 Miller, George Sanford Weygand Weygand Weygand Frelighuyzen Menendez
 Minge Sawyer Weygand Weygand Weygand Frost Metcalf Stump
 Mink Saxton Wu Weygand Weygand Weygand Gibbons Millender-
 Moakley Schakowsky Wynn Weygand Weygand Gilchrest McDonald
 Moore Serrano Wynn Weygand Weygand Goode Miller (FL) Tanner
 NOES—202 Everett McCrery McIntosh Goodlatte Minge Taylor (NC)
 Aderholt Ewing McKeon Goodling Mink Goss Moore
 Archer Fattah Fletcher Goodling Ney Goss Moore
 Armey Fattah Fletcher Goodling Ney Goss Moore
 Bachus Fletcher Mica Miller (FL) Graham Morella
 Baker Frost Miller (FL) Miller, Gary Northup Hefley Norwood
 Ballenger Ganske Miller, Gary Northup Hefley Oberstar
 Barcia Gekas Mollohan Hayes Hooley
 Barr Gibbons Moran (VA) Packard Paul Hostettler
 Barrett (NE) Gillmor Murtha Oberstar Hooley
 Bartlett Goodlatte Myrick Peterson (MN) Pastor
 Barton Goodling Ney Peterson (PA) Paul
 Bateman Graham Northup Hayes
 Berry Granger Norwood Hefley
 Bilarakis Green (TX) Nussle Oberstar
 Bliley Green (WI) Oberstar Hill (MT)
 Blunt Gutknecht Ortiz Ortiz
 Boehner Hall (TX) Ose
 Bonilla Hastings (WA) Oxley
 Bono Hayes Packard
 Borski Hefley Paul
 Boswell Herger Peterson (MN)
 Boucher Hill (IN) Peterson (PA)
 Boyd Hill (MT) Petri
 Brady (PA) Hilliard Phelps
 Brady (TX) Hobson Pickering
 Bryant Hoekstra Pickett
 Burr Holden Pits
 Burton Horn Pombo
 Buyer Hostettler Pomeroy
 Callahan Hunter Portman
 Calvert Hutchinson Pryce (OH)
 Camp Hyde Radanovich
 Canady Isakson Riley
 Cannon Istook Rogers
 Chabot Jefferson Rohrabacher
 Chambliss John Ros-Lehtinen
 Coble Johnson (CT) Royce
 Coburn Johnson, Sam Ryan (WI)
 Cooksey Jones (NC) Ryan (WI)
 Costello Kanjorski Ryan (KS)
 Coyne Kingston Salmon
 Cramer Klink Sandlin
 Crane Knollenberg Schaffer
 Cubin Kolbe Scott
 Cunningham LaHood Sensenbrenner
 Deal Largent Sessions Abercrombie Berman Capps Bono Frank (MA)
 DeLay Latham Shadegg Ackerman Berry Capuano Bono Gallegly
 DeMint LaTourette Shaw Andrews Bilbray Carson Borski Ganske
 Diaz-Balart Lewis (CA) Sherwood Archer Bishop Castle Boucher Gederson
 Dickey Lewis (KY) Shimkus Armey Blumenauer Chabot Brady (PA) Gekas
 Dooley Linder Shuster Baird Boehlert Chambliss Brady (TX) Gephardt
 Doolittle Lipinski Siski Berry Boyd Clay Burton Gillmor
 Doyle Lucas (KY) Skeen Barr Brown (FL) Clayton Gilman Klink
 Dreier Lucas (OK) Smith (MI) Barrett (WI) Bryant Coble Callahan Gonzalez
 Duncan Maloney (CT) Smith (TX) Bass Buyer Coburn Calvert Gordon
 Dunn Manzullo Souder Bryant Coble Camp Granger LaHood
 Edwards Martinez Stearns Becerra Campbell Collins Cardin Green (TX)
 Emerson Mascara Stenholm Bereuter Canady Condit Clement Cooksey
 English McCollum Strickland Berkley Cannon Conyers Green (WI)
 Greenwood

□ 1913

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, STRICKLAND, GRAHAM, LINDER, HILLIARD, LUCAS of Kentucky, BERRY, HALL of Texas and CUNNINGHAM changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SAXTON, McINNIS, COOK, EHRLICH, HULSHOF and HILLEARY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 281, the McGovern amendment, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is a demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 169, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—248

Aderholt	Costello
Archer	Bachus
Armey	Coyne
Bachus	Baker
Baker	Dramer
Ballenger	Barrett (NE)
Barcia	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Bartlett
Barrett (NE)	Dickey
Bartlett	Hilliard
Barton	Doggett
Bateman	Hinchey
Berry	Bateman
Bilirakis	Doyle
Bliley	Bentsen
Blunt	Biggert
Boehner	Ehlers
Bonilla	Bilirakis
Bonino	English
Boulier	Blagojevich
Boulier	Bilirakis
Boulier	Eshoo
Boulier	Ewing
Boulier	Fattah
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	Hunter
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier	Hoffel
Boulier	Holden
Boulier	Horn
Boulier	Hoyer
Boulier	John
Boulier	Hinojosa
Boulier	Hobson
Boulier</	

