

The National Park Service conducted the study with assistance from the Wekiva River Basin Working Group, a committee established by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection to represent a broad spectrum of environmental and developmental interests. The study found that 45.5 miles of river are eligible for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (the "System") based on free-flowing character, good water quality, and "outstanding remarkable" scenic, recreational, fish and wildlife, and historic/cultural values.

Almost all the land adjacent to the eligible rivers is in public ownership and managed by State and county governments for conservation purposes. The exception to this pattern is the 3.9-mile-long Seminole Creek that is in private ownership. The public land managers strongly support designation while the private landowner opposes designation of his land. Therefore, I recommend that the 41.6 miles of river abutted by public lands and as described in the enclosed report be designated a component of the System. Seminole Creek could be added if the adjacent landowner should change his mind or if this land is ever purchased by an individual or conservation agency who does not object. The tributary is not centrally located in the area proposed for designation.

I further recommend that legislation designating the Wekiva and eligible tributaries specify that on-the-ground management responsibilities remain with the existing land manager and not the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. This is in accordance with expressed State wishes and is logical. Responsibilities of the Secretary should be limited to working with State and local partners in developing a comprehensive river management plan, providing technical assistance, and reviewing effects of water resource development proposals in accordance with section 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

We look forward to working with the Congress to designate this worthy addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 2000.

□

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4578, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 524 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 524

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided further" on page 18, line 6, through line 19. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any proposed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 2130

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 524 would grant an open rule waiving all points of order against consideration of H.R. 4578, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001.

The rule provides one hour of general debate, to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule provides that the bill will be considered for amendment by paragraph, and waives clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill) against provisions in the bill, except as otherwise specified in the rule.

The rule also waives clause 2(e) of rule XXI (prohibiting non-emergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation) against amendments offered during consideration of the bill.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce the voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if a vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4578 is to provide regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior, except the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other related agencies, including the Forest Service, the Department of Energy, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundations of Arts and Humanities.

H.R. 4578 appropriates \$14.6 billion in new fiscal year 2001 budget authority, which is \$303 million less than last year and \$1.7 billion less than the President's request. Approximately half of the bill's funding, \$7.3 billion, finances Department of the Interior programs to manage and study the Nation's animal, plant, and mineral resources, and to support Indian programs.

The balance of the bill's funds support other non-Interior agencies that perform related functions. These include the Forest Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture; conservation and fossil energy programs run by the Department of Energy; the Indian Health Service, as well as the Smithsonian and similar cultural organizations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as a Westerner, I applaud several limitations on funding contained in this bill. One, for example, would prohibit the use of funds for lands managed under any national monument designation executed since 1999. These lands are already in Federal ownership, and may still be managed under their previous land management status.

For example, just last week the Clinton administration designated 200,000 acres along the Columbia River in my district known as the Hanford Reach, designated that as a national monument. This action pulled the plug on an extended series of negotiations among local, State, and Federal officials seeking to develop a shared partnership to manage the Hanford Reach for future generations.

Instead, unfortunately, the administration chose to unilaterally assign management responsibility to these lands with the Department of the Interior. Unfortunately, that left State and local citizens and officials with no real role except to comment periodically on plans and decisions of Federal regulators.

H.R. 4578 would prohibit the expenditure of funds to issue a record of decision or any policy implementing the Interior-Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, or ICBMP, as we call it in the Northwest, unless a regulatory flexibility analysis is completed.

This project amazingly enough started in 1993 without congressional authorization, and affects a huge area of the West, including 63 million acres of Forest Service and BLM lands in six States, including much of my district in the State of Washington.

The administration appears to be rushing to complete this project before the end of President Clinton's tenure, and the committee is concerned that such haste will expose the project to high-risk litigation for failure to comply with the requirements of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. I applaud the committee's decision in that regard.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the Members of this committee for their willingness to address both the Hanford Reach National Monument and the ICBMP project, two issues that are of great concern in central Washington.

More generally, Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his tireless efforts to balance protection and sound management of our Nation's natural resources with the steadily increasing demands placed on those resources by commerce, tourism and recreation.

Significantly, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and his colleagues have done so while staying within their allocation from the Committee on the Budget.

That said, Mr. Speaker, this bill, like most legislation, is not perfect. Individual Members will no doubt take issue with one or more provisions of this bill. Those wishing to offer amendments should be pleased that the Committee on Rules has granted the Committee on Appropriations's request for an open rule.

Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to support not only the rule but the underlying bill, H.R. 4578.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule that will allow the Members of the House to work their will. But the underlying bill fails to honor Congress' obligation as steward

of America's lands and history for future generations.

The measure contains several anti-environmental riders that continue the attack on our natural resources.

The first major rider would stop the management and protection of lands designated as national monuments by the President, the right of every president since Theodore Roosevelt.

The second blocks the management and protection of lands along the Columbia River, which contains a threatened species of salmon.

The third rider would prohibit the establishment of the North Delta National Wildlife Refuge near Sacramento, California.

Still other riders in the bill would limit funding for protection of endangered species, allow grazing on public lands without an environmental review, and delay national forest planning.

In addition to the numerous policy riders, H.R. 4578 contains deep cuts that will harm our national parks, our forests, and the protection and enforcement of environmental laws.

The funding in H.R. 4578 is \$300 million below last year's level and \$1.7 billion below the President's request. Such deep cuts will have a devastating impact on Indian health, on national park maintenance, which has consistently been underfunded, and on energy research and conservation.

Even though the House overwhelmingly passed the land and water conservation bill in May by a vote of 315 to 102, this bill is \$736 million below the amount authorized in that bill. At a time of record surpluses, this bill cuts funding for key national priorities in order to fulfill the majority's commitment to fund huge tax breaks for the wealthy.

The bill's funding level is simply not realistic. Moreover, the majority had a failed yet again to restore some of the unwise cuts made 5 years ago in funding for those agencies responsible for the country's small but critically important arts and humanities education and preservation efforts.

The bill funds the National Endowment for the Arts at \$98 million, a level 48 percent below the 1995 funding level; the National Endowment for the Humanities at \$115 million, 33 percent below the level in 1995. These funding levels fundamentally ignore the successfully efforts by both NEA and NEH to broaden the reach of their programs and to eliminate controversial programs, the two reforms that were requested by the majority when they reduced the funding in 1995.

It is time to recognize the success of these reforms and give these agencies the resources they need to meet their critical needs. Unfortunately, the amendment offered by a Democrat committee to raise funding for both agencies was defeated.

Because of the inadequate funding levels, the President's senior advisors are recommending that he veto this

bill, making this exercise on the floor a redundant act in our continuing theater of the absurd when it comes to spending bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York. I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the open rule for the Interior Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2001 which protects what the Committee reported.

I want to commend our Chairman, Mr. REGULA, on the difficult task he was faced with writing this year's spending bill. Unfortunately, the subcommittee was given an unrealistic allocation and as a consequence, this bill simply falls short in too many areas and I will be forced to oppose it on the floor.

I know that it would have been extremely difficult to provide all of the increases requested by the Administration, but I am frustrated that the allocation this bill received was so inadequate. With these levels, we will not even be able to provide fixed costs for all of the agencies within our jurisdiction. We are severely under-funding critical programs within our jurisdiction.

When this bill was considered by the full Appropriations Committee, the Administration sent a letter to the Chairman expressing deep concern over not only the spending levels provided in the bill but also several "riders" which were added at the last minute. The letter threatened a veto if substantial changes were not made to the bill.

Each of these legislative provisions jeopardizes passage of this bill on the floor, and guarantees another confrontation with the White House this fall. These riders deal with complex policy concerns and should be addressed by the authorizing committees of jurisdiction, not attached to an annual spending bill.

I do however appreciate that the Rule provided for this bill will enable Members wishing to offer amendments to these provisions the ability to do so.

I am forced to oppose this bill because I do not believe we have adequately funded dozens of important priorities within our jurisdiction, and I oppose the inclusion of these controversial riders. I do however appreciate the bipartisan cooperation and responsible manner with which our Subcommittee works. This bill however did not receive an adequate allocation to start with now faces an even greater hurdle with the inclusion of these riders.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. It is balanced, fair, and adequate for the job. I only wish I could say the same for the bill.

I do not blame the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio. I do not think he is the villain in this situation. In fact, in my opinion he has been given an impossible task,

because his own leadership has made it basically impossible for his bill to adequately provide for the important environmental and other programs that it covers.

As a result, the overall bill falls short of what is needed, even though it does include some good provisions. If I might, I would like to just touch on a few of those provisions.

The bill does provide some funds for the acquisition of a tract in the Beaverbrook area of Clear Creek County, part of the district I represent, owned by the city of Golden, Colorado. I requested inclusion of funds to enable these lands to be acquired for Forest Service management. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman for inclusion of \$2 million for that purpose.

The amount provided, like the bill's total for such acquisitions, is simply inadequate to meet this and other urgent conservation needs.

In a similar fashion, the bill sets up a pilot project under which the Forest Service can arrange for Colorado State foresters to assist with fire prevention and improvement of watersheds and habitat on national forest lands that adjoin appropriate State or private lands.

I have had an opportunity to discuss this with Jim Hubbard, our State Forester, and I believe this can be very valuable, especially in the Front Range areas of Colorado where residential development is spreading into forested areas. Again, I appreciate the inclusion of that provision, especially since it states that all the environmental laws will continue to apply.

Again, the bill does not provide enough important support for many other Federal land management agencies, including not just the Forest Service but the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Park Service.

It also fails to adequately address matters of concern to Native Americans. In fact, I think it takes a step backwards. The total funding for the Indian Health Services and the Bureau of Indian Affairs is cut by \$520 million. I think in effect the bill sends the message that we are no longer willing to meet our trust responsibilities to our American Indian tribes.

There can be no denying the need. Information I have seen indicates that in 1997, the Indian Health Service could provide only \$1,397 dollars per capita for its patients compared to about \$3,900 in per capita health spending by all Americans.

□ 2154

Even though Indians have a 249 percent greater chance of dying from diabetes and a 204 percent greater chance of dying from accidents than our general population. Since then, health care funding for our Indian citizens has failed to keep up with the growing Indian population and has also failed to rise along with inflation.

The bill is also loaded with undesirable riders. Let me mention three of

them. One deals with the management of new national monuments. The idea there may be to reign in the President, but I think it would choke needed management and the real victims would be the American people and our public lands.

Another rider that should be thrown off is the one on global warming. By restricting funds that would be used to prepare to implement the Kyoto Treaty, this rider effectively would stop work on the most important tools for holding down costs as we combat global warming.

This provision is extreme and should not be a part of this bill.

Finally, the bill does not do enough to promote energy efficiency. We need to do more to invest in Energy Department research and development programs that reduce our dependence on imported oil while furthering our national goals of broad-based economic growth, environmental protection, national security and economic competitiveness.

The rule properly permits amendments to address some of these shortcomings and I will be urging adoption of desirable amendments, but in my opinion unless the bill is dramatically improved it should be not passed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it is presently in front of us has language that notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter the Secretary of the Interior must concur in developing, implementing, and revising regulations to allocate water made available from Central and Southern Florida Project features.

My understanding is that a point of order will be raised and that language will be struck from the bill. It is not protected by the rule.

I think that that language is critical really in terms of Everglades restoration. I applaud the committee, the subcommittee, for an incredible effort, the largest ecosystem restoration in the history of the world that this committee has been part of. I think it is a legacy each of us are leaving, not just to our children and grandchildren but future generations as well.

Unfortunately, though, when this language will be struck from the bill, the concern that some of us have that the priority until we pass the Everglades Restudy, the priority of this funding is not necessarily the priority which I think most of us want, which is that resource protection be the highest priority but that flood management protection which is critical, and water supply which is critical will be potentially a higher priority.

Therefore, I look forward to working with the substantive committee and the Committee on Appropriations to include similar language which is necessary to the intent, I think which the majority of members want.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may

consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), who mentioned Indian health services and so on, that we do have increases; not as much as we would like nor as much as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) would like, but we have increased Indian health service over last year. We have increased the BIA operation of Indian programs and we have increased BIA education.

Now we are going to hear during the debate a lot about cuts, and I just want to say to all of my colleagues those cuts that they talk about will be cuts from the President's proposals. It was easy for the President to propose 1.7 million additional dollars without having to identify a source for those dollars.

We have tried to work within the confines of the allocation that was provided to our committee, recognizing that it is \$300 million under last year. But in the process, we have addressed the needs of the land agencies in every way.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) for his comments on the Everglades issue, and I regret, too, that there will be a point of order on the language that would give the Department of Interior a voice in the way the water is distributed, because the whole mission of the Everglades restoration is to have adequate water supply so that the ecosystem will flourish.

Hopefully, in the process of a conference and final wrap-up on this bill we can get some language that will accomplish this goal in perhaps a somewhat different way, because I think all the parties on the Everglades restoration need to be at the table. The State of Florida, the Southeast Florida Water District, the mako sica Indians, but also the Federal Government, because we are putting a billion dollars of Federal money from 50 States into this restoration.

The great interest on the part of most of the people across this Nation would be restoring the asset and preserving the asset known as the Everglades.

So we will try to address that. I do not want to take time to get into the other merits. We will have time during the debate to discuss those. I simply want to say that I think the Committee on Rules did a great job here. They gave us a balanced rule. It is fair, as is the bill. Everybody will have their opportunity to be heard through the amendment process. Hopefully, out of all of this will come a constructive addressing of the problems that confront our national lands, almost 700 million acres.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

#### 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, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material, on the bill, H.R. 4578.

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

There was no objection.

□

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524 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. 4578.

□ 2153

#### 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. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE 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. REGULA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, tonight I bring before the House the fiscal year 2001 interior appropriations bill. Before I begin, however, I would like to take the opportunity to reflect upon the previous, including this year, 6 years. Under the rules of the House, this year is my last year as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations. I have served on this subcommittee for the past 26 years, first as a junior member, later as its ranking member and most recently as chairman.

This committee has been a labor of satisfaction for me. I believe it is a vitally important committee in the Congress; and even though I will not serve

as its chairman next year, I intend to remain very involved in it and hope to continue the many positive initiatives begun over these years.

Upon reflection, three themes come to mind. First, I have tried to improve management within the agencies funded in the bill. Too often, government managers do not focus on the difficult issues of responsible and accountable actions and decisions. Over my tenure as chairman, I have held 25 oversight hearings with the underlying focus on improving management. I believe these efforts are producing results. We have brought management reform to the national parks services construction program ensuring that the American taxpayer will no longer be asked to foot the bill for a \$784,000 outhouse in a national park. We have eliminated duplication in our Federal agencies with the abolishment of the Bureau of Mines which had jurisdiction over programs already being conducted by OSHA, the Department of Labor and the Department of Energy.

Next, over my years of service, I have grown increasingly concerned about our lack of attention to maintaining our federally owned lands and the facilities on them. Through an oversight hearing conducted by our subcommittee, I learned that I was correct in my concern. The four land management agencies, the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, provided estimates that the maintenance backlog totals nearly \$13 billion. To address this unacceptable situation, our committee initiated a recreation fee demonstration program in fiscal year 1995.

Under the program, the land management agencies are permitted to collect a nominal fee at up to 100 sites. The fee stays at the site where it is collected and is used at that site for maintenance or other projects to enhance the visitors' experience. The fees are expected to generate \$500 million over the period of this demonstration.

The fee program is working well as facilities and trails are now being maintained better today than we would have been able to do so through appropriations alone. Further, we have evidence that vandalism is down in sites where people are paying fees as they feel they have a stake in the park or forest they are visiting.

Let me emphasize, however, that recreation fees are not carrying the sole responsibility for maintenance of our public lands. Under my chairmanship, our committee has set maintenance funding as a priority and over these past 6 years we have provided several hundred million dollars in maintenance funding and, most importantly, we have required the land management agencies to assess their maintenance requirements, establish common criteria for what deferred maintenance is and develop 5-year master plans to address the situation. Our attention to the maintenance issue is making a difference.

Finally, each year I have brought the bill before this body for consideration, we have been faced with the difficult challenge of meeting the countless needs of the 35 agencies within the constraints of a tight budget environment. We have tried to balance these needs with the simple test: Must do items, need to do items, and nice to do items.

We have always done the must do. We have done many of the need to do and some of the nice to do. Using this test as our guide, I believe our committee has done our best over these years to use the taxpayers' money wisely while meeting our Federal responsibilities.

I want to express particularly my appreciation to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), who has served as the ranking member of the subcommittee. He has been a real partner, as we have worked together on a number of policy priorities of the committee, including the backlog maintenance issue.

Next I would like to compliment the able staff members who have assisted during my tenure as chairman. I particularly express my appreciation to our clerk, Debbie Weatherly, as well as other subcommittee staff members, Loretta Beaumont, Joe Kaplan and Chris Topik. On the minority side, I want to thank Leslie Turner on the staff of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and welcome Mike Stephens, a long-time committee veteran who returned to the Committee on Appropriations this year following the retirement of Del Davis.

I appreciate the professionalism of each of these people and the many dedicated hours they have provided this House over the years.

Mr. Chairman, today I present before the House the fiscal year 2001 interior appropriation bill. This year, the subcommittee received more than 550 letters from Members of the House requesting funding for more than 3,400 individual items totaling \$152 billion, all for interior and related agency programs.

For fiscal year 2001, we received an allocation of \$14.6 billion, which is \$300 million below the fiscal year 2000 enacted bill. As we can see, we have had to make some tough choices, and the bill reflects this challenge.

Again, I want to say the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has been a real teammate in addressing these. I know that he has not agreed with the allocation. In some respects, I have not myself but we have made the best of what we had to work with. I think that took a real team effort.

I think the fact that we have had the requests of over \$152 billion demonstrates the popularity of this bill and the important projects that are out there if we had the means to provide the funding.

Within the constraints of our allocation, we were unable to fund the President's lands legacy initiative.

□ 2200

However, we have included \$164 million in Federal acquisition funding and