

Ose	Sanford	Tancredo
Oxley	Saxton	Tanner
Packard	Scarborough	Tauzin
Paul	Schaffer	Taylor (NC)
Pease	Scott	Terry
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Thomas
Petri	Sessions	Thornberry
Pickering	Shadegg	Thune
Pitts	Shaw	Tiahrt
Pombo	Shays	Toomey
Porter	Sherwood	Trafficant
Portman	Shimkus	Upton
Pryce (OH)	Shows	Vitter
Quinn	Shuster	Walden
Radanovich	Simpson	Walsh
Ramstad	Sisisky	Wamp
Regula	Skeen	Watkins
Reynolds	Smith (MI)	Watts (OK)
Riley	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Rogan	Smith (TX)	Weldon (PA)
Rogers	Souder	Weller
Rohrabacher	Spence	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Wicker
Roukema	Stenholm	Wilson
Royce	Stump	Wolf
Ryan (WI)	Sununu	Young (AK)
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	
Salmon	Talent	

## NAYS—182

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Neal
Allen	Gordon	Oberstar
Andrews	Green (TX)	Obey
Baca	Gutierrez	Olver
Baird	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Baldacci	Hall (TX)	Owens
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Barcia	Hill (IN)	Pascrell
Becerra	Hilliard	Pastor
Bentsen	Hinchee	Payne
Berkley	Hoeffel	Pelosi
Berman	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Hooley	Phelps
Bishop	Hoyer	Pickett
Blagojevich	Inslee	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Borski	(TX)	Rangel
Boswell	Jefferson	Reyes
Boyd	John	Rivers
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kennedy	Rothman
Capps	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Rush
Cardin	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Carson	Klecicka	Sanchez
Clay	Kucinich	Sanders
Clayton	LaFalce	Sandlin
Clement	Lampson	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lantos	Sherman
Condit	Larson	Skelton
Conyers	Lee	Slaughter
Costello	Levin	Smith (WA)
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Cramer	Lipinski	Spratt
Crowley	Lowey	Stabenow
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Stark
Davis (IL)	Luther	Strickland
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Delahunt	Markey	Taylor (MS)
DeLauro	Mascara	Thompson (CA)
Deutsch	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Dixon	McDermott	Turner
Doggett	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Edwards	McIntyre	Udall (NM)
Engel	McNulty	Velazquez
Eshoo	Meehan	Waters
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Watt (NC)
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Farr	Menendez	Weiner
Fattah	Millender-	Wexler
Filner	McDonald	Weygand
Forbes	Miller, George	Wise
Ford	Mink	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Wu
Frost	Moore	Wynn
Gejdenson	Moran (VA)	
Gephardt	Napolitano	

## NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie	Cummings	Kaptur
Arney	Danner	Lofgren
Barrett (WI)	Doollittle	McKinney
Campbell	Hinojosa	Nadler
Chenoweth-Hage	Houghton	

Sawyer	Thurman	Visclosky
Serrano	Vento	Young (FL)

□ 1033

Ms. RIVERS and Mr. DEUTSCH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HEFLEY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, during the vote I was unavoidably detained with my staff concerning issues related to the FY 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” for rollcall vote 278.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The Journal was approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4387. An act to provide that the School Governance Charter Amendment Act of 2000 shall take effect upon the date such Act is ratified by the voters of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1967. An act to make technical corrections to the status of certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, to take certain land into trust for that Band, and for other purposes.

S. 2498. An act to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, construct, and equip laboratory, administrative, and support space to house base operations for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory Submillimeter Array located on Mauna Kea at Hilo, Hawaii.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2614. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act to make improvements to the certified development company program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4576. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4576) “An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending Sep-

tember 30, 2001, and for other purposes,” requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. DURBIN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

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

There was no objection.

## TIME LIMITS ON AMENDMENTS OFFERED ON H.R. 4635

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

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, I just want to say to all of the Members, the goal of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and myself is to get this bill finished in a timely manner today, by 6:00 or before, because I know that many of the Members have plane reservations. We can accomplish that if everybody will cooperate. We will have to get time limits on some of the amendments, and perhaps we can address some of them with a colloquy. We will work together to accomplish the goal to finish this bill in a timely fashion.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). 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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4578.

□ 1039

## 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 further 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. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday June 14, 2000, the amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) had been disposed of and the bill

was open for amendment from page 53 line 10 through page 53 line 22.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, the amendment by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), adding a new section at the end of title I, if offered, shall begin with his initial 5-minute speech in support of the amendment. No further debate on that amendment shall be in order.

Amendments to that amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) or the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), each shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence of both the chairman and the ranking member to allow me to speak out of turn.

The reason I would like to address the House this morning is with respect to the roadless forest initiative. My colleague and friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), had originally looked at introducing some limitation amendments on the roadless forest initiative and as he will say shortly has decided not to introduce them. In some ways I regret that but I certainly respect his decision.

I rise in opposition to the roadless forest initiative. I represent a national forest that was once the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forest. Like so many others, I have a concern over the effect of the roadless forest initiative on the economy of my district and the health and safety of our national forests.

I would like to make three brief quick points this morning to show the breadth of opposition in my home area to this roadless forest initiative.

First, local units of government in the State of Wisconsin in general, and in the Eighth Congressional District, oppose the roadless forest initiative. The Wisconsin Counties Association opposes it. The Counties of Vilas and Oneida and Oconto and others oppose it. They oppose it because they understand how dependent our communities and our economy is upon the national forest, recreation, and timber harvesting.

They also oppose it because they recognize that cutting off these forests to human access poses substantial fire and safety risks.

Point number two, the roadless forest initiative violates a historic compact between local units of government and the Federal Government. This national forest in northern Wisconsin was created in the 1920s. There were a series of transactions between local units of government, county forests, the private sector and the Federal Government.

On record, on the public record and in public documents, specifically these transactions were made with an understanding that access to the national

forests would be maintained, in fact, explicitly that commercial access to the forests would be maintained. Yet, the roadless forest initiative, if it is implemented, would break that understanding, would break that agreement.

Very clearly, the Federal Government is on the verge of breaking its word with the people of northeastern Wisconsin and very clearly these local leaders would never, would never, have transferred county forest to the national forest if they knew that years down the line we would go back on our word.

Finally and most damning, the Forest Service employees of northern Wisconsin themselves oppose the roadless forest initiative. The very people being called upon to implement the roadless forest initiative oppose it. They have taken a formal position through Local 2165 of the National Federation of Federal Employees, they have taken a formal position against the roadless forest initiative. They understand the difficulties of enforcing it. They understand how it will do tremendous damage to our way of life and they understand how the roadless forest initiative has failed to take into account the local concerns in northern Wisconsin.

I will later place in the RECORD these resolutions demonstrating the clear opposition in northern Wisconsin to this initiative.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) indicated, we were prepared to offer up to several amendments to block the roadless initiative and the road management rule. Instead, through conversations with the Chair and the ranking member, we have decided not to.

These policies and rules that are currently pending before the National Forest Service are still pending. We will have time in the months ahead to help fashion and mold hopefully something we can all live with.

Let me just take a few minutes here and explain what is going on with the roadless initiative and the road management policy.

□ 1045

These are new Forest Service policies. They are decisions affecting the national forests throughout the country. They are not found in any of the local-national forest management plans, and they are developed without a local input and without local forest officials' input.

Now, the roadless initiative on the face of it does not sound too bad, because it includes defined roadless areas. In my two national forests in Otawa, that is 4,600 acres and in the Hiawatha National Forest, that is 7,600 acres.

We could probably agree that, in those areas that are identified, it makes some sense not to put roads; and we agree that could make some sense. But then it calls for other unroaded

areas, other unroaded areas. We do not know the size of those areas. We do not know where they are located. It cannot be simply identified.

So if we cannot identify the other unroaded areas, why would we let a policy go through and we as Members of this Congress allow a policy to go through that we have no clue, no clue where these other areas are. Talk to Washington officials, they say one's local officials know. Talk to our local forest officials, and we have had hearings on this part, and they said we do not know because we do not have the guidelines. So they would let a policy go through.

Look, the proper role on roadless initiative, identify the areas; and if one wants it to be a wilderness area, that is a proper role of Congress. We should do it.

Proposals undetermine other roaded areas. It limits one's access. It limits one's use. It limits one's enjoyment of the forest.

If it was the roadless initiative, we could probably live with that, but look at what else is going on at the same time. At the exact time is this thing called road management rule. The only way one can build a road in the national forest if this road management rule goes through is if there is a compelling reason for a road.

Temporary roads that we use and rely on for fire fighting, for insect control, for harvesting timber are not recognized. No more temporary roads, none whatsoever.

Who has to agree to it? Not the local foresters, but the regional forester. In Milwaukee, they are going to decide for Michigan and Wisconsin whether or not there is going to be a road in northern Michigan regardless of what the local forestry officials say.

So it virtually bans road construction and reconstruction. So in other words, one cannot even fix up a forest road if this policy goes through, only essential classified roads, no feeder roads, no feeder roads. It does not recognize temporary roads for forest timbers.

So put the roadless initiative with this road management rule that no one knows anything about, put it together, and one has new policies, new rules that will supersede existing locally developed forest management plans in our national forest.

The results are one is going to have a national policy that says one size fits all. We lose our local control. There is no control input. Economic impact is not even recognized. For northern Wisconsin and northern Michigan and Minnesota, we rely upon our national forests, not just for timber sales, for recreation, no personal enjoyment, for hunting; but one has no input. Those economies are not even recognized as we develop these policies.

Last but not least, the new policies and rules change the established use of the forest, the access to the forest, and the activities that can be performed within the forest.

What we have here, as we have debated this bill many times in the past, legislative attempts to limit road building, to limit reconstruction of roads in our national forests. They cannot pass that. They cannot come before Congress and legislatively pass it. So they are doing this back-door approach through a rulemaking process on road management that there is no input.

One can write one's comments, but there is not a meeting anywhere in the United States where people from the local national forest did come and confront the local forest people and say here is what we need roads for. Why cannot one reconstruct this one road that goes to our lake? Because they are going to put through an administrative rule underneath the Administrative Procedures Act.

So I urge all Members to look at the roadless initiative. When one applies the road management on top of that roadless initiative, we have serious problems with what is going on in our national forests. I ask them to be vigilant and fight these policies by the National Forest Service. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), ranking member, for allowing the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) and I to proceed outside of order.

#### NEW FOREST SERVICE POLICIES/RULES

(Decisions affecting National Forests; not found in Forest Management Plans; developed without local community & local forest officials input)

#### ROADLESS INITIATIVE

(Includes defined Roadless Areas and undefined "other unroaded" areas)

Wilderness Designation is proper role of Congress.

Proposes undetermined "other unroaded areas".

Limits access, use & enjoyment of forest.

#### ROAD MANAGEMENT RULE

(Only if compelling reason for a road; no "temp" roads; EIS signed by Regional Forester)

Virtually bans forest road construction & reconstruction.

Only essential classified roads (no feeder roads).

Does not recognize temporary roads for timber harvest.

#### NEW POLICIES/RULES THAT SUPERSEDE EXISTING LOCALLY DEVELOPED FOREST PLANS—RESULTS

National Policy—"one size-fits-all" mentality, loss of local control.

Economic Impact—not recognized, local economies depend on National Forests.

New Policies/Rules—change established uses, access & activities.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report copy B of the Dicks amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKS:

On page 52, after line 15, add the following new section:

SEC. . Any limitation imposed under this Act on funds made available by this Act related to planning and management of national monuments, or activities related to the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan shall not apply to any activity which is otherwise authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House yesterday, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which would overcome section 334 and 335 of the Interior Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001.

My amendment seeks to overcome the funding limitation imposed in the bill under section 334 and 335 relating to the Interior-Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan, known as ICBEMP, and the design, planning, and management of national monuments.

Both of these provisions are objectionable to the Clinton administration, and the committee has received a letter from the Office of Management and Budget director Jack Lew stating that the President's senior advisors would recommend a veto unless these riders are removed.

Section 334 of the bill would stop the Interior-Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, ICBEMP, from going forward. The author of the provision included report language to the bill language stating concern that the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are not in compliance with the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Flexibility Act by completing a regulatory flexibility analysis. The administration, on the other hand, believes that such an analysis is not required. This is a major issue in this debate.

Now, I understand that the author of the amendment may have concerns about the agencies complying with all laws, but I have been assured by the administration that they are, in fact, in compliance with all existing Federal laws and, therefore, object to the inclusion of this provision which would basically stop their work on this particular project.

Further, I do not know whether the author of the amendment does or does not support the Columbia Basin Project's goals, but I think it is vitally important to articulate why it should go forward and not be stopped with a rider in this Interior appropriations bill.

The Columbia Basin Project was initiated by President Clinton in 1993 to respond to landscape-scale issues, including forest and rangeland health, the listing of Snake River salmon, bull trout protection, and treaty and trust responsibilities to the Tribes in the area. It also sought to bring more certainty and stability to the communities located in the Columbia River Basin, which were impacted by these events.

What we had before were literally dozens of smaller management plans that only addressed specific areas within the basin. The goal of ICBEMP was to better assemble each individual plan into a more coordinated watershed-

based program. ICBEMP has several goals. Among them is to better protect the habitat important to threatened and endangered species and also to provide a long-term plan for mining, grazing, and timber harvest, all of which are still allowed under the project.

It is not a land grab, nor does it take decisions out of the hands of local communities and local management offices. It is an important step to better manage these critical lands, and it has had several years in development and has received extensive public comments and participation.

Section 335 prevents the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture from using any funds for the purpose of designing, planning, or management of Federal lands as national monuments which were designated since 1999.

This provision attempts to restrict the designation of monuments by the President under the authority of the 1906 Antiquities Act by using a back-door method: funding limitation. A prohibition on spending funds for these monuments would not change their legal status, but it would prevent any ongoing spending within the monument areas as defined by law.

I would say to all of my colleagues who had monuments declared, that the author of the amendment chose not to cover his monument, but he is covering our colleagues' monuments.

The author of the amendment included language in the Interior Appropriations report to accompany the bill which states: "Nothing in this language prevents either Secretary from managing these Federal lands under their previous management plans." But the bill language clearly states that no money shall be expended for the purpose of design, planning, or management of Federal lands as national monuments.

Once the President has acted to designate these lands, they are legally designated and would thus be subject to the spending limitation. All this provision would do is ensure that no Federal dollars by our land and resource management agencies could be spent in these areas.

A monument designation does not lock up these lands. Quite the contrary, monument status does not preclude such activities as grazing or mining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has expired.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, monument status also involves an extensive community involvement process so that programs can be established for all public uses. Hunting, fishing, hiking, canoeing are all allowed in these areas. But they would all be stopped if we could not do necessary wildlife surveys and environmental programs.

This provision would not allow any funds to be spent for law enforcement

and staffing in the monument. In the areas where there are visitors' centers, they would be closed because the provision would preclude any funds from being spent to operate, maintain, or staff them.

I understand that some of the President's recent designations have been controversial. But he has had, in each instance, the complete authority to act under the jurisdiction of the 1906 Antiquities Act. If the authorizing committees, and I note the presence of the chairman of the authorizing committee, if the authorizing committee of jurisdiction wishes to reexamine the Antiquities Act or wishes to pass legislation to cancel any specific monument designation, then they should do so. But the inclusion of this provision and the other provisions are ill-advised and ensure a veto by the President.

I urge support of my amendment and hope the House agrees that these provisions should not be included in this bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment.

The text of the amendment to the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 46 offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT to the amendment offered by Mr. DICKS:

Strike "monuments," and insert "monuments or".

Strike " or activities related to the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 14, 2000, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

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

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the Dicks amendment would strike the provision in the Dicks amendment concerning the Interior-Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, called ICBEMP.

First and foremost, the linkage of the national monuments portion of the Dicks amendment with the Interior-Columbia Basin Management Project language in his amendment requires that they be separated. They are not the same. They are completely different. They have no relevance to each other. They have no relationship to each other. Therefore, on that point alone, my amendment should be adopted. My amendment seeks to strip the ICBEMP language from the Dicks amendments. So that is point number one, and that

is the simplest way to look at this whole issue.

The second issue and the reason for removing it from the Dicks amendment is that this ICBEMP project was begun in 1993 as a scientific assessment of eastern Washington and eastern Oregon. Now, I want my colleagues and the chairman to keep this in mind, it started as a scientific assessment. We were going to take a look at the ecosystem condition of eastern Washington and eastern Oregon. The scientific findings were to be used as forest and Bureau of Land Management districts updated their land management plans.

Since 1993, this administration has grown this project to a size that encompasses Idaho, western Montana, parts of Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming.

□ 1100

Seven States, 144 million acres, are affected by what started out as an assessment informally.

Even more troubling is that it has grown to a scope that it has now become a decision-making document with standards, meaning that the recommendations of the project managers will automatically amend the land use plans in the region. The seven-State region; 144 million acres.

In 1998, the House had this issue before it. It voted to keep the Columbia Basin project advisory in nature. Not a rulemaking, not a decision-making document, but advisory. That language, which I sponsored and which was adopted by the House, rejected the idea that it should be more than advisory in nature. Unfortunately, in the negotiations on this whole issue at the last minute with respect to the omnibus appropriations, that language was sacrificed by the leadership and on the insistence of the President.

Section 334 of the bill, language which I put in, requires the Forest Service and the BLM to comply with existing law. That is the second broad but important point in this whole debate. It requires this administration to follow existing law, the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, prior to finalizing any interior Columbia Basin ecosystem management project record of decision.

What is happening here, and those of us in the West understand this, is that this administration has time and time again tried to rush to judgment, to have a record of decision that will have the effect of law and that will affect dramatically the land use ability and land use of the western States, the seven western States which are part of this so-called study. The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act passed overwhelmingly in this House, signed into law in 1996, requires agencies to do this simple task: Examine and mitigate for the impact that a proposed rule will have on small entities.

This administration knows that the small entities, the small rural commu-

nities of eastern Washington and the seven western States that I mentioned, are impacted by this outside of the power that they have to stop it. So the only resource we have is to make sure that this administration complies with the law, and that is what this amendment does. It says before a record of decision is issued, Federal agencies must comply with the law that exists, that was signed into law by this President.

I heard my friend from Washington say that he has an assurance from the administration that they do not have to comply with the law in this case; that this act does not apply to them. Only this administration would urge that the Congress ignore the obligation that this administration has to comply with the law. Only this administration would do that. So I am not persuaded by the assurance that we have been given that this law, the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act does not apply. It applies, and there are court decisions that confirm that it applies. The General Accounting Office has issued a report confirming that it applies.

This plan, the ICBEMP plan, is going to amend 62 individual land use plans in the West. It is going to amend land use plans on 32 national Forest Service and BLM administrative units in this project area. It will replace three interim strategies. The project is clearly a rule, and there are court decisions that say so. Failure to comply with the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Act is judicially reviewable by courts, and courts have invalidated agency rules on this basis, against Mr. Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, in 1998.

Evidence is that the agencies have been wrong about this before. Over \$56 million have been spent on this project. It is not authorized. This Congress has not authorized this project. The northwest industries have indicated to me that if a regulatory flexibility analysis is not completed, as required by law, and again that is all we are trying to do is have this administration comply with the law, they will pursue litigation which will throw this whole study into turmoil. Congress has the responsibility to ensure that the project does not leave itself open to litigation, if a record of decision is issued without having completed a regulatory flexibility analysis.

This is overreaching by the administrative agencies of this government, by this administration, by the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the BLM. They are trying to go around the law, and that is wrong. That is wrong for rural America, it is wrong for the States that are represented in the West, and we should not let it happen.

So this should be separated out from this amendment because it does not apply to the national monuments issue. It applies to the fairness and the obligation to small businesses to be

true to the law, and this administration is lacking in that regard if it tries to go forward.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my good friend and colleague that 7 years is hardly a rush to judgment.

I want my colleagues to hear the language of this limitation in this appropriation bill. It says right here, "None of the funds made available under this act may be used to issue a record of decision or any policy implementing the interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project not prepared pursuant to law, as set forth in chapter 6 of Title V of the United States Code."

In all my years of being on the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, the relevance of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act has been somewhat questionable. But let us talk about the analysis that is done in an Environmental Impact Statement. It looks at the socioeconomic impact of the EIS.

Now, either we can get serious and decide we want to really pass legislation, and this bill. Frankly, it is fatally flawed, but these limitations are objectionable to the administration every single year because they offend the process. We do not have hearings, we do not get into great detail on these things and, frankly, and the gentleman, of course, has been here for a number of years, but that is why we have authorizing committees and that is why in most instances we should let the authorizing committees deal with these substantive issues and not deal with them in the appropriations process. I think on both sides of the aisle there has been a consensus that we should not do these limitations unless there is just absolutely no other way to deal with the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) in opposition to the Nethercutt amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time to speak against the Nethercutt amendment and in favor of the Dicks amendment.

First, as it relates to what my friend from Spokane has advanced, I think it is important to allow the Columbia Basin Ecosystem plan to proceed. If adopted by this chamber, the Nethercutt amendment would retain the anti-environmental rider, which would block the implementation of this Pacific Northwest plan for forests, watersheds and endangered species.

It is true that it has grown somewhat in terms of scope and dimension. It has done so because that is what has been dictated as in the best interests of the region that we all care about and in terms of what will make the most difference. Careful long-term planning is a help, not an impediment, to the var-

ious challenges that we face in the Pacific Northwest.

I have heard my colleague more than once on this floor talk about the problems how this has stretched out over 7 years at a cost of \$45 million. Well, adoption of this amendment, and subjecting yet another requirement to this plan, is only going to make the process more expensive and more time consuming. And, indeed, Congress itself is in no small measure a culprit. Every year that I have been here, since 1996, the Committee on Appropriations has been interfering with the orderly implementation of this review.

Now, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) pointed out, the extension of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act to this study is something that has never before been required. It is vigorously disputed as to its applicability. But most important it opens up a very real possibility that we are going to block the potential Federal Government activity to improve the environmental and management activities in the Columbia River basin.

It is going to make it more likely, not less likely, that a court is going to intervene, possibly issuing a decree that could mandate management plan changes and entirely halting the production of goods and services on Federal lands in project areas throughout its deliberations, and the variety of little pieces that are involved there. It is wrong. We ought to get on with this business. It has the greatest potential of solving some very real problems that we in the Pacific Northwest face.

I would like to speak, if I could for a moment, to something that I consider even more insidious, and that is the underlying amendment that would include restrictions on the ability to have funding to implement the National Monuments Act.

This is a major policy adjustment, as has been suggested by my colleague from Washington, and it would have severe, I hope unintended, consequences. Some may applaud at the prospect of not having law enforcement on our public lands, but that is an extreme position that would not be approved by my constituents, nor I think by the constituents of at least most of us in this Chamber.

It is not going to do us any good to not be able to regulate off-road vehicles, law enforcement, mining, the grazing activities. This is categorically wrongheaded, and it is, in and of itself, why the administration will veto the bill. They would have no choice. But it is an example of the environmental extremism that we hear so often about on the other side of the aisle.

If my colleagues do not like the Antiquities Act, they should go ahead and repeal it. If they do not like what the President has done in any specific designation, they should have the courage to bring a specific bill to Congress and undo it. They do not because these are popular actions, they are things that

would be supported by this Chamber, and the environmental extremists on the other side of the aisle would rather play havoc with our ability to manage public land in an orderly fashion.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's point is right on target, as far as I am concerned. The gentleman mentioned this Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. According to the Department of the Interior, the House requires, under this amendment, the Federal Government to prepare analysis, to their knowledge, that has never been prepared for any land use planned effort, no matter its scope.

As a result, the House action will unreasonably extend the duration of planning for this project, which, in part, due to requirements placed on the Federal Government by riders to every full year appropriation for Interior since 1996, has already taken 7 years to complete at considerable cost to the American taxpayer.

The thing that I worry about is that we are going to get ourselves into the same mess we did before the forest plan was put into place, and that is that a Federal judge is going to say that we have not done the right things in terms of watershed protection, that we are not protecting these fish under the Endangered Species Act. He will stop all the logging, all the mining, all the grazing, and an injunction issue. And that is the worst possible outcome.

So I am saying to the gentleman from Washington, who I do consider to be a friend and a thoughtful person, that it is time now to let this process go forward and finish this EIS and make the changes that are necessary to protect the bull trout, to protect the salmon runs on the Snake River, to make sure that we are doing the watershed protection so that we do not get the Endangered Species Act implemented in an adverse way in the gentleman's area.

But we cannot simply do nothing. We cannot just say we have no plan, no strategy. I have supported both gentlemen from Washington on the issue of the Snake River dams. But if we are not going to take out the Snake River dams, then we have to do other things to protect the habitat, to deal with hatchery problems, to deal with harvest. And protecting the habitat is a major part of this requirement in order to protect these fish.

I am going to let the gentlemen on the other side here have a chance, because I know the gentleman from Alabama is ready to go, but this amendment is offered in good constructive spirit. I think the strategy of trying to stop any change here is simply not going to work. It is going to wind up with the Endangered Species Act being applied by the Federal judges in a way none of us want, and so we have to make some hard decisions.

□ 1115

We cannot say no to everything. That is why I supported the protection of the Hanford Reach. Because if we are not going to take out the dams, at least we will protect these salmon in the Hanford Reach.

So I appreciate my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) yielding to me on this. This is something I feel very strongly about. I think the strategy here of continuing to delay this is a mistaken strategy, and that is why I offered this amendment. And I appreciate speaking on it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just conclude by expressing three things.

First, I would like to acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) in attempting to balance a very complex set of issues that we deal with in the Pacific Northwest. And oftentimes I know he must feel like he is the man in the middle. But I think he has addressed this in a direct and forthright manner.

I do not think there is anybody in the Pacific Northwest who has worked harder to reach out to try to find middle ground and to avoid the catastrophe, I think, on all sides of these controversies. If we are going to cede our ability to plan in a thoughtful and manageable fashion and have it done on a piecemeal basis via the courts, I think we ought to move forward in terms of supporting what the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has proposed.

I want to make clear that, as far as the national monuments are concerned, my Republican colleagues have been in control here for the last 4 years, and they have been unable to fashion a compromise acceptable to the American public to go ahead and repeal this legislation. And we have been in fact left with, and I am pleased that we still have, an Antiquities Act that has been utilized by 14 Presidents over the course of the better part of this last century, since 1906, Republicans and Democrats alike.

I think it would be a tragedy for this House to use this back-door attempt to try and take away a power to have disastrous consequences on lands that belong to the American public, and they want us to exercise this sort of stewardship.

I would ask them to at least have the decency to bring forward legislation to repeal the Antiquities Act and do this in a straightforward fashion.

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

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and everybody on that side voted for two pieces of legislation to not repeal it but to take care of it. And what the gentleman has said and the other gentleman has said about law enforcement and other areas is just not true.

What this does, if this gets through, all that ground will stay under the

management plan it now has, which allows for law enforcement, which allows for cars. It does not make any changes whatsoever.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, that is simply not what the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service say. They say that once it is designated as a monument, this amendment applies. They cannot do law enforcement, they cannot do planning, they cannot take care of the visitor. They legally changed the designation and thus would be impacted.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would be happy if he would put in there to repeal that project. I would be very happy to have him do that. And when all else fails, read it and he will see he is wrong.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to say this slowly to my friends on the other side just so we keep our eye on the ball here. This requires that the agencies of the Federal Government to deal in land management comply with the law.

Talk about lawsuits. We are going to have big lawsuits if they do not comply with the law and adopt this amendment. That is what we are talking about here.

The means to do justify the end. That is what this administration seems to want to do is just say, we do not care about the law, we just want to get this done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. Chairman, it has been an interesting conversation. I will stay away from the monuments, but we will talk about that later. We did vote on them on this floor. If the gentleman did not vote for it, he was not doing his duty.

I am a little disappointed that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) opposes the Nethercutt amendment. The Nethercutt amendment does exactly what he says it does, it follows the law.

I know the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) likes to follow the law. He goes to the State of Alaska and catches all my salmon. And the best thing I want to do is have the salmon reestablished on the Columbia River so he quits raiding my fish in Alaska. I mean, especially when he takes numerous amounts of those fish that I would like to take myself.

I would like to suggest one thing. The Nethercutt amendment does exactly what is correct, following the laws that this Congress passed. But this administration has a great tendency to not to follow the law in any

way, shape, or form. This is their habit. This is their MO. They care little about this Congress. We are going to do what we think is right and forget the people of America.

Now, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) said it exactly right, the Columbia initiative was in fact a designation and a study on the Columbia River concerning mostly Oregon and Washington, Montana, Idaho, State River, Columbia River, etc.; and it is all being done by the agencies.

And my colleagues want to have a decision that goes against the laws on the books today, a decision made by an administration that does not really follow the law? They want to include this Congress in that decision on how it will affect the local economy? They want to have a decision made now so we do not have further actions by the judicial branch?

I am going to suggest, respectfully, if the Nethercutt amendment is not adopted it will end up in court and nothing will occur and no solution will be reached.

So I am suggesting that the Nethercutt amendment is the right way to go. This is what should be done and will be done if we do what is right.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in opposition to the Nethercutt amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is very poorly directed in a sense that if my colleagues are complaining about whether or not it is too expensive, I think this amendment only makes this process far more expensive. I think, also, the amendment is targeted at trying to declare the Basin Management Plan something that it is not, and that is that it is not a regulatory process, it is a management plan.

All of us have gone through this. We have gone through this in the Sierra Mountains, where we have known that we cannot deal with this on an individualized little watershed bill; we have got to look at the entire ecosystem.

In California we just completed with the governor and the Secretary of Interior the Cal Fed plan. Why? Because if we do not do that, it is very clear that all the pieces in and of themselves are deficient and they are deficient so we end up shutting down the water system in California, whether it is the irrigation system for our farmers, whether it is the drinking water for our cities, because the system cannot be operated in such a fashion.

In order to stave that off, we engaged in comprehensive basin management just as we are talking about on the Columbia River. Because the gentleman from Washington is right, if we stop this process, if we kill this process, then we go back to the status quo. And

the status quo, it is a no-brainer for a court to put them right back into the situation that they are in on the other side of the mountains, on the western side, where they had chaos, where they had just chaos ruling in terms of whether people lost their jobs or communities did not do well or whether the forests were harvested or not harvested.

This is a chance to get ahead of that curve. They spent \$15 million trying to get ahead of that curve. They had endless meetings with local towns and communities and political subdivisions and all of that. And the question is, can they come up with a plan so they can continue to improve this, may continue the viability of the basin.

This is no different than what we are confronting all over the West. And we are doing it so that we can escape the chaos of individualized slapping down of endangered species problems and all the rest of that. Because that is why this plan came into being, because we know what we can front down the road.

So it is very easy that if they stop this, in fact, the evidence is so clear on its face that the judge simply decides that they cannot provide the level of management to provide the kinds of protections that are necessary to the habitat, to the watersheds, to the species; and, therefore, they are back into chaos.

And it is difficult. We have been at this a number of years in California with the Cal Fed process. As difficult as it is, all parts of the puzzle recognize that, with a comprehensive management plan, they in fact are in a better place than what they would be.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the fact about how complicated and difficult these are to work through. I think we would all agree on that.

But what I keep hearing is how ICBEMP is going to resolve this issue just as the Northwest Forest Plan was resolved on the West side. Is the gentleman arguing that the Northwest Forest Plan is a success and has met its goals?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am arguing that what we have learned is that, absent comprehensive plans that address all facets of the various large basins, the large systems, whether it is the Sierra or the Columbia River or the California water system, absent that, what they get is they get back into chaos because the individual attempts are not sufficient to provide the level of protection. So they find themselves with the court running their systems as opposed to the political leadership and the local communities.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say this. We have been through this. On the West side, we were enjoined by the Federal judge, no timber harvesting. Zero.

The new administration came in and held a summit in Portland, and nobody was entirely pleased with the outcome, but we got the injunctions lifted. We got some timber harvest restored. We got a \$1.2 billion-a-year plan to help the communities deal with these problems. And we moved on.

What we are talking about here with the Nethercutt amendment is going back to the way we used to do business, and that way is going to lead us to the Federal Court's injunction. And, again, he is going to hurt his own people. That is why I do not understand why he is doing this.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Because, as my colleague knows, the court is back saying the plan that has been put forward after that has been done on the Northwest Forest Plan is still not in compliance. Because the survey and management requirements that were shoved in in the dark of night by this administration says the Forest Service has been unable and may indeed be incapable of meeting. We still are not achieving the goals of that plan.

My point in this debate right here, right now, is that to use that as an example of success is not fair when it has been a failure. I agree we have got to have the science in place.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think that is the case. Listen, they are going to continue to challenge us on Cal Fed from either side, from the agricultural side and from the environmental side. They will continue to challenge us on the Sierra plan. But the fact that they have a plan in place allows the judge to look at that in a much different fashion than if they have nothing in place so the judge can then tinker with the plan, but they are not back into wholesale injunctions on an eco-wide system. So that plan is serious, serious insulation from going back to where they were.

I mean, maybe time has erased our memory what was going on in the Northwest. But take ourselves back to the late 1980s and 1990s, we had total chaos.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, so what he is arguing is that, if we are going to err at all, we need to err on the side of following the law. Right?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. No. The gentleman can say whatever he wants to say.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. But the General Accounting Office, in 1997, says that this does constitute a rule in their opinion and, therefore, this small business would follow.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, and obviously, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture seriously disagree with that. Let us not pretend that they do not.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to just say to my friend from California, not from the Northwest, this is not killing the process at all. We are just requiring that the agencies of the Government comply with the law.

The means do not justify the end.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1130

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my friend from Eastern Washington for all the work that he has been doing on this issue. I do enjoy working with my friend from western Washington. We have worked on a lot of issues together that is obviously important to my district. I do appreciate that very much. But on this issue, obviously there is a basic difference as to how we should approach our economy and our resources in our given area. It is an honest difference of opinion, I think.

What I find very interesting in the arguments that I have heard heretofore from my friend from western Washington and my friend from Oregon, they were saying that if we do not like this process by going through the appropriation process, we ought to use the authorizing process. I have always been a proponent of that, but I would make this point very clear. ICBEMP was never authorized. It was done at a time in 1993 when that side of the aisle controlled both houses of the Congress and for some reason they felt that they did not need to authorize this project. It was put in an appropriations bill and now we are living with the consequences of something that has grown from \$5 million now to \$56 million. It has kind of grown like Topsy and it has grown in scope, too.

Let me make a couple of points that were made by those on the other side as far as their arguments. In his opening remarks, my friend from western Washington was saying that in the planning process, the ICBEMP provides more certainty and it does not take planning out of the local jurisdictions. I would just make this observation. This ICBEMP as it has been expanded in this time period covers some 105 counties in those seven States. Not one of those counties has passed a resolution in support of ICBEMP. In fact, to the contrary, 65 of those counties have passed resolutions in opposition to ICBEMP for the very reason opposite of what the gentleman said, they are concerned that this affects their planning process.



Again, this seems to be a pattern from this administration that we will have these meetings that has been mentioned a number of times, but at the end of the day we are not going to listen to the concerns of those at the local level. That seems to be a pattern over and over and over.

What are the reasons why? I can state one of my large counties in my district, why they are concerned about the Federal Government doing this planning and governing in one area, in the northern part of my district in Okanogan County. They are concerned about how the Forest Service is addressing the issue of noxious weeds. They are not addressing the issue of noxious weeds in the forest land. That is going over into the private lands and it is putting a burden on the taxpayers in that area to fund the noxious weed board. That is just one example why they have a concern about the Federal Government taking over this planning.

Finally, I would like to as far as the resource part of it make this observation, because the Endangered Species Act has been a threat, that if we do not do this, the Endangered Species Act is going to preempt everything, and we will end up in a bad situation. I would make this observation, that unless we listen to the local people that are affected, we are going to be in worse shape than we ever possibly think we could. Because it seems to me the implicit idea or thought process of this administration is to not trust those that are elected at the local level to make decisions. I find that, frankly, wrong.

There is another example in my district where local people have worked together trying to comply with the Endangered Species Act as it is written right now through the HCP process. That was signed a couple of years ago by the Chelan and Douglas County PUDs. It still has not gone through the whole NEPA process yet, but they are very confident that if they go through that process, they can live to the letter of the law with the Endangered Species Act. I for one, by the way, think that the Endangered Species Act ought to be changed, but in the letter of the law they can. Why? Because this is local people working together to come to a solution. But ICBEMP, the way it is structured and what we have seen does not allow for that to happen.

Finally, from the regulatory standpoint here with my friend from eastern Washington's amendment. This area that we are talking about is largely an agricultural area. There is no huge urban area like Portland, Oregon or like Tacoma or like the Bay Area in California. There is no large urban area like that. It is largely agriculture. If we do not know what the impact is going to be on the farm implement dealers or the farm chemical dealers or the food processors who are largely smaller businesses in that area, then we are not doing a service to those that are going to be affected. That is all

that this amendment does, is to say, let us put everything into the mix and follow the law. After all, this is an unauthorized project. If the concern is that it goes for one more year, what is wrong with that, as long as we get it right? Because this will have a big impact on my constituents.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my friend from eastern Washington's amendment. I think it is the right thing to do in order to clarify where ICBEMP is going.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

(Mr. HILL of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Montana. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents are deeply concerned about this interior Columbia Basin management plan. They see this as kind of a classical bait and switch that occurred. Basically what happened is that the Clinton administration proposed this study as a scientific assessment so that we would have a regionwide science that could be applied to the individual forests for the development and the renewal of the individual forest management plans. In the process, the administration went to the local governments and solicited their input and their participation and invited them to participate in the process. As a consequence of that, there was pretty broad support for doing this scientific assessment, because, as the gentleman from California pointed out, it was necessary for us to be able to have local forest management plans, to have regionwide science in the development of those plans.

But along the way, things changed. The administration decided that it was going to shift this from a scientific assessment to a decision-making document. What does that mean? It means that the standards and the rules and regulations that would be determined in interior Columbia Basin would be imposed on the local forests. The consequence of that is that now the individual forests cannot make individual forest management decisions. They have to comply with an increasing number of standards and rules and regulations that are on a regionwide basis. We have heard some talk out here about the success of this in a narrow regional area west of the Cascades. But, Mr. Chairman, the forests and the BLM lands that are being impacted by interior Columbia Basin are diverse. The species of trees is diverse. The elevations are diverse. The amount of rainfall that occurs is diverse. There is little similarity in these forests except that they are all part of the Columbia River drainage.

In any event, the administration then determined that it was going to basically override the intent of Congress. Congress has said it wants forest management, land management deci-

sions made locally by making an overriding regional decision document.

The problem today is that this Interior-Columbia Basin issue and the Reg Flex issue is kind of caught up in a bigger set of issues. Because right now we have the designation of national monuments going on, the roadless forest initiative going on, mineral and oil and gas withdrawals of the Clinton administration, proposals to breach the dams on the Snake River and ICBEMP all occurring at one time. It is no wonder that the people in this region feel like there is a war being declared on them with all these things happening.

What the gentleman from Washington's amendment is trying to do is deal with just one narrow area. That says that if ICBEMP is going to go through and it is going to be a decision-making document, then let us make sure that it complies with all the laws. If the goal of this device is to eliminate injunctions in court overriding local decisions, then it has to comply with all the law. That is what this amendment intends to do.

I urge the support of the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) who is a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the more unfortunate aspects of the present majority's rule of this House over the last several years has been this propensity to attach antienvironmental riders to appropriations bills. Essentially that is what we have here today in this particular context. Seven years ago, the administration embarked upon a plan to improve environmental management in the Columbia River Basin. All of the land affected by this plan, by the way, and very importantly, is public land.

It is not private land. It is public land. It is land owned by all of the people of the country. So my constituents in New York as well as every constituent of every Member of this House has a stake in the development of this plan to manage important public resources in the Columbia River basin. That project has gone forward. It has gone forward very carefully, very intelligently, and in a very open way.

An environmental impact statement has been produced. A supplemental environmental impact statement has been produced. All of the activities here have been based on good, sound, responsible science. The intention is to improve habitat in the Columbia River, to improve habitat for bull trout, for salmon, to improve recreational resources, to improve timber resources, and to have a comprehensive plan which will stand and which will allow people all across the spectrum, from recreational uses all across the spectrum to extracted uses to be able to use this public land in the most effective and efficient way.

Now we have this amendment to the Dicks amendment which would block



implementation of this Pacific Northwest plan for forest watersheds and endangered species. It would do so by attempting to superimpose an aspect of the small business law onto the environmental law, to take one piece of a law and inappropriately attach it to a situation where it does not belong, has no standing, has no meaning and makes no sense.

Therefore alone, for that reason alone, just on the structural basis of it, the technical aspects of it, this amendment ought to be rejected. But it ought to be rejected on much more solid ground and much more important ground, and that is this, we are here discussing the future of a very important part of America. Again, I emphasize, a part owned by all of the citizens of this country, held in trust by the Federal Government, administered by the Bureau of Land Management and other agencies within the Department of the Interior.

Now, everybody has a responsibility to make sure that this works and this antienvironmental rider inappropriately attached to this bill ought to be very soundly and solidly rejected.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that just because someone says that it is an antienvironmental rider does not mean that it is. This is complying with the law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) who is from the region that is affected by this study, not from outside our region.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to follow somebody from New York who has a district along the river much like the Columbia River, the Hudson River. There is a lot of similarity there. The difference is they do not have this kind of a planning process in place by the Federal Government, ICBEMP.

I want to talk for a moment, Mr. Chairman, about the relationship of this requirement for this rule. The GAO, the General Accounting Office general counsel wrote in July of 1997 a letter to Congress that a national forest land and resource management plan generally was considered a rule for the purposes of this Small Business Regulatory Act. Failure to comply with this act is judicially reviewable and courts have invalidated agency rules on this basis.

All we are asking here is for this administration to follow the law. And if there is a question about whether this is legal or not, would it not be time for this administration to err on the side of following the law if there is a question? Would that not be refreshing?

Mr. Chairman, let me talk for a moment about the monument issue, because we have heard a lot about the Antiquities Act. I have a copy of the relevant statute here. Let me read from it, that "any person who shall appropriate, excavate, injure or destroy any historic or prehistoric ruin or

monument or any object of an antiquity situated on the lands owned or controlled by the government of the United States."

□ 1145

That is what we are talking about, these objects, these archeological fines. It goes on to say, that the Government may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

And then it goes on to talking about archeological sites, small little objects, and we are going to protect the land around it. Ladies and gentlemen, this is not the smallest area possible to protect an archeological find, is it?

These are the areas that have been approved already, and, in fact, I want to point out a factual error because the Hanford Reach National Monument declared a week or so ago is actually 202,000 acres, not 195,000 acres. These are monument proposals all in the works right now that people are talking about, could total 149 million acres, almost 150 million acres. Ladies and gentlemen, the ICBEMP proposal covers 144 million acres.

I want to share with my colleagues the fact that that is an area, if we took all of these national monuments that are being considered by different groups and perhaps this administration into account, this is an area more than all these States combined: West Virginia, Maryland, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Hawaii, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia combined.

This administration can do this by fiat. This is not the way to manage public lands in this country. This is a violation of the Antiquities Act. The Antiquities Act is about objects and monuments and those sorts of things. Read it. It is right here; I will share it with my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Nethercutt amendment. We can have this science in this planning, and we can have this administration follow the law as well.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), who formerly represented this part of the area, who is a distinguished member of the House and a very strong environmentalist.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the Washington delegation, I rise in very, very vigorous opposition to the Nethercutt amendment. And I would like to share with my fellow Members why I do.

I know this area very, very well, and the Interior-Columbia Basin. It is an area my colleagues should come see. It is an area where Lewis and Clark first encountered the salmon cultures of

North America, where they first came down the Snake River and they ran into the Columbia River, and guess what they found? They found an entire people who lived on salmon.

Lewis and Clark in their journals in *Undaunted Courage*, Members should read it, it is a great book, said they could walk on the backs of salmon literally across the small areas of the Columbia River when the first European arrived.

Now, today, we have at least 12 runs of salmon that are endangered. They are on the verge of going to extinction forever at our hands, at our hands, at the hand of the Federal Government, who has not to date acted in their interests to make sure that we do not take natural-use land policies on Federal land that drive them to extinction.

I am here to ask that my colleagues from across the country to come to the aid of the State of Washington to save the salmon that Lewis and Clark first discovered in the Columbia River. And I want to tell my colleagues that if this amendment were to pass, it would gut the most meaningful effort we have to date to make sure that we the Federal Government plays its role in saving these salmon.

Now what would this do, what would the study simply do? It would do what I think is common sense. It would try to have some coordination between the 62 land-use plans, the 32 forest plans that are now independently running off in their separate directions like chickens with their heads cut off. This would send us right back to those old days of agencies not acting in coordination.

I want to address specifically those. I want to address those who are very concerned about the potential of dam breaching on the Snake River, and those are legitimate concerns.

I want to tell my colleagues that the single most effective way we could send us all down this dam breaching road, is to ignore the common sense things we need to do that we hope the Forest Service and BLM will do to help restore habitat. Because I can tell my colleagues this, if we fail in our obligation to restore salmon habitat, if we fail in our obligation to change hatchery processes, if we fail in these obligations, in these responsibilities, then the potential exists that we do get into a dam breaching scenario.

Those who want to speak about dam breaching, the last thing we should do is to try to stop the Federal Government from taking common sense measures to do something about salmon.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just simply want to make this point, because the basis of the argument of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) has been on the salmon, and the implication of his argument is such that only the Federal Government can make the right plans.

My question to the gentleman, since the gentleman used to represent that district that I now represent, is the gentleman aware of the Vernita Bar agreement, which is a local agreement between the local State and Federal Government that has enhanced the salmon runs? In fact, we are now seeing the benefits of that. Because I think the gentleman probably is aware that the spring chinook run coming back to the Columbia River is higher than it has ever been since they started keeping records in the mid-1950s.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to just say this does not gut anything. The Nethercutt amendment simply says comply with the law, so we do not have huge lawsuits later.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good debate.

Mr. Chairman, one of the gentlemen says that if we have a plan that gives a judge a better opportunity to look, well, look at the tuna dolphin bill, that passed the House, that passed the Senate, over 300 votes here. It was signed by the President, environmental groups supported it, animal rights groups supported it, but the gentleman from California in the other body judge-shopped to get that stopped, and that is why we are talking about this.

I have heard extremists, and I have heard anti-environmentalists to ask the Government to follow the law is not extremist. And I would like to take a look at the things that we are actually looking at in this amendment.

Californians, when they complain, they call it extremists because we do not want to follow the Antiquities Act on millions of acres without review. This is East Coast and all the colored lands in here are owned by the Government.

Now, when we turn this chart around, Mr. Chairman, this is what is in the West. When the President takes Utah and millions of acres and millions of acres in Oregon and other areas, when the Antiquities Act was met, the average is 47 acres, then that is damaging to California and the West.

Yet we are called extremists because we want to limit that. And all we are asking, and what the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is asking, is that for the Government to follow the law; that is not extremist. That is not anti-environmentalist.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman on tuna dolphin, the Government did not follow the law. They failed to do the studies but went ahead with the action and the judge said, no, the law says you have to do the studies, do the studies.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the White House, violation after violation of things, look at what Secretary Babbitt has done; and we are saying that in those cases then the Government should have to follow the law, and that is the reason I support the Nethercutt amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, my colleague from eastern Washington said talk real slow, the allegation here is following the law. What they are basing this on is a GAO report on the Tongas wilderness. This would subject a precedent that they somehow want to stretch to every land use decision. No court has ever decided this.

This was a GAO opinion from 1973. No court has ever decided it, but I find it ironic that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are somehow holding up to such reverence a GAO report when they do not do this for mining practices, for timber practices, for abuse in the oil industry. These are all GAO reports that the majority has seen fit to avert their eyes; but here, they would subject every land use process to an opinion that devolves from this one item.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to just point out to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BLUMENAUER), he has not read the law with respect to Northwest Mining Association versus Babbitt, 5 F. Supp. 2d 9, DC District Court, 1998. That is absolutely contrary to the statement that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has just made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE).

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, we really have to focus on what the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is trying to do here. As I sat and listened to the debate last night and as I listened to it today, I find that this side of the aisle is really trying to constrain spending and keep the agencies confined to the letter of the law, while we see the other side not really seeming to care if we go overbudget or spend a lot of money.

Spending and spending seems to be their flavor and the American people are saying pay down the debt and constrain government and constrain spending. Now, this is the biggest, best example, this ICBEMP project, of a project going way overbudget. This is the poster child for the real paralysis of analysis that we find in the Federal Government of overspending, overanalyzing, overregulating and not producing anything for \$56 million, but a huge plan that covers 62 Forest Service plans, multiple States, private property and State property.

All they have done is plan for \$56 million. My colleagues, the Dicks amendment attempts to override reasonable language requiring the administration to follow the law, and that is all the Nethercutt amendment is doing. We should not have to be here, but the agencies tend to ignore the law. What the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is doing is saying it simply is not fair as the Congress had recognized before in the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act. It simply is not fair for a small business not to have the impact of government agency decisions analyzed.

The Forest Service and all of the agencies must comply to that. We should not even have to be here, except the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is having to remind the agencies and this administration once again we simply need to follow the law.

The ICBEMP decision will have major impacts on small businesses, in Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington; and this administration ignores its responsibility under the law. And Congress must not condone its efforts to side-step the law.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds. Mr. Chairman, I find it hard to believe that in one breath we can say we are going to delay this process now for 7 years and then complain about the fact that it has cost \$56 million to do the process.

If we stop delaying it, let them issue the Record of Decision, we can get on with this. We have looked at the socioeconomic consequence in the EIS.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise both Members that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has 4 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has 1½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), who survived the fires; and we are glad he is here.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the issue here is one of do we proceed on a piecemeal basis with the devastating consequences that we have had or do we proceed and look at the overall basin. All of us know that the great explorer that came out West, John Wesley Powell, when he looked at organizing governmental units in this area, said we ought to look at basins; we ought to look at watersheds. And we did not take that advice, and what we have gotten today is a piecemeal approach.

□ 1200

It has been absolutely devastating to the natural resources, to the salmon, to the watershed, to the forest.

So what we have today is an attempt, what we have today is an attempt, to continue piecemeal, to continue to go

into court, to continue to try to bog and slow down the process, rather than look at the whole Columbia River Basin. That is what the issue is here today, and it is an important issue, and it is an issue.

I am from the West. There have been criticisms here from the other side turning around and saying, oh, these Easterners should not be able to talk. We ought to look at all of our basins in the West. I am willing to have the Rio Grande looked at. We are looking at the Columbia River Basin. We ought to continue to look at a sound scientific approach on our river basins.

So I would urge all of my colleagues, all of my colleagues, to reject this amendment. It is antienvironmental, it is a return to a piecemeal approach, and it is not the approach that we should be heading into in the 21st century in terms of dealing with our resources.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that I am interested in the gentleman from New Mexico's comments. The gentleman has come out and says he wants to breach the dams in the lower Snake River. So I do not give much credibility to the idea that this is somehow antienvironmental. It is just not.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), for a comment on the legal issue.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I went over and looked at the citation from my colleague from eastern Washington, and I apologize for not being conversant with it, but it seems to me quite clear that what that is, it talks about this as potentially reviewable. The point I made is that there is no judicial determination on point that would apply this to a land use planning process, and I stand by that assertion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my friend from Washington, we have had a very spirited debate here today. We have discussed this issue. The administration feels very strongly that further delay of this draft environmental impact statement is counterproductive, because what we are trying to do is to protect this habitat and make sure that we restore these salmon runs, and also to make sure there is some commodity production on the lands that the gentleman is concerned about.

What the gentleman is opening himself up to by further delaying a rational answer, a scientifically credible, legally defensible answer, is the same kind of injunction that we got on the West side which led to a total halt in all timber harvesting. So it is a high-risk strategy that I think will fail.

I must say also to my colleagues, who say do not breach the dams in the Snake River, if you are not going to do that, and I agree with you on that issue, but if you are not going to do

that, then you have got to do something to protect this other habitat, so that we can restore these fish runs, so we can restore the bull trout, restore the salmon runs on the Snake River. Yes, they may be healthy on the Columbia River, but we have endangered listings on the Snake River.

One cannot stop everything and say you are addressing the problem. What government is about is coming forward with leadership, coming forward with proposals, working these things out. Our State had the forest and fish plan, we have had habitats conservation plans, where good people get together and work these things out.

I say to the gentleman, it is time to stop blocking this ICBEMP proposal, because you are undermining our ability to solve these environmental problems.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's passion, but he is wrong. We are not trying to stop anything. We are trying to make this government comply with the law. Everything that has been done, the \$56 million that has been submitted on this issue, it is going to remain. We are not going to stop anything. But, doggone it, if you are from the east side of the State of Washington, and the gentleman is not, these decisions by these agencies have real consequences on our people.

So I am not persuaded by the idea that this is somehow stopping anything. It is simply saying comply with the law. That is something this administration has not done. It ought to stop right here.

We are going to use this ICBEMP project, but, doggone it, do it right. Do not rush to judgment and use any means to get to your end, and that is lock up our region, frankly, and do things that are going to hurt our people.

So this is in the best interests of our people. We are going to have litigation if we do not do this, my friend; we are going to have litigation if we do not do it.

So I am saying to my friends is, this issue is separable from the national monument issue, and all the crying about antienvironmental is just wrong. This is the most environmental thing we can do, is make sure we are not tied up in litigation on the other side of the issue.

Comply with the law, administration; do what you are supposed to do, and do not confuse this with some antienvironmental attitude. It is not. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and do the right thing for this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 221, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—206

Aderholt	Gekas	Packard
Archer	Gibbons	Paul
Army	Gilcrest	Pease
Bachus	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Goode	Pickering
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Pitts
Barr	Goodling	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Portman
Bartlett	Graham	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Granger	Quinn
Bass	Green (WI)	Radanovich
Bateman	Greenwood	Regula
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Reynolds
Biggett	Hansen	Riley
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Rogan
Bilirakis	Hayes	Rogers
Bliley	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Blunt	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehert	Heger	Royce
Boehner	Hill (MT)	Ryan (WI)
Bonilla	Hilleary	Ryun (KS)
Bono	Hobson	Salmon
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Sanford
Bryant	Horn	Scarborough
Burr	Hostettler	Schaffer
Burton	Houghton	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Hulshof	Sessions
Callahan	Hunter	Shadegg
Calvert	Hutchinson	Shaw
Camp	Hyde	Shaw
Canady	Isakson	Shimkus
Cannon	Istook	Shuster
Castle	Jenkins	Simpson
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Chambliss	Jones (NC)	Smith (MI)
Chenoweth-Hage	Kasich	Smith (TX)
Coble	King (NY)	Souder
Coburn	Kingston	Spence
Collins	Knollenberg	Stearns
Combest	Kolbe	Stenholm
Cook	Kuykendall	Stump
Cooksey	LaHood	Sununu
Cox	Largent	Sweeney
Crane	Latham	Talent
Cubin	LaTourette	Tancredo
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Deal	Linder	Terry
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
DeMint	Manzullo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Martinez	Thune
Dickey	McCollum	Tiahrt
Doolittle	McCrery	Toomey
Dreier	McHugh	Trafficant
Duncan	McInnis	Upton
Dunn	McIntosh	Vitter
Ehlers	McKeon	Walden
Ehrlich	Metcalfe	Wamp
Emerson	Mica	Watkins
English	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Everett	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	Moran (KS)	Weldon (PA)
Fletcher	Nethercutt	Weller
Foley	Ney	Whitfield
Fossella	Northup	Wicker
Fowler	Norwood	Wilson
Frelinghuysen	Nussle	Wolf
Gallely	Ose	Young (AK)
Ganske	Oxley	

NOES—221

Abercrombie	Blagojevich	Clement
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Clyburn
Allen	Bonior	Condit
Andrews	Borski	Conyers
Baca	Boswell	Costello
Baird	Boucher	Coyne
Baldacci	Boyd	Cramer
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Barcia	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Becerra	Capps	Davis (IL)
Bentsen	Capuano	DeFazio
Berkley	Cardin	DeGette
Berman	Carson	Delahunt
Berry	Clay	DeLauro
Bishop	Clayton	Deutsch

Dicks	Larson	Ramstad
Dingell	Lazio	Rangel
Dixon	Leach	Reyes
Doggett	Lee	Rivers
Dooley	Levin	Rodriguez
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Roemer
Edwards	Lipinski	Rothman
Engel	LoBiondo	Roukema
Eshoo	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Etheridge	Lucas (KY)	Rush
Evans	Luther	Sabo
Farr	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Filner	Markey	Sandlin
Forbes	Mascara	Sawyer
Ford	Matsui	Saxton
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)	Schakowsky
Franks (NJ)	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Frost	McDermott	Serrano
Gejdenson	McGovern	Shays
Gephardt	McIntyre	Sherman
Gilman	McKinney	Shows
Gonzalez	McNulty	Sisisky
Gordon	Meehan	Skelton
Green (TX)	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Hall (OH)	Menendez	Smith (WA)
Hall (TX)	Millender-	Snyder
Hastings (FL)	McDonald	Spratt
Hill (IN)	Miller, George	Stabenow
Hilliard	Minge	Stark
Hinchee	Mink	Strickland
Hoeffel	Moakley	Stupak
Holden	Mollohan	Tanner
Holt	Moore	Tauscher
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Hoyer	Morella	Thompson (CA)
Inslee	Murtha	Thompson (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Thurman
Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Tierney
(TX)	Neal	Towns
Jefferson	Oberstar	Turner
John	Obey	Udall (CO)
Johnson (CT)	Olver	Udall (NM)
Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Velazquez
Jones (OH)	Owens	Visclosky
Kanjorski	Pallone	Walsh
Kaptur	Pascrell	Waters
Kelly	Pastor	Watt (NC)
Kennedy	Payne	Waxman
Kildee	Pelosi	Weiner
Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)	Wexler
Kind (WI)	Petri	Weygand
Klecicka	Phelps	Wise
Klink	Pickett	Woolsey
Kucinich	Pomeroy	Wu
LaFalce	Porter	Wynn
Lampson	Price (NC)	
Lantos	Rahall	

## NOT VOTING—7

Campbell	Lofgren	Young (FL)
Danner	Myrick	
Hinojosa	Vento	

## □ 1226

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Messrs. ANDREWS, PORTER, and PETRI changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

As the gentleman is aware, the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge is in my Eleventh Congressional District in California. Due to the controversy over its existence and management, the chairman has been instrumental in

limiting funds from being spent on land acquisitions for the refuge. I thank the chairman for his support over the years on this issue.

Unfortunately, it has come to my attention that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has intentionally ignored the direction from the Congress and commitments made to myself on this issue. The Service has been actively seeking and approving land purchases for the Stone Lakes refuge. One documented purchase used CVPIA funds, Land and Water Conservation Funds, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Funds, Packard Foundation grant money, and Stone Lakes environmental grant money. The amounts used for these various sources totaled over \$1.9 million.

It gets better. When the Director of Fish and Wildlife Service was asked about this, she was not immediately aware of the purchase of land at Stone Lakes.

## □ 1230

Apparently the regional manager initiated and approved the purchases without consulting her office. This action was in violation of congressional direction, and violated instruction from the director that proposed purchases for this refuge be brought to her attention.

While I would like to see the purchase negated, the damage is done. The innocent landowner who sold his property was lied to and misled about the Federal Government's authority to buy his property for Stone Lakes. The Federal taxpayer is out the money and Congress has been ignored.

I have contacted the director of Fish and Wildlife, and we have met this morning. However, as the Representative of the area in question I must act to ensure that there is a consequence to this ill-advised Federal action.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the Fish and Wildlife Service's blatant disregard of the direction of Congress I ask that the gentleman work with me as this bill moves forward in conference to include the strongest language possible to prevent any funds from being spent or handled by the Department of Interior for purposes of buying land or easements for Stone Lakes, including administrative funds. I also ask that such language address the Department's escalating acceptance of non-Federal funds to carry out purchases of land and easements. The routine practice of foundations and conservation organizations giving money directly to the Department has contributed to problems at Stone Lakes. Without congressional oversight or accountability, the Department is bound to repeat history.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. I thank my colleague for bringing the Stone Lakes situation to my attention. I am very concerned

over the actions taken by the Service and the disregard of congressional intent and of the commitments made to the gentleman by the director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The committee held a hearing this year to address the multiple sources of funds used by the Service to establish refuges and acquire land. At the request of the committee, the General Accounting Office looked at this issue. At the hearing, the GAO reported several facts that are cause for alarm and relate to the gentleman's problem. Let me share a few of the GAO's findings with the gentleman.

One, the Fish and Wildlife Service established 23 new refuges in the 5 years from 1994 through 1998. Fifteen of those refuges were established with non-appropriated funds, donations and exchanges. Congressional approval, or even notification, is not required to establish a refuge with nonappropriated funds. After establishing refuges with donated funds, the Service routinely adds more land to those refuges with appropriated funds.

The Service has authority to acquire land for many different habitat and endangered species preservation purposes. As a result, just about any piece of undeveloped land appears to be a potential target for land acquisition by the Service.

The Service has many different sources for Federal land acquisition, appropriated funds through the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund, nonappropriated funds through the Migratory Bird Fund, and donations and land exchanges.

To complete the land acquisition for all the current and planned refuges will require about \$4 billion.

The Service continues to create new refuges and expand existing refuges. Six new refuges were created in 1999.

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

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

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the Service does not consider the annual operations and maintenance requirements associated with establishing new refuges when making its decisions on refuge establishment.

I want to say to the Members, I think this really goes around the policy-making responsibility of the Congress to have this happen, and I think we need to address this issue in statute and require the Congress to have a voice in the establishment of refuges, because we end up with the cost of maintaining them.

I want to assure the gentleman that I will work with him on this issue as this legislation moves into conference with the Senate.

Mr. POMBO. I want to thank the gentleman for all of the help he has given me on this issue over the year and I look forward to working with him.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HANSEN TO  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANSEN to the amendment offered by Mr. DICKS:

Strike "planning and management of national monuments, or".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 14, 2000, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the great conservationist Teddy Roosevelt could see, as he went through the West, and he was very familiar with the West, that there were some things that needed protection. So he asked Congress to pass a law, and that was called the Antiquities Law that was passed in 1906.

It is kind of fun and interesting to go back and read the information regarding the Antiquities Law. As they stood on the floor and debated it, they said what is this really going to do? Between the gentleman from Texas and the other gentleman, they said it will protect the cave dwellers, or what they had there, and it should be called the cave dwellers bill.

In this particular instance, what does it say? It amazes me, Mr. Chairman, because we have passed two previous pieces of information about this, 408 to 2 this year and one the term before, but very few people even take the time to look at the law.

As Chairman John Sieberling used to say, when all else fails, read the legislation. I could not agree more with that.

When one goes to what this does, it talks about going into these pre-historic ruins and what one can and cannot do. Then in the next section it says this, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined, now keep this in mind because everyone seems to ignore this, shall be confined to the smallest area compatible to protect that site.

What sites does it talk about? It talks about archeology. The Rainbow Bridge is a great example of a monument in archeology.

It talks about historic. Where the two trains came together and we called it the Golden Spike is a great historic example of what we have.

Out of these things, and many people have argued this, they say, gee, we would not have the parks without these.

Out of the Monuments Act came the Grand Canyon, came Zion's and others,

but we did not have other laws up to that point.

Now, I say that many of the presidents that my colleagues on the other side have talked about did a good job and they created these very small, unique areas. However, along comes this administration, we have another thing happen. In September of 1996, the President of the United States went to the Grand Canyon and created the Grand Staircase Escalante. He forgot to tell anybody about it. Let us say they intentionally told nobody about it.

Out of that, they did not take a small thing like the law says. They did not mention an archeological or historic or scientific thing, like the law says, but they went ahead and did 1.7 million acres.

We were very curious, why did they do that? So we subpoenaed that. We even wrote a little book. I hope somebody has read it. I doubt it, from the arguments I have heard about this, but it is called Behind Closed Doors.

Now let me read from this book what they say. McGinty, who was the chairman of the Council of Environmental Quality, she says this, I am increasingly of the view we should just drop this Utah issue. These lands are not really in danger.

Now, I would say to my colleagues, please listen to this if they would. This is a letter we had as we subpoenaed these papers. The real remaining question is not so much what the letter says but the political consequences of designating these land as monuments, now listen, please listen, when they are not really threatened with losing wilderness status and they are probably not the areas in the country most in need of this designation.

Now listen to this. I talked about what other presidents have done. Now listen. Presidents have not used their monument designation authority in this way in the past; only for large, dramatic parcels that are threatened.

Do we risk a backlash from the bad guys? I guess I am one of those. It talks about it, but the discretion is too broad. So now we find ourselves in a situation where, where is all of this going? From that time to this time look at all of these on this map that have now come about; every one of them exceeding what the law says.

Do we designate what it is? No. Do we use the smallest acreage? No. And we find ourselves in a position where we are losing this.

I find it interesting that the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Babbitt, to the Denver School of Law said this, it would be great to get these protection issues resolved in the congressional legislative process, but if that is not possible I am prepared to go back to the President and not only ask, not only advise but implore him to use his power under the Antiquities Act and say, Mr. President, if he does he will be vindicated for generations to come.

So we have a brand new abuse, a brand new way to use it, never been

used before until this President comes about.

I would ask people to realize what is happening now and all over America is for political purposes, and if they do not believe that, please read what the White House says, what the Department of Interior says. To me, in my opinion, I cannot believe that we are letting anyone do this.

Article 4, section 3 of the Constitution says the ground of America is the purview of Congress, not the purview of the President of the United States.

This act has outlived its usefulness, but as we saw from the gentleman from Oregon what we are going to see is a whole bunch of them, 25 more they are telling me. Why does somebody not just say let us put the whole West in? Let us put all western States in and call it the Western National Monument and get it over with. It will not mean anything, but it sure will make a lot of people happy around here. Nothing will change but it may make a few people happy around here, because nothing has changed now.

Let me use the Grand Staircase as an example. We talk about protection. Do we realize under the management plan of all of these areas, which it can still do, we have more protection than we do under the Antiquities Act?

Now my friend from Washington and the gentleman from Oregon said, oh, we cannot work these lands if this happens. Here is the report, written by the Committee on Appropriations. Nothing in this language prevents either Secretary from managing these Federal lands under their previous management plan.

So what happens? They just go on as ever. They can call it that, but nothing happens. They can have police protection. They will continue to manage the plans. That is a red herring.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member, who has done a lot of work and research on the Antiquities Act.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a static country. In the next decade, we will have 20 to 25 million new people added to our population. We will have 35 to 40 percent more commercial airline flights, God help us all. We will have about 35 million more people knocking on the doors of national parks.

If one does not think that those parks are overburdened, I invite them to visit Yellowstone or Yosemite or any other of a couple dozen national parks around the country and see how much people are crammed in.

It is in the national interest of the United States for additional areas of special value to be preserved for future generations.

Now we have heard an attack on President Clinton for abusing his power

in adding 9 additional national monuments to the Nation's storehouse.

I would like to cite what the record has been since 1906. Teddy Roosevelt, and I recognize that the former Speaker of the House, Mr. Gingrich, indicated that one of his goals was to eliminate the Roosevelt legacy from the Republican Party and return it to the philosophy of William McKinley, but nonetheless, thank goodness, Teddy Roosevelt served a wonderful stint as President and he acted 18 times to put aside territory just like this.

William Howard Taft, that well-known "leftist," acted 11 times. Harding, Harding, that terrible, terrible "liberal," added 8 to the national storehouse. Calvin Coolidge, that well-known "champion of activist government," added 14.

□ 1245

Herbert Hoover, that well-known enemy of rugged individualism, let us see, he added 12. Then we had Eisenhower and Nixon. We know how far left they were. Right? They added eight. Wilson added 12. FDR was the champion of them all, 23. Harry Truman, Harry Truman is the Democrat the Republicans love to quote but hate to emulate; he added seven.

So now my colleagues are beating up on President Clinton for adding nine. The fact is, out of 151 that were added to the national storehouse since 1906, nine of them have been added by this President. That is hardly out of line with the historical record for the previous occupants of that office.

There is only one I see who was literally asleep on the job when it came to having an opportunity to add protected areas to the national storehouse. That was President Bush who did a grand total of one.

So it seems to me that President Clinton is well within the historical tradition of the country in doing exactly what he has done. I would also say that, despite the fact that my good friend indicates that the Secretaries maintain the ability to manage these lands as their former status would indicate, as forests or as wilderness, or as wildlife refuges, the general counsel has said that is not true. So we do not believe it is true. At best, it is an open question.

So it seems to me that we ought to stick with the amendment of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). What the President is trying to do is do what this Congress has not had the gumption to do, and I congratulate him for it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I was listening with great interest to the statement of the gentleman

from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). But if one took all the land of all the Presidents that set aside those monuments, it equals one-third of what this President has done in the past 3 years. The original intent of the Antiquities Act was not to set aside vast areas of land; it was to set aside those that are special.

I challenge anyone to show me where any of the areas this President set aside in the massive acreage that has occurred that has anything specifically special in those great borders. If it was special, that one small area should have been set aside. But this President is using this act, which was never intended to do so, to designate and to dictate the use of lands.

Under the Constitution, it says only the Congress shall have that responsibility. For this Congress and that side of the aisle and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the rest of my colleagues to acquiesce to the executive branch is unconstitutional. My colleagues swore right up as I did, I swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. Yet, we sit in this body and allow this act to be misused by this administration and say, oh, it is to protect those lands.

By the way, there was no local input, no understanding what effect would occur economically, culturally, psychologically. It was decided downtown, in big Washington, D.C., who knows best for all. This is against the Constitution. He is not protecting what should be protected. He, in fact, is running this as a fiefdom and a kingdom.

This Congress, to my knowledge, has never accepted any one of his monuments by the Representative from that district. If one goes back and checks Truman and Roosevelt and all those others, he did it in consultation with that Representative that was duly elected by the people. I challenge the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) to show me one Congressman that supports that area as declared a monument.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), who has been a strong protector of the environment.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We need to reject this amendment and strike the rider.

The language needs to be stricken because its effect, to put it very bluntly, would be perverse. This language would put land in newly created national monuments in a state of limbo. The lands would remain national monuments; but the design, the planning and management necessary to fully protect the lands and to make them accessible could not be accomplished.

Who could possibly gain from keeping lands in this sort of halfway-house condition? Nobody.

Not those who want to preserve the environmental value of the lands. The prohibition in this rider would block the planning and management needed to protect the environmental and cultural values that prompted the monumental designation.

Not those who want recreational access to the lands. The prohibition in this rider would prevent the development of programs or centers to enable the public to take greater advantage of the lands.

Not even those who have mineral or other economic interests in these lands. The prohibition in this rider would prevent the development of rules and policies that would determine how to handle their claims.

So why would anyone propose a rider that cannot help anyone concerned about national monuments and a rider that would cause this entire bill to be vetoed to boot? The reason is that the proponents of this rider want to signal their opposition to the 1906 Antiquities Act itself and with the particular monument designations that have been made this year.

But they have plenty of other ways to do that directly. The Congress could amend the Antiquities Act. The Congress could override any particular monument designation. The Congress could reject any particular management plan for a monument. Congress has all the direct authority it needs to have a full debate about lands policy.

But they do not want to do that because Congress has repeatedly shown its unwillingness to significantly alter with monument authority or designation. So, instead, we have a rider to try to do it in an indirect and inartful way through the appropriations process which could not be done through direct congressional action; namely, derail efforts to protect Federal lands through the use of the Antiquities Act. That is a misuse of the appropriations process, and it is especially misguided in this case because the direct impact of the language is so counterproductive.

So I urge my colleagues not to turn the discussions on this rider into a debate over the legitimacy of the Antiquities Act or the wisdom of any particular monument designation. If Congress wants to weigh in on these matters, it can and should do so directly. In any event, the rider leaves the act and all recent proclamations entirely intact.

This debate should be about the specific language in the rider which will leave the status of the land in an uncertain State which would hobble efforts to protect Federal lands and which would improperly take advantage of the appropriations process. It is a bad rider, and it should be stricken.

I urge a no vote on the Hansen amendment.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from New

York (Mr. BOEHLERT) on his statement and make this point: the effect statement of the Department of Interior basically says that, if this language passes, that we have basically neutered or gutted the Antiquities Act. It makes it impossible for the President to protect these important lands.

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is exactly right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the other point I want to make is he does not just go out and do this on any land. It has to be land that has previously been under Federal management. In most cases, they are still hunting and hiking and canoeing and other things that can be done on this land.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we are not instantly creating wilderness. So the gentleman is a moderate, a centrist, one of the most respected Members of this House. I think this language goes way too far. I think it will be a bad thing for, not only this President, who a lot of the people in this Chamber do not seem to like, but for the future President who may want to protect an important monument for this country.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this amendment. The previous remarks that were made by the gentleman from western Washington (Mr. DICKS) and by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) was that this land had to be under Federal ownership. That is exactly right.

But let me tell my colleagues about what happened in my district with the latest monument that was created. Those lands largely in the early 1940s were under private land; but because of the Second World War, the Government took them over.

Now, the Hanford Reach runs through that area. For those of my colleagues who do not know, the Hanford Reach is the last free-flowing stretch of the Columbia River. The issue, the people will talk about the Hanford Reach and say we need to protect it for spawning reasons. Well, this Congress already acted on that. In 1995, we passed a bill to prevent any dam building, any dredging, any channelling of that river. So the spawning beds are already protected. What we are talking about is the lands surrounding the river.

Now, there has been a lot of discussion on this, and there are different ideas. My idea is an idea that is proposed by a citizens committee that worked for nearly 2 years coming up with a management plan that is in opposition to a one-size-fits-all Federal plan.

What they came up with is a shared plan that involved the Federal Government, that involved the State govern-

ment, involved the local government. It allowed for local decision-making for the people that live and work and recreate in that area.

But with this action of the monument, with this action of the monument, all of this work is taken away. As a matter of fact, this monument designation for the Hanford Reach is more likely, more extreme than any bill that had been introduced addressing this issue in the time that I have been in Congress.

So I think, frankly, it is a slap in the face to those that live and work in that area. I think that the amendment of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) is exactly the right amendment, because what we are talking about here, as the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) pointed out, is an abuse of power and process by this President in designating monuments. This is a classic example of how that has happened because the people in that area came up with the plan.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment and this debate is really about America's lands. It is not about the lands that any one Member of Congress controls. It is not about the lands of any one State. It is about the lands of this Nation, the great public lands that belong to all of the people of this Nation.

This summer, millions of Americans will set off with their families to visit our wilderness areas, to visit our national parks, to visit our national monuments, to visit our historical sites, one, because they want to enjoy the historical aspects, the cultural aspects of these great lands, of the tradition of our country, of the history of our country. They want to share that with their children, with their grandparents, their grandchildren. Many of them will remember when their parents took them on such a trip.

Because of the bold actions of this President, the vision of this President, of this administration, to think about the future, to think about the threat to these lands, they will be able to do that, and their children will be able to do that, and their grandchildren will be able to do that.

They will be able to visit the pinnacles of the midcoast of California whose protection is enhanced because of the enlargement of that monument. They will be able to visit the 3,000-year-old Sequoia trees that reach 300 feet into the air because this President made them a national monument. Because if we do not do this, we go back to the old management regime, if my colleagues believe what the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) said, that everything just goes back to the way it was. The way it was, we were cutting the Sequoias. We were destroying the environment of the Sequoias.

The Sequoias, the cathedral trees, the largest of the largest were threat-

ened by the actions around them. That is why this President took his action. This is a gift. This is a gift to our Nation, just as Yosemite was a gift to our Nation, just as Glacier was a gift to our Nation, the Grand Canyon and the Everglades.

This is a gift to our people, of having the foresight to go in, whether it was Teddy Roosevelt or Franklin Roosevelt or President Clinton, to go in and understand the threat and the need to preserve these lands, to understand that this country is filling up with people, that California is filling up with almost 35 million people, and that they want a place to go and to take their families so that they can recreate, that they can enjoy the history.

□ 1300

Because of the actions of this President in southern Oregon, parts of the Oregon Trail will be preserved so people can go there and undertake and look at the remarkable actions of the people who had the courage to set out from the Mississippi River to settle the West.

A member of my family walked that five times, bringing young people to the west from Missouri. A member of my family set out and he walked that first group, his children, as a wedding gift, because he thought they were too young to cross the country by themselves. They were 15 and 16 years old, they were married and they were going West. They ended up in Eureka, California, where this President had the foresight to protect the Headwaters Forest, the great cathedral trees of the redwoods on the North Coast, like the great cathedral trees of the Sequoias.

This amendment should be rejected because this amendment is an attack on our culture, our history, our legacy, and the great environmental assets. If my colleagues go to a foreign nation, their people will talk about our national parks, the so-called crown jewels. Talk to the businesses in these areas, and they will talk about the economic engines that wilderness areas, that monuments, and that national parks become for the business communities and for local communities.

This amendment should be rejected and America's wild lands and America's great environmental assets should be protected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind members in the gallery that they are guests of the House, and either approval or disapproval of any statements made by the Members is against the rules of the House.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and I would simply say to the House that, sadly, what the preceding speaker is telling us is that the ends justify the means. If we mean



well; if we, through good intentions or perhaps a form of arrogance, say we are better than others, that our motives are more pure than the Constitution of the United States, well, then, the law really makes no difference.

Perhaps, my colleagues, it would be good to actually listen to the words of the Constitution that we all swear to uphold, protect and defend; article 4, section 3, the second paragraph. "The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

My colleagues, the history was laid out correctly by the gentleman from Utah. The Antiquities Act was designed to protect archeological treasures and, really, in the fullness of time, to jump start a national parks system. The problem we have is not the Antiquities Act, it is not living up to the Antiquities Act, not setting aside the smallest amount of land possible and ignoring the process of turning to the Congress for Congress' constitutionally mandated responsibilities.

Indeed, to see a friend from Arizona, the Secretary of the Interior, testify in front of a congressional committee and to have the Secretary of the Interior asked what his intention is regarding these lands; could he tell this committee what lands he plans to designate, and then to have the Secretary of the Interior say no, my colleagues, that is contempt of Congress. That is contempt for the Constitution. That is not love of the land.

This is not a question of preservation and conservation. We all believe in that. There are ways to do that. And whether it was Franklin Roosevelt or Theodore Roosevelt, other presidents have acted in consultation with the Congress. That is what is important. And in our drive to preserve and protect lands, let us not destroy the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, on another note, if my friends on the left want to acquiesce here, then none of them should ever stand in the way of any president who wants to usurp his constitutional authority vis-a-vis our military.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the Hansen amendment.

I want to give my colleagues a sense of how the administration feels about the subcommittee action and why they believe that it is so dangerous.

"Although not completely clear on the face of the rider, its prohibition on managing national monuments as national monuments during FY 2001 is intended to effectively repeal the President's proclamations made since the end of FY 1999." Very cleverly written language, by the way. "This intent is made clear in the Committee report, which calls on the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to continue previous management scenarios until such time as Congress ratifies the

Monument declaration. As described in the report, then, the amendment would repeal the effect of recent monument proclamations until Congress ratifies them, thus effectively nullifying the President's exercise of the authority Congress gave him in the Antiquities Act.

"The Antiquities Act has been one of the Nation's most effective protection tools, implemented by both Republican and Democratic administrations since 1906. The proposed amendment, a rider to an appropriations bill, would essentially neuter the Antiquities Act by denying the responsible Federal agencies the ability to enforce key elements of the monument proclamations made since 1999. In the Antiquities Act, Congress vested in the President the ability to act quickly to protect portions of the existing Federal estate. In this appropriations provision, added without the congressional consideration that would normally accompany the substantive modification of an authorizing statute, the subcommittee is attempting to undo much of that authority for areas designated since 1999. The amendment would effectively strip the President of his ability to protect objects of historic and scientific interest for their unique value and for the enjoyment of the American people.

"A related effect of the House amendment would be to expose national monuments designated since 1999 to abuse and resource degradation, with potentially devastating results. Management as national monuments is prohibited by the rider language, so that any action constrained or described in a monument proclamation would be disallowed if affecting it required an expenditure of funds appropriated by the FY 2001 interior bill. This suggests one of two outcomes, both unfortunate for the American people. Either the Federal agencies, unable to enforce an otherwise valid Presidential proclamation, would be forced simply to close those lands to any form of public use; or the Federal agencies, denied funding to manage these monuments, would have to abandon them to vandals, invasive species, uncontrolled resource exploitation and other harm, until Congress restored the funding needed to manage them.

"For example, the rider would prevent the BLM from stopping mining activities in these monuments on claims located after the proclamation had withdrawn the area from operation under the Mining Law. The language would also prevent the responsible agencies from managing these lands for livestock grazing, even when grazing is a use recognized in the proclamation, because such uses cannot be managed without funding.

"A similar problem arises from a lack of funding to enforce restrictions on highway vehicle use. The proclamation that established the Grand Canyon-Parashant in Arizona, for instance, provides specifically that the BLM shall continue to issue and administer

grazing leases within the portion of the monument within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area consistent with the Lake Mead National Recreation Area authorizing legislation.

"And for the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road will be prohibited, except for emergency and authorized administrative purposes.

"The House amendment makes it impossible to implement these portions of a monument proclamation that depend on funding. Thus, enactment of the rider could force BLM to remove livestock from the Grand Canyon-Parashant, and close the area to vehicle use of any sort. Alternatively, BLM would be forced to walk away from this land all together, and abandon the enforcement of OHV restrictions, the monitoring of grazing allotments, and the review and renewal of grazing permits."

So I think this amendment is wrong. I do not think we properly considered it in our committee. I think the gentleman from Utah, and others who are against the Antiquities Act, should deal with it in the authorizing committees and not here as an appropriation rider. That is why I so strongly object to this amendment.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE).

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of his amendment.

My colleagues, this administration is involved in a very desperate grab of our Federal land, and I have to ask myself why does the government need all this land. The President is currently engaging in the biggest land grab since the invasion of Poland.

Now, it was pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona very succinctly that there is a strong reason why the gentleman from Utah is offering his amendment, and this is the reason why. The Constitution clearly assigns to the Congress the power to dispense with public lands.

Now, I put together a list here, Mr. Chairman, to show that the administration's abuses of the Antiquities Act is taking in about 150 million acres, that we know of, that the President intends to lock up. Now, that is what we know of. But this administration is reluctant to even tell the Congress exactly how many monuments and exactly how much land is involved.

In fact, the process that has been set up previously by the United States Congress to have these processes go in a manner so that we understand the environmental and economic impact and how it affects people's lives, how it affects counties and States, all of this has been abused. This is all done without the benefit of the National Environmental Policy Act.

But, environmental organizations are working to declare lands, or having the President declare lands in the West, these vast national monuments, nearly 150 million acres. The Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society, among others, have announced their desire to have the President create over 50 more new monuments, with a land area of more than 150 million acres. This is an area larger in the West than that compared to West Virginia, Maryland, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Hawaii, New York, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Rhode Island and the District of Columbia combined. And this is done by presidential edict.

The gentleman is absolutely right, we must support his amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a very valued member of our subcommittee and a person who has had great experience in these areas.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The first point I want to make is that land cannot be "grabbed" if it is already owned. All of these lands that are being designated and have been designated as national monuments are owned by the people of the United States, held in trust by the Federal Government and managed by the Department of the Interior. The amendment that we have before us here today would prevent, interestingly enough, Federal funds from being spent on nine fairly recently designated national monuments.

Now, the designation of national monuments under the 1906 Antiquities Act, passed by the Congress, of course, allows for the protection of natural and cultural resources that are under threat or need for preservation or protection. The point has been made that 14 presidents since 1906 have used this authority. Lands designated as monuments are already owned by the American public. Fifty million Americans enjoy these monuments every year. Monument designation provides permanent protection for long-term conservation of areas that are critical to the protection of resources and enjoyment by the public.

This antienvironmental rider targets nine recent monuments that were created to protect unique national resources for all future generations to enjoy.

□ 1315

A prohibition on spending funds on these monuments does not change their legal status as monuments but would prevent any ongoing spending within the monument areas.

Visitors would still visit these lands, but this would prevent Federal maintenance and appropriate actions taken. The Department of the Interior would not be able to provide law enforcement service to visitors or maintain roads,

thereby threatening visitor safety. The Department would be unable to process grazing applications for the lands or manage hunting or other suitable uses to public enjoyment.

This would hurt local people and local economies. It would hurt them the most by preventing outfitters and guides from going into these monuments and not allowing management of suitable uses.

There is one other interesting aspect to this particular amendment that is before us now. It would prevent spending on nine monuments, but it would not prevent spending on a particular monument in the State of Utah.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) kidding me? Is he telling me that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) exempted his monument?

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) has exempted his monument.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, so he is going to get funding for his monument?

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this amendment says they cannot spend Federal funds for nine monuments, and those monuments are located in California, in Arizona, in Colorado, Oregon, Washington; but they can spend money on the monument in Utah.

The budget that we have here today would spend, in fact, \$5.3 million on a visitor center for a national monument in the State of Utah. I believe that is located in the district of the sponsor of this amendment, which would prevent spending on these nine monuments in these other States. This is an interesting feature of this particular amendment.

Now, I have always thought that cynicism is a personality trait to be avoided, but one does not have to be terribly cynical to make the observation that something very odd and unusual is going on here. It is okay to spend money on the monument in my district, but it is not okay to spend money on the monuments in people's other districts in other States. That strikes me as being very strange.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the President started this tirade, this was the first one he put in was the Grand Staircase Escalante. It has been there 4 years. Money has been appropriated for it.

I would be happy, as I told the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and anyone else, to take all of the money out. Why did they not do that? We did not ask for that 5.3 million acres. That did not come from Utah.

That was from the administration. That did not come from us. If my colleagues want to strike that and put this in the amendment, I would accept that in a heartbeat. Go ahead and take it. Take the dang thing.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we are not interested in striking funding for that monument or for the other nine that they would strike either. We believe that these national monuments, belonging to all the people of the country, deserve to be protected and that the 50 million people who visit them ought to be treated properly and fairly. My colleague would deny then that opportunity.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a debate about national monuments. Every American takes pride in their national monuments. This is a debate about abuse of national monuments.

I just want to harken back to the last speaker. He would not yield time to me, but he began with a passionate debate saying we cannot lock up land that we do not already own because the law specifically says the Federal Government must already own these lands. Yes, the law says that. But I would like the gentleman to tell me, was he aware that, in fact, the President is locking up lands the Federal Government does not own?

In the State of Arizona, in the last 6 months, the President has created three new national monuments. Three. Count them. And he has done so by incorporating into those national monuments tens of thousands of acres of not Federal land but State land.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) was defending the use of the law in a proper fashion. This is the use of a law in an improper fashion. In Arizona, in one monument, they locked up 53,000 acres of State land, not Federal land. In another one, they locked up another 30,000 acres of State land.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a map showing the thousands of acres of State land that was put into a national monument in violation of the Federal law.

That is precisely why this amendment is here, because this administration is abusing the law.

Indeed, here is an editorial by the leading newspaper in the State of Arizona saying that preservation requires input and that they were not given that input and says, declaring monument was not done right. The paper generally supports monuments, as I think all Americans do, but not when the process is abused.

In Arizona, for example, there were no public hearings whatsoever. Now,

my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), says this is a wonderful thing, all being done in accordance with the law and all a good idea and a compliment to this administration doing this in the proper order of business.

If that is true, should we not ask ourselves why, of the nine national monuments which have been created by this administration, eight of the nine have been created in the last 6 months only? If these needed to be created, where were they 5 years ago, 4 years ago, 6 years ago, 7 years ago?

This is about abuse of this law. Let me explain this. These are the American people's lands, and they do take pride in national monuments. But 8 months ago I personally, in a formal hearing of this United States Congress, looked Secretary Babbitt in the eye, eyeball to eyeball, and said, Mr. Secretary, the people of America and the people of Arizona have a right to input in this process. Will you provide this committee with a list of the monuments you are considering across this Nation?

Secretary Babbitt looked me and the chairman and every other member of the committee in the eye and said, no, a one-word answer, no, I will not provide you a list.

That cuts the American people out of the process. It is an abuse of the law.

I support the amendment, and I call on my colleagues to support it, as well.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous opposition to this amendment.

Presidents, Republican and Democrat, for decades have left the American people great gifts across this country; and today the U.S. House, or some therein, attempt to gut the ability to leave those gifts to the American people. And, apparently, the way they are trying to do it is to make sure there are no fingerprints on the weapon to gut the ability to protect these gifts of the American people. Let me tell my colleagues why.

We should be allowing Presidents to create national monuments. If this amendment passes, all we will create are monuments to futility, monuments where we cannot do anything to protect these gifts.

Let me tell my colleagues why that is important. In the State of Washington, 6 days ago, the President left a gift to the American people creating the Hanford Reach Monument Area. Six days ago.

I will tell my colleagues, the people of the State of Washington want that monument. The people of the State of Washington deserve that monument. And the people of the State of Washington are going to get that monument. And let me tell my colleagues why.

This is a picture of the Hanford Reach, the last free-flowing stretch of

the Columbia River. Very close to this is where Lewis and Clark first came to the Columbia River. My colleagues can see these white bluffs form a spectacular scenery over the Columbia.

Let me show my colleagues what happened when we did not have this monument. When we did not have this monument, certain practices resulted in the absolute collapse of these white cliffs; and we would have a quarter mile of, essentially, dirt collapse into the river right into this area and destroy salmon habitat and destroy spawning habitat.

We need to stop that from occurring. There was a comment by my colleague about something about the local people do not want this. Well, I have got a message for the U.S. House from the first family of people who settled this area and broke this ground.

Lloyd Wheel, a 90-year-plus former judge, who grew up with the first European family who homesteaded on this property right outside this picture, Lloyd Wheel has a message for the U.S. House: do not destroy this monument. Protect these salmon. Make sure the natural heritages are protected.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that managing land through unilateral executive orders establishing national monuments is wrong. It ignores the role of Congress, the role of the people who live nearer and closest to the land, and the role of local elected officials. I believe the consensus-based management accomplishes more to protect the land than hierarchical mandates.

Unilateral national monument designation avoids the compromise necessary for consensus and implementation of the whims of the current administration.

Secretary Babbitt, in a hearing earlier this year, said, "I believe that the Congressional delegation is the way to go." He continued by saying that, "In most cases, there is now legislation, not all, but most," speaking of these nine recently designated monuments. "And in the cases where we did make the designation, particularly the ones in Arizona, it was crystal clear that there was no interest in the Congress at all. In one case, there was not even a sponsor of a bill for Aqua Fria, and in the case of the Grand Canyon, the bill that was offered before this committee reduced the existing level of protection."

If Congress concludes that the Nation's interest is best served in a manner different from what Secretary Babbitt and this administration may recommend, Secretary Babbitt apparently believes that the President should simply declare a national monument.

This amendment supports constitutional process. Congress makes decisions about the management of public lands because the Constitution gives us

that responsibility. We passed FLPMA in 1976 and established that we must first have the input of the locals.

Secretary Babbitt and the administration have not done this with their monument designations. Congress, therefore, has the responsibility to curb this excess by this administration by refusing to fund these monuments.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just speak to my colleague from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) and say to him, I understand his frustration, I have listened to his frustration around this issue, and I have respect for it. But I would urge us to continue to discuss this, as we have in the Committee on Resources, and there is legislation pending that would alter the Antiquities Act in ways that he thinks is appropriate and others do; and I would continue to be interested in having that debate.

But I think this amendment goes at it in the wrong way. It comes in through the back door; and it has the potential, as previous speakers suggested, of making only monuments in name and would be very, very counterproductive.

The other piece that I want to add to this discussion today has to do with local and specific examples in southwestern Colorado. The President just created the Canyon of the Ancients National Monument.

I will include for the RECORD a letter from the Commissioners of the County down there, who, in effect, said, "We need to move immediately and decisively to put our local input on the management of this area. The only way that we as a community can minimize the negative impacts and be in a position to reap the positive benefits is if we are organized and actively engaged in the planning management and problem solving connected with the monument from day one. If funding is blocked, we will lose this opportunity. Blocking funding will hurt the very communities that are already saddled with the impact of the monument."

Now, I might not have used those same words, but I strongly agree with him with the need for maintaining that funding.

So, again, I appreciate the point of view of the chairman, but I think this is the wrong way to have the debate about the Antiquities Act and how it is applied.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following letters for the RECORD:

MONTEZUMA COUNTY  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,  
Cortez, CO, June 12, 2000.

Hon. MARK UDALL,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: The Canyons of the Ancients National Monument in Southwest Colorado, which we spent a year working to avoid is a reality as of last Friday. The challenge now is to work together to realistically address the potential impacts on our constituents, our fiscal and economic health and the wide variety of important resources within the monument boundary. We are asking for your support in opposing budget amendments that would block funding to new National Monuments is critical for the reasons outlined below.

We need to move immediately and decisively to put our local imprint on the management of this area. We have, as a starting point, the summary of public input produced by the RAC citizen Working Group, and the resulting NCA legislative draft to guide the management planning process. We are not at all comfortable with the vague language in the Proclamation, and feel that it would be risky to let the management of this area drift on the basis of "interim guidelines" established without local involvement. We have been promised an advisory council representing the spectrum of local interests. We need to get the advisory group in place and immediately begin to engage the planning and management of this area.

With all the publicity that has and will result from the proclamation, we must be prepared and funded to deal with a wide range of immediate impacts. It is our understanding that visitation to the Grandstaircase-Escalante increased 250% upon Monument designation. The Working Group Report points to key areas of concern including the impact on services such as road maintenance, search and rescue, fire protection and law enforcement. Given the commingling of BLM and private land, we anticipate more problems with trespassing and damage to private property. The community is adamant about the protection of multiple-use, and we cannot allow the deterioration of archaeological resources to be used as a pretext for restricting these rights, privileges and activities including archaeological research. Nor can we afford to allow a lack of funds for BLM staffing to be used to justify restricting uses and areas of the Monument.

Restrictions on grazing would undermine our local ranching industry. Restrictions on oil and gas production would put at risk 30% of the County tax base. Restrictions on recreational uses would disrupt an important focal point for community pride and enjoyment. Much of the 164,000 designated acres are rugged and remote, while the more accessible Sand Canyon is already close to being over-run. Dealing with both the remote and the "loved to death" areas is going to require a major community effort involving everyone that uses and values the area. Even the economic benefits that will result will require close coordination between people in contact with visitors and the land management agencies.

The only way that we, as a community, can minimize the negative impacts and be in a position to reap the positive benefits is if we are organized and actively engaged in the planning, management and problem solving connected with this monument from day one. If funding is blocked we will lose this opportunity.

While we understand the anger and frustration which has led to efforts to block funding for National Monuments, we believe that it is far better to go to the root cause of these abuses by supporting legislation such as H.R.

1487 introduced by Congressman Hansen and S. 729 introduced by Senator Craig, which directly address a more participatory process for establishing National Monuments.

In the meantime we hope you will actively voice the concern to your colleagues and in the upcoming floor debate that blocking funding will hurt the very communities that are already saddled with the impacts of new monument designations. We appreciate your consideration. Please let us know if we can help or provide further information.

Sincerely yours,

G. EUGENE STORY, *Chairman.*

[From the Durango Herald, June 11, 2000]  
CANYON OF THE ANCIENTS  
MONUMENT IS ON THE MAP; NOW IT NEEDS  
FUNDING

On Friday, some 160,000 acres of rugged dry washes, canyons and rock formations covered with scattered sage, pinon and juniper between Cortez and the Utah state line were protected by the Clinton administration from further degradation. The land, occupied by pre-Puebloans between about 750 and 1300 A.D. and carved from lower elevation public lands controlled by the Bureau of Land Management, now will be known as the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument.

The monument designation, one of four announced across the West by Vice President Al Gore that day, occurred because increasing numbers of visitors threatened the fragile landscape and the remains of rock and wood-built pre-Puebloan structures. The monument designation should—must—provide additional federal money to properly protect its priceless contents.

While Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt has promised that a locally composed board will advise the BLM on its management of Canyons of the Ancients, the president's proclamation makes positions clear on several substantive issues dear to locals and Westerners: The monument status will not give the federal government any water rights, nor change the way the state of Colorado manages wildlife on the land. Nor will it impact any rights to the land claimed by American Indians. Grazing will continue, under BLM regulations as in the past. Carbon dioxide, gas and oil production will continue, under BLM regulations as in the past. Carbon dioxide, gas and oil production will continue, but further exploration will have to a greater degree take into consideration protection of the surface's natural resources and pre-Puebloan remnants.

Mining, other than CO<sub>2</sub>, and gas and oil extraction, is forbidden.

The monument designation does call for a transportation plan, and it's expected that off-road travel by motorized vehicles will be eliminated, and that the number of historical access roads will be significantly reduced. As a result, access to private inholdings may be more limited than they are currently.

The monument status was forced on Montezuma County, as some local critics charge noisily. But unlike the administration's previous monument designations, especially in southern Utah, it was not a surprise and it was not done without consultation with locals. The Secretary of the Interior signaled it was coming, and urged that Congress—lead by an initiative from Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell and Congressman Scott McInnis—instead provide the needed protections. But that was not to be, as Campbell deemed that extremists on both sides of the issue would make legislative compromises impossible.

The specifics of the monument designation did not originate in Washington. However, The administration listened closely to local

testimony in front of a stakeholder group convened a year ago to address issues surrounding the proposed monument, and Babbitt made a couple visits to the area. And, his telephone call to the Montezuma County commissioners two months ago allayed some fears as to what the monument designation would contain. In conversations with Babbitt, he was very familiar with the issues that surround the monument.

Now what's needed is a representative advisory board that applies thoughtfulness and vision in helping the BLM shape the future of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument. And money is also needed. In Southwest Colorado last week, it was encouraging to hear McInnis say that although he was opposed to the way the acreage was designated by the administration, he would work to secure funding to implement the needed protections. With public lands budgets already limited, that extra money is critical.

New maps of the Four Corners and Colorado will soon be leaving the printers, and on them will be the state's newest monument. We're glad the Canyons of the Ancients will be there, it's stunning natural features and man-made structures to be better protected for generations to come.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER).

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that it would be his preference that such an issue were not necessary here on the floor. But the reality is, this is the President of the United States who has necessitated this discussion for clearly abusing and misusing in a reckless fashion the law, which has been on the books for many, many years and as many Presidents previously, as has been indicated before, have used with due discretion and have used in cooperation with local entities, State jurisdictions, and certainly Members of Congress who represent the affected areas. But that is the distinction and the difference.

This President has made two fatal errors in his execution of the Antiquities Act: one is by dramatically expanding the coverage of these monuments beyond the archeological or historic focus of what a legitimate monument might constitute; and, secondly, doing so without even the consultation of Members of Congress, who have the ultimate policy-making authority and responsibility where monuments are concerned.

□ 1330

But the third thing that this President has done is used the Antiquities Act in establishing monuments in a blatantly political fashion and has consequently jeopardized the underlying purpose of the law and caused us to pay close scrutiny as we do here today.

These monuments are issued around election time where great, vast, beautiful landscapes are used as nothing more than a backdrop for politically motivated press conferences. Mr. Chairman, all of the flannel shirts and blue jeans cannot obscure the nakedness of a President bereft of the constitutional covering that we would

hope any President would rely on when orchestrating public policy on behalf of the country.

That is what this amendment really tries to get at and why we must adopt it, because it brings back into some semblance of reality the original intent and scope of the Antiquities Act, that these are small acreages designed to protect and preserve truly remarkable features that the American people want to enjoy and protect. I urge its adoption. I thank the gentleman for offering it today.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hansen amendment. Let me talk for just a minute if I can about the proposal being considered in Idaho to expand the Craters of the Moon National Monument into the Great Rift National Monument. It might surprise some of my colleagues that I am not necessarily opposed to the expansion of the Craters of the Moon into the Great Rift area. It is truly a unique geological area.

But what I am opposed to is a process by which any administration, Republican or Democrat administration, can ignore the input of local people, can ignore the input of local- and State- and Federal-elected officials and Congress can ignore its constitutional responsibility to dictate land management policies. It is the process that is a problem here.

The Secretary has been out to the State of Idaho twice. I appreciate the fact that he has called me twice when he is going out there to inform me of that. Mr. Chairman, I have requested information on the designation. Under the Antiquities Act, the requirement is that the President put the request in to the Secretary of Interior for what area ought to be designated as a national monument. I have requested the letter from the President and have not received it.

Secondly, they are supposed to use the least amount of land available to protect this area. The Secretary has not sent me the information on that. Thirdly, the area being protected is supposed to be of some geological, scientific, or historic nature. The Secretary has not told me what the nature that he is trying to preserve of this area is. But, fourthly, the most important thing is the area is supposed to be under some threat, some imminent threat. So far, the Secretary has refused to tell me what the imminent threat is in this area.

Mr. Chairman, this is not pristine habitat or natural forests or salmon habitat or anything like that. What it is is lava rocks. It is under no threat currently, and the Secretary refuses to acknowledge that.

Earlier one of the speakers from New York said, Congress already has the authority to control this by undoing a national monument if we want to. The reality is that a former congressman

tried to enact this and could not get support from his own party or the people of Idaho.

I urge the support of the Hansen amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, we continue to have the language being employed of the extreme antienvironmentalists, people who are talking about reckless. If it were truly reckless, my colleagues would be proposing alternatives to eliminate these as monument designations. They are not, and I think that that is *prima facie* evidence that it is, in fact, not reckless. These are reasonable approaches and are supported by the majority of the public.

There is the notion of a land grab. As my colleague from New York pointed out, this is not a land grab. These are lands that are already owned and managed by the Federal Government. There may have been surrounded some parcels of private property as our colleague from Arizona pointed out, but they have always been surrounded by the Federal Government and that does not change it. What is changed under this antienvironmental rider is that you can no longer use Federal funds to manage them. Bear in mind they do not change the category but things that were legal earlier to use Federal money, for example, to deal with issues of vandalism or invasive species which would have been legal under the prior designation are no longer legal because they would have to be managed as monument property.

Earlier you had legal grazing activities which require money to be able to manage, but now since it is monument land and would not be designated to spend money managing a monument means that you make that impossible for grazing; for mining. This is absolutely inappropriate and would not be supported and is truly going to lead to a condition that these folks in other contexts would be going absolutely bonkers if it were proposed. But their amendment, were it to be so unfortunate to be adopted, would put that into effect.

Last but not least, it would not allow funding for the planning and engagement of the community to make these processes work. These are efforts that the people talk about engaging the public. It would not allow money to do so. It is a bad idea. I hope that this antienvironmental rider is firmly rejected.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, previous speakers not only in this amendment but in other amendments have used the term antienvironmental extremists 11 times. Doth us think that there is a little politics here?

First of all, we feel that the President, a single individual designating

land in violation of the law taking State lands and affecting private property is wrong, a single person, without going through the Congress. Even yesterday we had talk about a backlog of taking care of our national forests and fish and wildlife. Just like with the California desert plan and other things, the moneys that are going to be required to take care of these, we do not have. The only way to do it is increase taxes. We do not want to do that.

Mr. Chairman, this map indicates the property that is controlled on the East Coast by the Federal Government. If I turn this over, this is the property in color controlled on the West Coast. What is too much? In Utah, Arizona, and Nevada, 70 and 80 percent of the land is controlled by the Federal Government. In California, over half the land is controlled by the Federal Government. What is too much?

All we are doing is saying that if we want these parks to be designated or these national monuments, at least bring it before Congress. Let us have a debate. We may lose the debate. But at least bring it before us. Do not have a king with the sign of a pen designate land. That is all our position is. We think that that is a test of fairness. The test of fairness in the past with the President and with Secretary Babbitt has been a one-way street. We think that that is wrong, also.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds. Again I want to point out, we already own these lands. There is no land grab here. We are not adding anything additional here. We are creating a monument which the President has the authority to.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR of California. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, there are only five States that are affected by this amendment. It is interesting that the author's State is not affected. Thank God for the Antiquities Act. Thank God for the action of the President to take Federal lands and upgrade their status so that they are more protected. The reason the President had to do it by executive order is because this Congress under this leadership is failing to deliver these things.

I introduced two bills in Congress on these issues that did not even get a hearing in the committee. The only member of the other party that has been supportive of all this effort is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). He has been the best environmentalist the Republican Party has because he is on the Committee on Appropriations and he can appropriate money. But to try to get a hearing in the other committees and try to get some substance out and get these lands protected, no way. Now they want to take them away.

Give me back my monuments. Give me back Sequoia in California. Give me

back the Grand Canyon-Parashant in Arizona. Give me back Agua Fria in Arizona. Give me back the California Coastal Monument. Give me back the Pinnacles National Monument in my district. Give me back the Canyons of the Ancients in Colorado. Give me back Ironwood Forest in Arizona. Give me back Cascade-Siskiyou in Oregon. And give me back Hanford Reach in Washington. This amendment would take all those away and take it away from the public who owns that land.

This is your land, ladies and gentlemen of the United States. Defeat this amendment. Give them back to the people.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I do not oppose designating national monuments, I do not oppose the Antiquities Act, but I do oppose the abuse of power. This is not taking these lands back to the people. Quite frankly, whether or not they are national monuments or not national monuments, they belong to the people. Some Presidents such as Theodore Roosevelt have used the Antiquities Act to preserve large threatened areas. But when we look at the previous examples of that like the Grand Canyon, they were clearly being privatized and degraded. It was being debated in Congress. There was public outrage. But in the case of President Clinton's new monuments, these monuments already are Federal lands. The fact is that if they are being degraded, it is under this administration.

FDR designated previously the highest number of public lands. In four presidential terms he designated 2.5 million acres. This President has already done 4 million unilaterally. It is clear that we need to and will continue to expand national monuments and parks. It is clear that our crown jewel parks are already in existence. And so now the question is really, are we going to adequately fund the existing parks plus as we add to this system, where will they be and what will the funding priorities be?

We heard earlier that this is about invasive species and grazing questions, but these new monuments are all in the West, where they already have at least 25 percent federally owned lands, in some cases 50 percent and in some the proposals are in States where it goes up to 60 percent. East of the Mississippi, we have lands that already have willing sellers that are clearly either culturally, naturally, or recreationally valuable for the public sector but we have willing sellers. But because the President has unilaterally designated additional lands in States where they already have 25 to 65 percent Federal lands, money will not be available for other places in the country where there are natural, cultural and recreational opportunities.

How is it fair to let a lame duck President unilaterally, in one year, ex-

ceed any other President's designation, including the two Roosevelts, who had, in FDR's case, four terms, and tie the hands of the Committee on Appropriations where we cannot meet the needs of existing parks or the demands we have in other parts of the country.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Many of these areas recently designated as national monuments are beautiful and sensitive and may well deserve protection. However, article 4, section 3 of the Constitution grants to Congress the power to make decisions respecting the property of the United States.

In these recent designations, the President has usurped and completely bypassed the authority of Congress. These new national monuments represent the worst abuses of executive power. No environmental assessments are conducted, and the public is not even allowed to comment on the merits of the designations as required. The administration is using the 1906 Antiquities Act, intended to protect small parcels of land, to set aside millions of acres. It is time for this body to reassert its authority and reject this latest presidential overreach.

□ 1345

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hansen amendment. The President of the United States clearly has authority under the Antiquities Act. Clearly, if the majority party wants to, they could repeal that act. They could pass it here, but they do not seem to want to do that. What they want to do is use an appropriations bill with a very cleverly drafted rider to prohibit the President from implementing these monuments.

I think it is terrible. I think the Federal government will wind up being embarrassed because we cannot do law enforcement. We cannot do planning. We cannot do anything once these monuments are designated. And try as you want to with report language, it does not nullify the effect of this amendment, which is to take away from the President the authority to name these monuments and then to have them properly implemented.

Again, I believe that these riders are wrong. We should do it only when we have had thorough debate and hearings, and we have not had that here. I would suggest to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) in his own committee that people want to work on this, if they want to improve the Antiquities Act, do it there, not on the Interior Appropriations bill.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a very interesting debate that we have had here.

I think it all comes down to one thing, abuse of power. I do not know of one President who has abused his power more than this gentleman has. He has done more than all of the other Presidents combined, and the interesting thing is, just what Member of Congress was consulted and which one agrees with what he has done?

Now, I always thought that the Constitution said "we the people," but when we read this thing behind closed doors, it said we cannot let this out, this has to remain secret. Now, to me, that is not the way we do things in America. What is this about?

Article IV, section 3 says, "Congress has the right of these powers of the land." It does not go to the President. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) had some things brought up that is the biggest red herring I have ever heard. Right here in their own manual, right here in the report, nothing in this language prevents either Secretary from managing these Federal lands.

These lands will go on as they were. This idea that they will not be managed and vandalized is nonsense. Of course they will be managed. Call up the local BLM director, call up the local forest director. They will tell us they will take care of the land. There is nothing in here that says they cannot maintain those lands at this time.

A little personal shot was made at me. I am big enough to take that, saying why not put your own in there? That was done in 1996, and it was funded by this Congress. I would be more than happy if my colleagues feel that way, why did colleagues not put an amendment in to do that, and I would have stood up and I said accept it; but my colleagues did not do that. It is more important to take a few shots, I guess.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the people in this particular body to do their best and do what is right for America and do what is right for the West. Help us out in this and vote for this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offer by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Under clause 6(f) of rule XVIII, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the underlying Dicks amendment that may follow immediately this 15-minute vote on the Hansen perfecting amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 234, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—187

Aderholt Goodlatte Pickering  
 Archer Goodling Pickett  
 Armey Goss Pitts  
 Bachus Graham Pombo  
 Baker Granger Portman  
 Ballenger Green (WI) Pryce (OH)  
 Barr Gutknecht Radanovich  
 Barrett (NE) Hall (TX) Regula  
 Bartlett Hansen Riley  
 Barton Hastings (WA) Rogan  
 Bateman Hayes Rogers  
 Bereuter Hayworth Rohrabacher  
 Bilirakis Hefley Ros-Lehtinen  
 Bliley Hergert Royce  
 Blunt Hill (MT) Ryan (WI)  
 Boehner Hilleary Ryun (KS)  
 Bonilla Hostettler Salmon  
 Bono Hulshof Sanford  
 Brady (TX) Schaffer Slaughter  
 Bryant Hutchinson Sensenbrenner  
 Burr Hyde Sessions  
 Burton Isakson Shadegg  
 Buyer Istook Shaw  
 Callahan Jenkins Sherwood  
 Calvert Johnson (CT) Shimkus  
 Camp Johnson, Sam Shuster  
 Canady Jones (NC) Simpson  
 Cannon King (NY) Sisisky  
 Chabot Kingston Skeen  
 Chambliss Knollenberg Smith (MI)  
 Chenoweth-Hage Kolbe Smith (TX)  
 Coble LaHood Souder  
 Coburn Largent Spence  
 Collins Latham Stearns  
 Combest LaTourette Stenholm  
 Cook Lewis (CA) Stump  
 Cooksey Lewis (KY) Sununu  
 Cox Linder Sweeney  
 Crane Lucas (OK) Talent  
 Cubin Manzullo Tancredo  
 Cunningham Martinez Tauzin  
 Deal McCrery Taylor (NC)  
 DeLay McHugh Terry  
 DeMint McIntosh Thomas  
 Diaz-Balart McKeon Thornberry  
 Dickey Metcalf Thune  
 Dooley Mica Tiahrt  
 Doolittle Miller (FL) Toomey  
 Dreier Miller, Gary Traficant  
 Duncan Moran (KS) Vitter  
 Dunn Myrick Walden  
 Ehrlich Nethercutt Wamp  
 Emerson Ney Watkins  
 Everett Northup Watts (OK)  
 Ewing Nussle Weldon (FL)  
 Fletcher Ortiz Weller  
 Fossella Ose Whitfield  
 Fowler Oxley Wicker  
 Gallegly Packard Wilson  
 Gekas Paul Wolf  
 Gibbons Pease Young (AK)  
 Gillmor Peterson (MN)  
 Goode Peterson (PA)

NOES—234

Abercrombie Cardin Eshoo  
 Ackerman Carson Etheridge  
 Allen Castle Evans  
 Andrews Clay Farr  
 Baca Clayton Fattah  
 Baird Clement Filner  
 Baldacci Baldwin Foley  
 Baldwin Condit Forbes  
 Barcia Conyers Ford  
 Barrett (WI) Costello Frank (MA)  
 Bass Coyne Frelinghuysen  
 Bentsen Cramer Frost  
 Berkley Crowley Ganske  
 Berman Cummings Gejdenson  
 Berry Davis (FL) Gephardt  
 Biggert Davis (IL) Gilchrist  
 Bilbray Davis (VA) Gilman  
 Bishop DeFazio Gonzalez  
 Blagojevich DeGette Gordon  
 Blumenauer Delahunt Green (TX)  
 Boehlert DeLauro Gutierrez  
 Bonior Deutsch Hall (OH)  
 Borski Dicks Hastings (FL)  
 Boswell Dingell Hill (IN)  
 Boucher Dixon Hilliard  
 Boyd Doggett Hinchey  
 Brady (PA) Doyle Hobson  
 Brown (FL) Edwards Hoeffel  
 Brown (OH) Ehlers Hoekstra  
 Capps Engel Holden  
 Capuano English Holt

Hooley McKinney Sanchez  
 Horn McNulty Sanders  
 Houghton Meehan Sandlin  
 Hoyer Meek (FL) Sawyer  
 Insee Meeks (NY) Saxton  
 Jackson (IL) Menendez Scarborough  
 Jackson-Lee Millender Schakowsky  
 (TX) McDonald Scott  
 Jefferson Miller, George Serrano  
 John Minge Shays  
 Johnson, E. B. Mink Sherman  
 Kanjorski Moakley Skelton  
 Kaptur Molohan Slaughter  
 Kasich Moore Smith (NJ)  
 Kelly Moran (VA) Smith (MS)  
 Kennedy Morella Snyder  
 Kind (WI) Murtha Spratt  
 Kleczka Neal Stark Stabenow  
 Klink Oberstar Strickland  
 Kucinich Obey Stupak  
 Kuykendall Oliver Tanner  
 LaFalce Owens Tauscher  
 Lampson Pallone Taylor (MS)  
 Lantos Pascrell Thompson (CA)  
 Larson Pastor Thompson (MS)  
 Lazio Payne Tierney  
 Leach Pelosi Towns  
 Lee Petri Turner  
 Levin Phelps Udall (CO)  
 Lewis (GA) Pomeroy Udall (NM)  
 Lipinski Porter Upton  
 LoBiondo Price (NC) Velazquez  
 Lowey Quinn Walsh  
 Lucas (KY) Rahall Visclosky  
 Luther Ramstad Waters  
 Maloney (CT) Rangel Watt (NC)  
 Maloney (NY) Reyes Waxman  
 Markey Reynolds Weiner  
 Mascara Rivers Weldon (PA)  
 Matsui Rodriguez Wexler  
 McCarthy (MO) Roemer Weygand  
 McCarthy (NY) Rothman Wise  
 McDermott Roukema Woolsey  
 McGovern Roybal-Allard Wu  
 McInnis Rush Wynn  
 McIntyre Sabo

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra Hinojosa Shows  
 Campbell Jones (OH) Vento  
 Danner Lofgren Young (FL)  
 Franks (NJ) McCollum  
 Greenwood Norwood

□ 1418

Messrs. BILBRAY, MINGE, GILCHRIST, RUSH, REYNOLDS, and HORN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BARR of Georgia changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, is the next vote going to be on the underlying Dicks amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, yes.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—243

Abercrombie Gutierrez Neal  
 Ackerman Hall (OH) Norwood  
 Allen Hastings (FL) Oberstar  
 Andrews Hill (IN) Obey  
 Baca Hilliard Olver  
 Baird Hinchey Ortiz  
 Baldacci Hobson Owens  
 Baldwin Hoeffel Pallone  
 Barcia Hoekstra Pascrell  
 Barrett (WI) Holden Pastor  
 Bass Holt Payne  
 Bentsen Hooley Pease  
 Berkley Horn Pelosi  
 Berman Hoyer Peterson (MN)  
 Berry Insee Petri  
 Biggert Jackson (IL) Phelps  
 Bilbray Jackson-Lee Pomeroy  
 Bishop (TX) Porter  
 Blagojevich John Price (NC)  
 Blumenauer Johnson (CT) Quinn  
 Boehlert Johnson, E. B. Rahall  
 Bonior Jones (OH) Ramstad  
 Borski Kanjorski Rangel  
 Boswell Kaptur Reyes  
 Boucher Kasich Rivers  
 Boyd Kelly Rodriguez  
 Brady (PA) Kennedy Roemer  
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Rothman  
 Brown (OH) Kilpatrick Roukema  
 Capps Kind (WI) Roybal-Allard  
 Capuano Capuano Rush  
 Cardin Cardin Klink  
 Carson Carson Kucinich  
 Castle Castle Kuykendall  
 Clay LaFalce Sanders  
 Clayton LaHood Sawyer  
 Clement Lampson Saxton  
 Clyburn Lantos Scarborough  
 Condit Larson Schakowsky  
 Conyers Latham Scott  
 Costello LaTourette Serrano  
 Coyne Lazio Shays  
 Cramer Leach Sherman  
 Crowley Lee Simpson  
 Cummings Levin Skelton  
 Davis (FL) Lewis (CA) Slaughter  
 Davis (IL) Lewis (GA) Smith (NJ)  
 Davis (VA) Lipinski Smith (WA)  
 DeFazio LoBiondo Snyder  
 DeGette Lowey Spratt  
 Delahunt Lucas (KY) Stabenow  
 DeLauro Luther Stark  
 Deutsch Maloney (CT) Strickland  
 Dicks Maloney (NY) Stupak  
 Dingell Markey Tanner  
 Dixon Mascara Tauscher  
 Doggett Matsui Taylor (MS)  
 Doyle McCarthy (MO) Thompson (CA)  
 Edwards McCarthy (NY) Thompson (MS)  
 Ehlers McDermott Thurman  
 Engel McGovern Tierney  
 English McInnis Towns  
 Eshoo McIntosh Turner  
 Etheridge McIntyre Udall (CO)  
 Evans McKinney Udall (NM)  
 Farr McNulty Upton  
 Fattah Meehan Velazquez  
 Filner Meek (FL) Visclosky  
 Foley Meeks (NY) Walsh  
 Forbes Menendez Waters  
 Ford Millender Watt (NC)  
 Frank (MA) McDonald Waxman  
 Frelinghuysen Miller, George Weiner  
 Frost Minge Weldon (PA)  
 Ganske Mink Weller  
 Gejdenson Moakley Wexler  
 Gephardt Moore Weygand  
 Gilchrist Moran (VA) Wise  
 Gilman Morella Woolsey  
 Gonzalez Murtha Wu  
 Gordon Nadler Wynn  
 Green (TX) Napolitano

NOES—177

Aderholt Bilirakis Calvert  
 Archer Bliley Camp  
 Armey Blunt Canady  
 Bachus Boehner Cannon  
 Baker Bonilla Chabot  
 Ballenger Bono Chambliss  
 Barr Brady (TX) Chenoweth-Hage  
 Barrett (NE) Bryant Coble  
 Bartlett Burr Coburn  
 Barton Burton Collins  
 Bateman Buyer Combest  
 Bereuter Callahan Cook



Cooksey	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	Hyde	Royce
Crane	Isakson	Ryan (WI)
Cubin	Istook	Ryun (KS)
Cunningham	Jenkins	Salmon
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Schaffer
DeMint	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Sessions
Dickey	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Dooley	Kolbe	Shaw
Doolittle	Largent	Sherwood
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
Duncan	Linder	Shuster
Dunn	Lucas (OK)	Sisisky
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Skeen
Emerson	Martinez	Smith (MI)
Everett	McCrery	Smith (TX)
Ewing	McHugh	Souder
Fletcher	McKeon	Spence
Fossella	Metcalfe	Stearns
Fowler	Mica	Stenholm
Galleghy	Miller (FL)	Stump
Gekas	Miller, Gary	Sununu
Gibbons	Moran (KS)	Sweeney
Gillmor	Myrick	Talent
Goode	Nethercutt	Tancredo
Goodlatte	Ney	Tauzin
Goodling	Northup	Taylor (NC)
Goss	Ose	Terry
Graham	Oxley	Thomas
Granger	Packard	Thornberry
Green (WI)	Paul	Thune
Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
Hall (TX)	Pickering	Toomey
Hansen	Pickett	Traficant
Hastings (WA)	Pitts	Vitter
Hayes	Pombo	Walden
Hayworth	Portman	Wamp
Hefley	Pryce (OH)	Watkins
Herger	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Hill (MT)	Regula	Weldon (FL)
Hilleary	Reynolds	Whitfield
Hostettler	Riley	Wicker
Houghton	Rogan	Wilson
Hulshof	Rogers	Wolf
Hunter	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—14

Becerra	Hinojosa	Nussle
Campbell	Jefferson	Shows
Danner	Lofgren	Vento
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Young (FL)
Greenwood	Mollohan	

□ 1428

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for forest fire suppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, \$614,343,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That not less than 50 percent of any unobligated balances remaining (exclusive of amounts for hazardous fuels reduction) at the end of fiscal year 2000 shall be transferred, as repayment for post advances that have not been repaid, to the fund established pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 71-319 (16 U.S.C. 576 et seq.): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, up to \$4,000,000 of funds appropriated under this appropriation may be used for Fire Science Research in support of the Joint Fire Science Program: *Provided further*, That all authorities for the use of funds, including the use of contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, available to execute the Forest Service and Rangeland Research appropriation, are also available in the utilization of these funds for Fire Science Research.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:  
Page 54, line 4, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)" after the dollar figure.

Page 85, line 7, insert "(reduced by \$1,960,000)" after the dollar figure.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes on each side.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection is heard.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the other side, would they agree to a unanimous consent agreement of 10 minutes on each side? The gentleman and I have been through this many times and I have great respect for the other side and I can remember most of the arguments very vividly. They are very clear. I think we could limit this. Many Members want to leave at 6:00.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, now the gentleman understands we are having a separate discussion here?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. We are going to treat this amendment separately from this previous discussion in terms of everything else, but on this one we will agree to 7½ minutes on each side, split it down the middle.

Mr. STEARNS. How about 10? All right. 7½ minutes is fine.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side have 7½ minutes on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's understanding of the unanimous consent agreement is 7½ minutes per side on all amendments to the Stearns amendment.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the amendment read and I need, I believe, to withdraw and clarify because I think the Clerk read it incorrectly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may either withdraw the first amendment or ask unanimous consent to.

## MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that, and I think the Chair has the correct amendment, which is the same thing.

It is basically a 2 percent cut in the National Endowment for the Arts and the rest goes into the wildland fire management. I believe I gave it to the folks correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:

In the first instruction strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,960,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) that his amendment be modified?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will still conduct the debate in accordance with the previous unanimous consent request.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 7½ minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an amendment that has come up annually. Basically for my colleagues, we are taking a 2 percent reduction in the National Endowment for the Arts and we are putting this money into the wildland fire management. Let me just read where it is going to go. For necessary expenses for forest fire pre-suppression activities in the national forest system lands, and for emergency fire suppression and/or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement.

Of course, this would affect my home State of Florida, as well as Los Alamos in New Mexico, as well as Denver, Colorado, recently where the fires came up to this wonderful city.

My home State of Florida is facing severe drought conditions after having the second driest May in history in this State of ours. As a result, of course, Florida is battling another season of wildfires. Since January, Florida has had 3,422 fires that have burned 121,000 acres. This is a staggering amount of land. Were it not for the tireless efforts of the Department of Forestry, fire departments, and countless, countless volunteers, these numbers would be probably even higher, perhaps twice as much.

My amendment is, I think, very important. It is significant in many ways. It obviously is taking a very small amount from the National Endowment for the Arts budget and allocating it to fire fighting.

I think we can talk about getting serious about government spending. A part of this money, obviously, in the way the outlays go would go to retire the debt. So it has an added benefit.

I think many of us agree that the NEA does not shield us from any invasion or protect us from crime or other economic hardship, so basically I am

here to talk about the NEA, as a program, as one of many programs that support the arts. Lots of times on the House floor we talk about the NEA as if it is the sole body that is protecting the arts, but last year there were 200 programs for the arts and humanities in this country. Last year Federal funding for the arts exceeded \$800 million. Interesting enough, before the program was created, President Kennedy stated, quote, I do not believe Federal funds should support symphonies, orchestras, or other opera companies.

So I think when we consider the funding for the arts, it has been reduced. I know that. I will hear that from the other side, but there is so much out there in terms of private support for the arts. In fact, it is over \$10 billion in private funds go for the arts. So I think just taking \$2 million to help fire fighting personnel in this country is worthwhile for us to do.

So we take a small step, reducing questionable spending that many of us feel on this side and perhaps a few on that side feel, so I believe our money would be better spent to help the fire fighters retire the debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) insist on his point of order?

Mr. DICKS. I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) is recognized for 7½ minutes in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as many of us know, the National Endowment for the Arts was created in 1965. I believe that this endowment has done a tremendous amount to help foster the arts in this country. When the Endowment was created, we did not have the great range of the arts we now have. We now have performing symphonies and ballets all over this country. We have seen a tremendous growth in the arts, and I believe that one of the major reasons for that is because of the challenge grants and the other programs that the Endowment approved over the years.

The private sector looking to an entity, an arts organization getting a National Endowment for the Arts grant, is almost the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. Since the endowments were created, we have seen a tremendous growth in the amount of money that the private sector contributes to the arts all over this country.

A few years ago, we were funding the National Endowment at about \$170 million. It was cut back dramatically. Today we only fund it at \$98 million. In fact, we will have a bipartisan amendment after we take care of the Stearns amendment to increase the money for the endowments in a modest way.

The President has requested for each of the endowments \$150 million. A few years ago, Congress had some concerns about the quality of the grants and some of the grants that were approved by the National Endowment for the Arts. We put in very strong language saying, since they cannot approve every grant that comes in, use quality as a standard for judging and assessing these grants, and do not let an entity get a grant and then give it to a subgrantee for some other purpose.

I believe that under Jane Alexander and Mr. Ivey, Mr. Ferris at the Humanities, that we have seen managers who have seen the words from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and myself that were crafted, and have implemented it. We now have congressional Members who are on the advisory boards of the panels to give congressional input, to make sure that the American people's voice is being heard on these issues.

So I think this is an amendment that Congress has defeated over and over again. I am confident that we will again defeat it today, because I think the American people believe that the modest investment we make in the arts, and I think also in the humanities, is tremendously important in communities all over this country. We see education, education in the arts being an important item in many communities.

I can remember going with Jane Alexander to Garfield High School in the city of Seattle and seeing an after-school program where the kids were doing very good high quality work in the arts. The kids were enthused about it. It helped us, I think, in dealing with crime and also furthered their education. It gave them something to believe in.

I think that educational programs are good. Dale Chihuly, one of the world's renowned glass artists from my district in Tacoma, Washington, has an after-school program to teach kids how to create blown glass and create glass art. These kids, some of which have been juvenile delinquents, swear that this has transformed their lives. One, they have something to do after school and, two, they are working in the arts in a very creative way.

I had a chance to go up and visit them to see their work, to actually try to create glass art myself. I was not as good as the kids, but it really made an impression on me and showed that programs like this that are sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts are truly very important to our country.

So I urge today that we will resist this amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. I would be delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), for any comments he wants to make.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to praise the gentleman on behalf of the

Arts Caucus, which is much more than 130 in this Chamber. I appreciate all he has done, both in the committee and are going to do.

I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the fact is we are not talking about funding the great symphonies of America. They can find the money in Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, and Boston. We are concerned about kids that live in urban America that have never seen a symphony, never seen an opera, never seen any aspect of the arts.

Let me say, in the last 5 years there has been a complete turnaround. It is not only the people in urban America, it is where I grew up in rural America. In the 1930s, I can remember as a 6-year-old seeing this wonderful WPA symphony. That came to Hollister, California, population 3,000. It inspired me to be a musician.

Those are the communities we are talking about throughout America, and William Ivey has done just an outstanding job as administrator of the Endowment.

I would hope the gentleman would actually withdraw his amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just tell my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), when he grew up the NEA did not exist. It started in 1965. Second of all, most of the money goes to six major cities. There are almost 150 Congressional districts that get no money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

□ 1445

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, some people think that conservatives hate the arts. They think that, because we oppose Federal subsidies for the arts, that we are uncultured dolts who do not appreciate the finer things in life.

Let me try to correct the record, Mr. Chairman. The arts are an essential part of our culture. I love the arts. I love art in many forms. In fact, I am an amateur artist myself. I do not want this to be a show-and-tell session, but let me just illustrate. Here is a print of an oil I did last year of an area in my district called the Brandywine Valley. Here is a little sculpture that I do for volunteers who donate for people helping in my campaign. My daughter is an artist. We have a show at this present time in Lancaster County at an art gallery there. We have never received one red cent. There are millions of amateur artists out there who do not get any kind of funding.

Mr. Chairman, in fact, there is no correlation between NEA funding and the state of the arts in America. The arts are flourishing in America today. It is not because they are subsidized.

Although NEA funding has gone down as much as 40 percent in the past

few years, there are more people working in the arts today than ever before. Employment in the arts is growing three and a half times faster than general employment at a time when we reduced NEA funding by millions of dollars.

In the last 5 years, attendance at artistic activities have increased by 37 percent, remember all this time when NEA funds are decreasing.

Now, the thing that outrages the taxpayers is when the NEA, and they have the pattern of doing this, funds the shock art, the outrageous art, the anti-Catholic bigotry, the pornography.

There is a play recently in New York City entitled "The Pope and the Witch," which is funded. It depicts the Pope called John Paul, II, as a heroin addicted paranoid advocating birth control and legalization of drugs. As long as this type of funding is done by NEA, we need to send them a signal and give them the modest cut of 2 percent. I support the Stearns amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on our side to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to first say, in the Catholic lead, when it had the thing that was called "The Pope and the Witch," I would like to read from the notes here. "Please note that the NEA is not supporting the development or the production of this play. All NEA grants are by law for a specific project, and this was not included in any of their projects."

I would also like to say that, in my little small town of Hickory, North Carolina, we built an art museum. The National Endowment gave us \$1,000. One would not think that was of any great value one way or the other. But with that \$1,000 we were able to go to all the corporations and supporters in that little town, and we raised \$3 million to build an art museum.

The \$1,000 is just like the best thing one can say when some corporation wants to know, what have you done? Who are you getting it from?

I would also like to say, when we cut it \$65 million in 1995, I voted for that cut because I thought the National Endowment had gotten out of hand, and we should mandate changes; and we did mandate changes because of problems that were there. They have had no increase in 8 years now.

Let me just give my colleagues a couple of things. They have a cap on the amount of money that can go to any one State; whereas, previously New York got way out of their share of it.

The State grants program, the State set-aside, has been increased. Every State gets more money, and my colleagues would be surprised at the number of every State that participates.

State grant programs and State set-asides I say have increased. Anti-obscenity requirements for grants, this is supported by the Supreme Court. They have to live by this.

No matter what anybody wants to say, they are doing what was mandated and what they deserve. There is a large number of us that think that, in spite of what they say, art does add a great deal to the quality of life.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just point out to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that, if he wants the list of projects they have supported since 1980, they have a 20-year record here, from the Sorano, Mapplethorpe, I mean, to the one that the gentleman from North Carolina just mentioned. I mean, it goes on and on and on.

So the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina got \$1,000, the rest is going to six major cities.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. One of the most amazing characteristics of the human race is our ability to express ourselves artistically. All of us have been touched by a piece of music, a beautiful and interesting sculpture, an outstanding theatrical performance.

Art can be as enriching to the soul as nature itself. But sometimes in this job, we are forced to choose priorities. I think wildland fire management is a higher priority for the amount of money that we are talking about.

Because the arts are flourishing in America. Most people do not know that more people attend artistic events in a given year than sporting events. The private sector contributes over \$9 billion to the arts every year. Employment in the arts is growing 3.6 times faster than the general employment. Of the money that we do give to the arts from the Federal Government, 20 percent is consumed in overhead. A majority of the remaining amount is spent in New York or California.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) was relishing that he got \$1,000 for his district, \$1,000. It is not very much money. Very little of this money makes it out to the rest of America.

I think our Founding Fathers noted that the benefits of keeping the Government out of the arts were great. But if any of my colleagues have lost personal possessions to a fire or to a flood or to theft, they know how serious that is. Sometimes it is merely a scrap of paper with a signature on it or a canceled check or photo, something that cannot be replaced.

If we can support the wildland fire management, I think we are going to help people from losing their possessions and keep our natural heritage, the wildlife areas, from burning.

So this issue is not about the importance of our arts in our society, as much as it is about helping protect those who stand to lose everything from wildfire.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment takes a very small step in reducing questionable spending and shifts it to a much more needed important area. I believe our money would be better spent protecting Americans than being used to promote art that is many times antireligious and, recently last month, anti-Catholic.

We hear repeatedly that the NEA has changed. It simply has not. The New York Times reported that 70 percent of its grants go to the same recipients every year, while fires are ravaging our country.

The people who believe in giving it to just six major cities are subsidizing them, and I think it is an amendment between public safety and environment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the Stearns amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, \$424,466,000, to remain available until expended for construction, reconstruction, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities, and for construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532-538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided*, That up to \$15,000,000 of the funds provided herein for road maintenance shall be available for the decommissioning of roads, including unauthorized roads not part of the transportation system, which are no longer needed: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be expended to decommission any system road until notice and an opportunity for public comment has been provided on each decommissioning project: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the Forest Service "Construction", "Reconstruction and Construction", or "Reconstruction and Maintenance" accounts as well as any unobligated balances remaining in the "National Forest System" account for the facility maintenance and trail maintenance extended budget line items may be transferred to and merged with the "Capital Improvement and Maintenance" account.

## LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, \$50,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS  
SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, \$1,068,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND  
EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

## RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94-579, as amended, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST  
AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), \$92,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (1) purchase of not to exceed 132 passenger motor vehicles of which 13 will be used primarily for law enforcement purposes and of which 129 shall be for replacement; acquisition of 25 passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft, the purchase of not to exceed six for replacement only, and acquisition of sufficient aircraft from excess sources to maintain the operable fleet at 192 aircraft for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed \$100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and (7) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

None of the funds made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended to abolish any region, to move or close any regional office for National Forest System ad-

ministration of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions if and only if all previously appropriated emergency contingent funds under the heading "Wildland Fire Management" have been released by the President and apportioned.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development and the Foreign Agricultural Service in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States and international organizations.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or 7 U.S.C. 147b unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report No. 105-163.

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the procedures contained in House Report No. 105-163.

No funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture without the approval of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be available to conduct a program of not less than \$2,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended by Public Law 93-408.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, \$1,500 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101-593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to \$1,250,000 may be advanced in a lump sum as Federal financial assistance to the National Forest Foundation, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for administrative expenses or projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than \$200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds: *Provided further*, That hereafter, the National Forest Foundation may hold Federal funds made available but not immediately disbursed and may use any interest or other investment income earned (before, on, or after the date of

the enactment of this Act) on Federal funds to carry out the purposes of Public Law 101-593: *Provided further*, That such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98-244, \$2,650,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service shall be available for matching funds to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 6201-3709, and shall be advanced in a lump sum as Federal financial assistance within 60 days of enactment of this Act, without regard to when expenses are incurred, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds advanced by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities for sustainable rural development purposes.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 80 percent of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service in the "National Forest System" and "Reconstruction and Construction" accounts and planned to be allocated to activities under the "Jobs in the Woods" program for projects on National Forest land in the State of Washington may be granted directly to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife for accomplishment of planned projects. Twenty percent of said funds shall be retained by the Forest Service for planning and administering projects. Project selection and prioritization shall be accomplished by the Forest Service with such consultation with the State of Washington as the Forest Service deems appropriate.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to sections 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99-663.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as appropriate with the Pinchot Institute for Conservation, as well as with public and other private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals, to provide for the development, administration, maintenance, or restoration of land, facilities, or Forest Service programs, at the Grey Towers National Historic Landmark: *Provided*, That, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, any such public or private agency, organization, institution, or individual may solicit, accept, and administer private gifts of money and real or personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the activities and services at the Grey Towers National Historic Landmark: *Provided further*, That such gifts may be accepted notwithstanding the fact that a donor conducts business with the Department of Agriculture in any capacity.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available, as determined by the Secretary, for payments to Del Norte County, California, pursuant to sections 13(e) and 14 of the Smith River National Recreation Area Act (Public Law 101-612).

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service not to exceed \$500,000 may

be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar non-litigation related matters. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the requested funding transfers.

No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

The Forest Service shall fund overhead, national commitments, indirect expenses, and any other category for use of funds which are expended at any units, that are not directly related to the accomplishment of specific work on-the-ground (referred to as "indirect expenditures"), from funds available to the Forest Service, unless otherwise prohibited by law: *Provided*, That the Forest Service shall implement and adhere to the definitions of indirect expenditures established pursuant to Public Law 105-277 on a nationwide basis without flexibility for modification by any organizational level except the Washington Office, and when changed by the Washington Office, such changes in definition shall be reported in budget requests submitted by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Forest Service shall provide in all future budget justifications, planned indirect expenditures in accordance with the definitions, summarized and displayed to the Regional, Station, Area, and detached unit office level. The justification shall display the estimated source and amount of indirect expenditures, by expanded budget line item, of funds in the agency's annual budget justification. The display shall include appropriated funds and the Knutson-Vandenberg, Brush Disposal, Cooperative Work-Other, and Salvage Sale funds. Changes between estimated and actual indirect expenditures shall be reported in subsequent budget justifications: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2001 the Secretary shall limit total annual indirect obligations from the Brush Disposal, Cooperative Work-Other, Knutson-Vandenberg, Reforestation, Salvage Sale, and Roads and Trails funds to 20 percent of the total obligations from each fund.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be used for necessary expenses in the event of law enforcement emergencies as necessary to protect natural resources and public or employee safety: *Provided*, That such amounts shall not exceed \$500,000.

Section 551 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111-61) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) TRANSITION.—Until September 30, 2002, the Secretary of Agriculture may expend amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to carry out this title in a manner consistent with the authorities exercised by the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the transfer of the Recreation Area to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary, regarding procurement of property, services, supplies, and equipment."

Mr. REGULA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 66, line

16 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY  
(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds made available under this heading for obligation in prior years, \$67,000,000 shall not be available until October 1, 2001: *Provided*, That funds made available in previous appropriations Acts shall be available for any ongoing project regardless of the separate request for proposal under which the project was selected.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:  
Page 66, line 21, insert "(increased by \$22,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 85, line 7, insert "(increased by \$15,000,000 which shall not be available until September 29, 2001)" after the dollar amount.

Page 85, line 21, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000 which shall not be available until September 29, 2001)" after the dollar amount.

Page 86, line 19, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000 which shall not be available until September 29, 2001)" after the dollar amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. REGULA. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer my first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:  
Page 66, line 21, insert "(increased by \$22,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, we are calling up this amendment to give a much-needed raise to three agencies of the Federal Government that have been starved by this Congress for a number of years simply because of misperceptions and absolute downright lies about the kind of work that they have done.

I do not think any reasonable person in the United States can dispute the good work that these agencies do. As a matter of fact, in the years which we struggled just to keep it alive, we have gotten a lot of help from the associations, the counties, the conference of mayors, major corporations in the United States who believe that creative thinking is the key to success.

This year we can afford to give to the National Endowment of Arts \$15 million more, and \$5 million more to the National Endowment for Humanities, and only 2 million more, I wish it were more, for the Museum Service, which does so much, the Museum and Library Service.

The debate over the years about these three agencies, over this government have taken such a terrible beating. Things have been said on the floor that have been, as I said earlier, misperceptions and down right wrong. But we struggle just simply to keep them alive. But we have ample proof from the response of the people throughout the United States that they, not only want these agencies alive, they want these agencies to survive.

I want to make it clear this afternoon that I am offering this amendment on behalf of the Arts Caucus of the House of Representatives, which is co-chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN). This amendment is cosponsored also by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

What we are asking is, as my colleagues know, the bill calls for a deferral of \$67 million. We would like to increase that by \$22 million for a total of \$89 million, as we said before, to give the NEA a \$15 million raise, the NEH \$5 million more, and the Library and Museum Service \$2 million more.

People cry out for it. Even our opponents on the other side have talked about how much people appreciate going to arts programs.

The National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for Humanities have made certain over the years that they have reached out to every nook and crannie from sea to shining sea in the United States, trying to make the little bit of money that we give them stretch to meet the needs of the growing population of the United States.

□ 1500

We know more than we used to about the development of the mind. We know more about what it is like for a child to be exposed to art at a very early age. We know a child who has studied art for 4 years in high school will do 80 points better on their SAT scores. And we know that this House should vote to support these agencies.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

We also know that we could keep more talented young people in the school system if we put resources into good programs in the arts, learning about the arts, and the humanities. It is something that every student in college, and some of our California State universities, have to take at least one course in the arts and/or music. And that is important because it broadens the mind, and it keeps the brain moving.

The arts also provide inspiration. We all know that. So we should not have to go through these annual maulings where we have to refute some new

bogus charge which is utter baloney. Some earlier grants often had nothing to do with the National Endowment for the Arts.

In 1965, I happened to be on the Senate staff and the establishment of the Arts and Humanities endowments were overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. As far as government support of the arts in the depression, the WPA, the Works Progress Administration, put millions were put in when people were unemployed, and they brought inspiration both in murals, in symphonies, in opera.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I just want to echo what the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) has said.

It is unbecoming for this Congress every year to debate this subject the way we do. Last night half of this group in this House went over to the Kennedy Center for a free performance of *To Kill a Mockingbird*, and this afternoon they have come back for a performance on the floor to try to kill the NEA.

I think the time has come to stop that nonsense and fund these agencies a little bit more so they can do three times more work.

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

I had hoped that we could do this swiftly for our colleagues. I know many of them would like to be heading home this evening. Except for this one amendment, which we could not get agreement on, we could have had an agreement on every other amendment in this bill. But if we have to do it this way, we have to do it.

I think this issue is crucially important to our country, and I believe that the gentlewoman's amendment, which would increase the deferral by \$22 million, would then allow us to have the room necessary to vote for an increase of \$15 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and \$2 for the museums and libraries.

Now, believe me, that is not a lot of money. I do think it would send a signal that after 8 years of holding down funding for the Endowment of the Arts that we see that Bill Ivey and his people have done a good job and that they deserve this small amount of additional money.

I want to commend the chair of the Congressional Member Organization for the Arts, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and the vice chair, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), for their leadership on this. It is bipartisan. There are people on both sides of the aisle here that support the arts in this country.

When I go home to my State and I look at what has happened in Washington State in the arts, and it is not just in Seattle, it is Tacoma, in Bremerton, in Port Townsend, it makes me

proud that that small amount of Federal money has been used all over this country to create performing arts' groups, ballets, and symphony orchestras. And, also, we have been able to get funding from the private sector because they see the government involvement, they see that Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval, and they are willing to match those monies, as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) previously talked about.

So I think this is a solid amendment. Unfortunately, we have to offer it in three different steps. But I hope that on each of these steps everyone in this House will recognize that this is the amendment on the National Endowment for the Arts. If my colleagues support it, they support the Slaughter amendment. If they do not, then they do not. But I think there is a majority in this House. If given a chance to vote up or down on this issue in this House of Representatives, I think there is a majority here in support of the National Endowment for the Arts and for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I regret that we are forced to offer this amendment in this convoluted fashion because the majority is so nervous about this issue. What is wrong with the arts? What is wrong with the humanities? Why are they afraid of this issue, when in every community in this country there are great examples of where the arts and humanities are helping the American people, and our museums as well?

I am very upset that we could not work out an agreement here. This is the only issue we have not been able to resolve amicably, and I hope that people will stay with us, vote for these amendments as we have to go through this process. We will clearly identify which ones are for the arts, and we appreciate the hard work of the gentlewoman from New York who is chairman of the arts caucus.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This budget is very tight. We have many needs to balance within the interior budget and the overall budget, and we must not take funds from Social Security and Medicare because we are afraid to make tough choices.

My opposition is based on budget grounds. In the past, I have helped lead the opposition to NEA on a number of grounds which, under the direction of Bill Ivey and the new guidelines passed by Congress, has corrected a number of its past problems. No longer are NEA funds so concentrated on the major cities of this country, where arts resources are already plentiful. This has also helped alleviate the cultural elitism of the past.

There has also been major progress in the area of performance artists, where the only art is in the eyes of the artist. If art is to be public funded, it needs to be more majoritarian or consensus art.

If the NEA wants me, my family, the people of Indiana, and America to pay for it, it should be something appreciated by others not just the artists.

Probably Americans are most familiar with the controversies around the funding of morally offensive art by the NEA. It is unfortunate that conservatives, such as myself, do not speak up often enough about the importance of arts to the soul. A society without artistic expression would be gray, boring, and depressing. But publicly funded art should not gratuitously insult the deeply held religious beliefs of the American public.

The Reverend Donald Wildmon and Pat Trueman of the American Family Institute have performed a tireless public service in making sure Americans and Congress aware of where our tax dollars are spent. It is my belief that the new director and the new rules of the NEA help make progress on limiting morally offensive art funded by our tax dollars.

I was shaken, as others have been, by several cases where NEA funds have gone to organizations in the last few years that have either performed or provided a venue for art that attacks Christian beliefs in an aggressive calculated way. The clear goal was to cause insult and offend, not to inspire the soul or cause reflection. They are crudity designed to shock.

I decided to study the possible NEA involvement further, and this is what I discovered. And it was not enough just to argue that the funding was not for the individual projects because money can be fungible and it can be used to send tacit approval to the organizations that performed it.

There was recently a play entitled "The Pope and the Witch." It depicted the Pope, called John Paul II, as a heroin-addicted paranoid, advocating birth control and legalization of drugs.

The NEA provided funding to the Irondale Ensemble Project and provided funding for the New City, where the play was performed. But here is the rest of the story. The \$15,000 grant to the Irondale Ensemble was for a musical theater piece of "The Murals of Rockefeller Center." The date was prior to the morally offensive anti-Catholic about the heroin-addicted Pope.

The NEA did not fund the offensive play, nor did they know such a play would later be performed by this organization. The real test is next year. Now they know this theater has stuck its finger in the eye of the American people. Now there should be no more funds.

The same is true for the theater for New York City. Their grant was to fund education programs. It was given before the disgusting, anti-Catholic play about a heroin-addicted Pope. While NEA did not know that this organization was going to provide a venue for an anti-Catholic play when their grant was given, they now know. No more funds.

The Brooklyn Museum in New York is a famous institution. It was not a surprise that NEA would have supported an arts program at that museum. After that funding was granted, the Brooklyn Museum apparently decided that their best hope for raising money was to insult Christians to gain attention. A Virgin Mary made out of dung certainly did that.

No NEA money was used for that art. NEA money to the Brooklyn Museum had been given earlier, so it was not moral support or fungible money. But now we know they will deliberately insult Christians with shock art. No more funds.

Another case raised by critics actually started in 1996. In this case, "Corpus Christi" promoted itself as a play about Christ being a homosexual who had sex with the apostles. Clearly, not something taxpayers would want to support. But once again the facts do not show that NEA supported this play.

In 1996, the Manhattan Theatre Club received a grant to develop Terrence McNally's new play "Corpus Christi." Here is the application that described this proposal. I have read it and gone through the application. Here is all that it said. "Spirituality has been one of the major themes in Terrence McNally's most recent plays at MTC. His next play, Corpus Christi, will be an examination of good and evil. He will use certain miracles in the life of Christ as inspiration for the story, which will have a contemporary setting."

In case my colleagues missed the part about Christ being a homosexual and having sex with his apostles, it is because it is not there. That is why Congress now requires more in-depth descriptions.

But that is not even the rest of the story. The Manhattan Theatre Club then wrote to cancel this grant and asked to transfer the funds to "Collected Stories." I have reviewed the letter exchanges that clearly show the grant transfer.

Nothing then happened for 2 years. In 1998, McNally completed the disgusting shock art play, which was performed without NEA funds. Many artists today would rather use their creative powers to mock God and try to provoke outrage from people who love and honor our Creator rather than develop art.

Our anger and legitimate concern that no tax dollars provide funding, direct or indirect, or even in the form of moral support, is completely justified. But we also, especially as Christians, have a moral obligation to stick with the truth. NEA did not fund this art, directly or indirectly.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I wish to engage in a colloquy with the gentlewoman from New York.

It is my understanding that in the offset for the gentlewoman's amendment, she seeks to defer until 2002 \$22 million of previously proposed funds

for the Clean Coal Technology Program of the Energy Department. For 15 years, through the Clean Coal Technology Program, the Federal Government has been a solid partner, working jointly with private companies and the States to develop and demonstrate a new generation of environmentally clean technology using coal.

Companies were willing to sign agreements with the government because Congress, under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, and others, had the foresight to appropriate the entire Federal share of funding in advance. The companies knew the money would be available, and with that confidence they came to the table ready to commit their own funds.

In fact, for every \$1 committed by the Federal Government, \$2 have been committed by private industry and State agencies. This program is coming to a conclusion. All projects have been selected and all contracts have been negotiated. Can the gentlewoman give me her assurance that the deferral of funds called for in her amendment will in no way inhibit the Department of Energy's ability to fulfill its contractual obligations for fiscal year 2001; and, further, can the gentlewoman assure me that none of the current projects in the Clean Coal Technology Program, for which contracts have already been signed and agreed to by the government, will not be canceled as a result of the deferral of funds in the gentlewoman's amendment?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to respond to the gentleman's inquiry.

I have contacted the Department of Energy and been assured that deferring the additional \$22 million would not cause any significant problems and is not expected to result in the cancellation of any contracts.

In fact, the Department of Energy originally proposed deferring \$221 million and rescinding an additional \$105 million in clean coal funds. Consequently, a deferral of \$22 million should not cause any major hardship, and I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to allocate the funding to the arts and humanities.

Mr. HOLDEN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman and will support her amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but it is important to understand what this amendment is. This is the first of four amendments which, in all, will try to add \$22 million to cultural programs; \$15 million to the National Endowment for the Arts, \$5 million to the National Endowment for

the Humanities, and \$2 million from museums. It is paid for out of an account which will suffer no impact if it loses that offset because that money cannot be spent.

I would remind my colleagues that the agencies that the gentlewoman from New York is trying to fund are at this point funded at a level 40 percent below where they were a decade ago.

□ 1515

I would just say, I understand the anger that persons have felt in the past when they have seen obscene art or so-called works of art that are morally offensive to large numbers of Americans, and I think that has no place in a program like this. And as you know, we have instituted many reforms to assure that, to the maximum extent possible by any human being, that will not happen again.

At this point, I guess my suggestion to any Member would be: Whoever on this floor has never made a mistake or never had their staff make a mistake, whoever there is on this floor, please feel free to go ahead and criticize this agency. Because they had a 99.9 percent record of funding projects which are perfectly acceptable to everyone.

I would remind you that even a stopped clock is right twice a day, and so there are times when even in the best of circumstances something wrong will occur.

But as one of the previous speakers pointed out, in many of those instances, the projects that were being objected to were never funded by NEA in the first place.

I would also say, I just wish that you could see one action that is taking place in schools in my district where one song writer goes into schools and takes young people who have never had exposure to this kind of program, finds out their interests, gets them to put the words down on paper that express their feelings about those interests, and then, in turn, puts those words to music. He has produced a wonderful CD as a result of that. And it is incredible what some of those kids have been able to do.

We need more projects like that all over the country. It would be a terrible shame if we could not begin the new Challenge Program that Bill Ivy and the National Endowment is trying to bring forth.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for her amendment, and I would ask the cooperation of the House so that she can achieve what she is trying to do in piecemeal fashion because the rule does not allow her to do it all at the same time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise to speak in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is another year and another debate on a modest increase in funding for the NEA and the NEH. Most of us could probably dust off last



year's statement and just use that again because the issues have not changed; they are the same every year.

Every year supporters of the National Endowment for the Arts come to the floor, and we present overwhelming evidence that the NEA is a good investment for our country. We talk about the broad geographic reach of the NEA, with grants to all 50 State arts agencies as well as to the hundreds of communities across the country.

We talk about how the NEA has extended the reach of the arts into rural communities to which the arts never reached before all across the country.

We talk about the importance of NEA seed money in leveraging private support, like the \$4 million in total funding Chamber Music America was able to raise from just a \$300,000 NEA grant.

We talk about the economic benefits of the NEA, pointing to the tens of billions of dollars in economic activity generated, the millions of jobs supported, and the billions of dollars in Federal income tax generated by the arts every year.

And we talk about the numerous educational projects supported by the NEA from programs for young children to life-long learners.

Finally, we talk about the inherent value of supporting a vibrant arts community in this Nation, how the arts lift the spirits of our citizens and bring us together, how they entertain us and make us think, how they leave a lasting legacy for our children and their children to remember and celebrate.

But as I said, we bring up these arguments year after year. Of course, a few years ago we were debating whether the NEA should even exist, whether it was the proper role of Government to subsidize the arts. But we have won that fight.

Clearly, the American people support the NEA and the work it does. Clearly, the American people believe the Federal Government also has a role in promoting the arts and cultivating artists throughout the country. But in order to carry out this mandate, we must fund the NEA at a level that enables it to fulfill its mission.

Today, resources are stretched too thin to adequately fund worthy projects. The average grant size has dropped by over half since 1997 and is expected to drop even further unless we provide an increase this year.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, this agency is funded at a level 40 percent less than a decade ago. When we limit funding, we also hamper the ability of the agency to continue its work in expanding the reach of the NEA to underserved areas.

The massive cuts to the NEA enacted a number of years ago has reduced a once thriving agency to a very valuable but still shell of its former self. In these times of unparalleled prosperity, of unparalleled huge and increasing budget surpluses, it is nothing short of outrageous that we have not provided a

nickel's increase for this vital and popular agency for the last several years.

I think we should return to the glory days of the Reagan and Bush administrations when the NEA received almost twice what it does today. Short of that, I urge my colleagues to support the modest increases we are talking about in these amendments.

As is pointed out, the offset provided in this particular amendment poses no danger to anything because they cannot spend that money now. The offset has no negative impact. The modest increase of \$15 million to the NEA and \$5 million to the NEA and \$2 million to museums is less than we should do, but we can do no less today.

I urge the adoption of these amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues walk through the tunnel that connects the Longworth Building and the Cannon Building with the Capitol today, they will see the difference from what happened yesterday when the walls were bare. Now the walls are hung with beautiful, live, vibrant art. Now, we cannot miss it. We cannot miss the change from nothing to what these young students have done around our country.

My favorite piece of art is the cow poking its nose through the barbed-wire fence. But that is today. Tomorrow I will walk by, and I will see another piece of art, and it will become my favorite. Because that is what art does, it tickles us, it enthuses us, and it makes us love living. And that is what art is all about.

What an embarrassment for the House of Representatives to once again in an appropriations bill hold funding levels for the National Endowment for the Arts and for the Humanities.

As anyone who has managed a budget knows, this really means we are decreasing funds for the arts for the humanities, for the libraries. Opponents of the NEA and NEH cry fiscal discipline as if the richest Nation in the world needs to be the most culturally impoverished.

But money is not what this is all about. We know that the dollars that we invest in the NEA and in the NEH leverage matching grants and multiply many, many times over in every one of our communities.

What we are really witnessing here is an assault on free expression, a war on culture. It is a battle as old as the stockades in Puritan times, and it is absolutely wrong-headed.

The arts and humanities teach us to think. They encourage us to feel, to see in a new way, and to communicate. A world without art would be as dreary as those tunnels between the Cannon Building and the Capitol when they are without the art of the young people across our country. A world without art would be a dreary, dreary existence indeed.

I hope that all of my colleagues will support the Slaughter-Johnson-Horn amendment to increase funds for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum and Library Services. It is a small investment with a return as vast as our very imaginations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this critical amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Arts are our cultural language. They bring our communities together and serve to define who we are as a society. Both the NEA and the NEH broaden public access to the arts and humanities for all Americans and improve the quality of our lives for our children and our families.

I spent a good deal of my career in public schools, and I have seen the positive impacts that arts has in our children's education. The arts teach our children rhythm, design, creativity, and critical thinking.

The arts have also been shown to deter delinquent behavior of at-risk youth and to help dramatically to improve academic performance, truancy rates, and other critical skills among our children.

As the new economy demands a workforce that can think and work innovatively, arts education provides a crucial part of that skill building, skills that can begin at a very young age. For example, in a child's elementary school class trip to the museum.

In my district on the central coast of California, students have been exposed to the virtues of music, poetry, and dance as a result of our National Endowment of the Arts support.

Students from Santa Barbara, San Marcos, and Morro Bay High Schools had the opportunity to participate in the Essentially Ellington program and study the jazz music of Duke Ellington.

Students and adults have been exposed to poetry through National Poetry Month at the Lompoc Public Library, Miguelito Elementary School, the Dunn School in Los Olivos, the San Luis City County Library, and the University of California in Santa Barbara.

Thousands of my constituents have been thrilled and inspired by the Mozart Festival in San Luis Obispo, the Santa Barbara Symphony Orchestra, and the LINES Contemporary Ballet, which has performed at both Allan Hancock College in Santa Maria and CalPoly University in San Luis Obispo. These exhibits and performances have been funded and supported by NEA.

For slightly less than 36 cents a year, all Americans have access to all that the arts have to offer. It is a small price to pay for one of our Nation's richest and most effective resources.

And so I urge my colleagues, let us vote for our children and support the

Slaughter-Horn-Johnson amendment to strengthen both the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

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

Mr. Chairman, since its creation in 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts has issued more than 110,000 grants; and of this total, fewer than 20 have been considered controversial.

We can match that 20 against grant recipients who received 35 of the past 46 National Book Awards, National Book Critics Circle Awards, and Pulitzer Prizes in fiction and poetry since 1990.

Thirty-five of those recipients have been NEA recipients. Match it against the grant recipients of PBS's Great Performances that were nominated for 121 Emmys and won 51 Emmys.

Imagine all of those who are recipients of NEA awards. Great performances or small, the NEA has supported hundreds of professional orchestras, dance companies, nonprofit theaters. And before that NEA support, they really did not exist. But given NEA seed money and given the credibility that they get by NEA choosing to make an award to them, even if it be a small award, they then go out and raise substantial amounts that are in many multiples of the actual money that NEA gets. But that little seed, that credibility, makes a world of difference.

Federal funding for music, dance, theater, literature, and visual arts is not just about the quality of life; it is about investments to fulfill our human economic potential. By directing funds toward culturally diverse, educational community-oriented programs, we provide places where at-risk youth can express themselves creatively rather than destructively.

□ 1530

One witness provides a living testimony for why Congress should increase NEA's budget. Three years ago, I know I was moved by the testimony and I think all of the members of the subcommittee were moved by the testimony of a young opera singer named Denyce Graves. She testified that without the NEA, she never would have heard an opera, let alone determined that she was interested in pursuing a career as an opera singer.

Growing up in Washington, D.C., Ms. Graves was only a few miles away from the Kennedy Center but because her family could never afford Kennedy Center productions, it might as well have been a world away. It was not until Ms. Graves, as a teenager, saw her first opera at a local community theater funded in part through the NEA that she changed her whole career aspirations. She was so inspired by the music, the drama, and the passion that she decided at that moment she would become an opera singer.

Since that day, Denyce Graves has performed as Carmen at the Met and

sung all over the world in major opera productions. But she has never forgotten the role that NEA had in her life. She devotes a large amount of her time working in community theater groups sponsored by the NEA. She talks to inner-city kids about the importance of arts as an alternative to violence and about how they can find constructive ways to express their passions, their fears, their desires and their dreams.

That is what this is all about, funneling people's passions into constructive things rather than destructive pursuits. Promoting the arts improves our culture and helps instill civility. Arts and the humanities can lift people up and show them a different way of looking at the world. This Congress should continue to help the young Denyce Graves of the world to achieve their dream.

Today we have a chance to increase our investment for this worthwhile program. We can vote to increase opportunities for our citizens, to enrich their lives, their communities, and improve the social fabric of our Nation. We ought to give more Americans the chance to enjoy the arts the way Denyce Graves and countless others have had that opportunity because of the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA, the NEH, the Museums, all that we do for the arts pays multiple-fold dividends. It is part of our quality of life and part of our social and economic progress. We ought to increase that investment today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to complicate this, because everybody has expressed themselves adequately and there has been a lot of emotion and a great deal of coverage here. I just think there are three things: One, do you believe in the arts? Secondly, do you believe in the government being in the arts? And thirdly, how much money is involved?

I do not think there is any question about the first issue. I do not think anybody who is adamantly opposed to the government being in the arts opposes the arts. I mean, it is clear that there is tremendous benefit to our society, to our children, all of the richness of our lives.

So the second thing is, should the government be in the arts? I really think it should. I will tell my colleagues why. I will give an example of a particular program that years ago was trying to start up an arts camp in Massachusetts. They could not get any money. It was unproven. They were not sure it was the right thing to do. So they finally got a 5-year grant, I think it was \$5,000 a year, from the NEA, which clearly was not enough to cover the program but it was enough to signal to the other program on the outside, this is really worthy of something because the National Endowment for the Arts of the United States is supporting this.

The end result of this is they got the money, that people, individuals, corporations and foundations supported this thing and as a result, there are 40 to 45 of these camps literally touching the lives of thousands of students. That never would have been possible had it not been for that authenticity.

The third area is how much. I do not know how much. I do not know if there should be an increase of 15 for the NEA, five for the NEH and two for the Museums or whether it should be more or less. I do know, though, the trend has been going in the wrong direction. Somehow if we believe in this, then we must reverse it, and the numbers expressed here today make a great deal of sense.

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

As a proud member of the National Council of the Arts, and I saw my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) here, I cannot help but be impressed with the thoughtfulness, the seriousness and the commitment of the Members who are making these judgments. I have seen with the gentleman from North Carolina firsthand the NEA's grant selection process. I just want to applaud them once again for successfully increasing America's access to the arts despite level funding for the last 3 years.

Unfortunately, the bill before us sorely underfunds the NEA and would inhibit the NEA from funding worthy and creative programs such as Chairman Ivey's "Challenge America" which would further arts education and outreach, particularly in underserved areas. It is so exciting to see and to talk with Chairman Ivey about what he wants to do, to go to areas where young people do not have access to the arts, to go into schools where many of our young people really cannot express themselves as well as others can without access to music, to art, to other cultural attractions. This is so very vital for their education.

In a Nation of such wealth and cultural diversity, it is a sad commentary on our priorities that year after year we must continue to fight for an agency that spends less than 40 cents per American each year and in return benefits students, teachers, artists, musicians, orchestras, theaters, dance companies and their audiences around the country.

Mr. Chairman, let us make a change this year. Now is the time to increase funding for the arts. Let us do the right thing. Let us support our young people. Let us support these programs. And let us make sure the United States of America can stand tall and be proud of our commitment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the NEA, the NEH, the Museum and Library Services and in support of the Slaughter-Johnson amendment. My colleague the gentleman

from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) said, Well, we support the arts. We support the Federal Government involvement in the arts. The question is, how much money?

Let me take a try at explaining why we should be putting more money into these organizations at this time. The National Endowment for the Arts has been treated unkindly by this body for too long. Since the early 1990s, the NEA, for example, has seen its funding reduced from \$162 million in 1995 to \$99 million in 1996, to \$97.6 million last year. So even if we adopt this amendment, the NEA budget would still fall short of the President's budget request.

To the credit of the NEA, it is continuing to do more with less. Even with the shrinking budget over the last 5 years, NEA has provided a greater number of grants to more communities across the entire country. Unfortunately, simple math will tell us, while the number of grants has risen, the average grant amount has dropped by 45 percent. We must stop starving the National Endowment for the Arts. We have won the fight, I hope, for the existence of the NEA and the NEH and Library Services. But every year, it seems, we have to fight to raise it above starvation. Whether it is the Kennedy Center's touring company in Manalapan or the Boy Choir School or the McCarter theater, all of those in my district, or a nonprofit group in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, or in Lake Placid, New York, funding for the NEA touches all of our constituents, bringing them arts, cultural events and educational opportunities. Visual and performing arts, literature and poetry help us know ourselves as a society and help us stretch ourselves and grow as a society.

The President made a reasonable request of \$150 million for the NEA. My colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations set the NEA allocation at \$98 million. This amendment, I think, is a reasonable increase and will help raise this above starvation levels.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this opportunity for personal enrichment, for societal enrichment, for cultural enrichment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of increased funding for the arts and humanities. I know there is a philosophical difference over whether or not there is a Federal responsibility to assist in the creation of the arts and the humanities across this Nation and whether the Federal Government should be involved in helping to expose more Americans to the benefits of those arts. But I have come to the realization that I think the Federal Government does have a role, not a primary role but it does have a role.

I also believe that increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts is justified. There are a lot of arts groups in my district, in my part of Arizona that benefit very directly from

this funding, such as dance theater performances and in-residence musical troupes that have been there in communities like Safford and Thatcher, poetry readings, photography exhibits in Tucson and other small communities around the district. These activities are a real asset to the rural towns and to the larger metropolitan areas. They are precisely the type of cultural activities that got overlooked too often without the National Endowment for the Arts.

But having said that and my support for added funding, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, as a member of the majority and as a member of this subcommittee, I have a basic question and a basic responsibility and, that is, how do we get this bill past the House of Representatives? An increase is great if it helps us to pass this bill on the floor of the House. But it does not do us much good if the majority of this body end up voting against the overall measure. So my question to the sponsors would be, do they intend to support this bill if an amendment is passed to increase the funding of the NEH and the NEA? I hope that we get this answered sometime before this debate is over.

My concern is a very practical one. If we adopt the amendment, do we gain support for the bill? It appears that we do not. But I can assure my colleagues that its passage results in a loss of support, unfortunately as far as I am concerned, but a loss of support by some Members on my side who have a very different point of view and whose view I also respect.

It is for that reason, until I have some assurance about this, that I would have to oppose this amendment. Because if we cannot get the bill through the House of Representatives, off the floor of the House and to conference with the Senate, then we all lose. We have to govern responsibly. I do not want to risk shutting down our national parks and forests over a virtual increase in funding, and I say "virtual" because this amendment does not actually allow any additional money to be spent or obligated to NEA or NEH until the last day of the fiscal year. It is in essence an advanced appropriation for the fiscal year 2002, not 2001.

So it is my hope that when this process is completed, the appropriations process is finished for this next fiscal year, we can find a consensus somewhere in what I would call the "radical center" and achieve a responsible increase in funding for the arts and humanities.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the Slaughter-Johnson-Dicks amendment and really applaud them for all of their hard work on this amendment. This would add additional funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by \$15 million, the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million, and the Insti-

tute of Museum and Library Services by \$2 million.

These programs help communities across the Nation develop critically important cultural resources. Through the NEA grants to local communities, support is provided for more than 7,400 K-12 arts educational programs in more than 2,600 communities all across this great Nation.

Chairman Bill Ivey has listened to the concerns of Congress and responded to them. He has initiated a series of reforms, first in how grants are given, and secondly in the arts reach program, he has reached out to all of the States with the goal of making the contributions equal among the States.

□ 1545

The Challenge America program of NEA is hoping to bring educational programs to our public schools, to our young people in the early years, which is tremendously important. Study after study shows that children who are exposed to the arts do better in school and have higher self-esteem.

NEA, NEH and IMLS reach out to all of our communities. They provide cultural and educational opportunities to our children and families that enrich each and every one of us.

At the same time, these programs generate an enormous amount of revenue, approximately \$3.6 billion each year for our local economies across this country.

The NEA is useful to all our communities and comes at very little cost to taxpayers. Funding for the arts is much less than 1 percent of our Federal budget, and funding for these extremely beneficial programs has been frozen for several years.

In fact, funding is now 40 percent lower than it was 10 years ago. So it is time to do more for students and communities across our Nation. In my own city of New York, I cannot even imagine what it would be like without the arts.

It is such a vital and important part of the enrichment and cultural life of our city. And every single city should have arts, humanitarian programs, the humanities and library services.

This amendment reaches out to accomplish that goal. Again, one goal is to make sure that all States have equal funding. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this package.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to divide my time with the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who actually was here before me, and the gentleman consented to this. I will speak for 2½ minutes or less.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in strong support of the Slaughter-Horn-Johnson amendment to enable an increase in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by \$15 million, for the National Endowment of the Humanities by \$5 million, and for the Institute of

Museum and Library Services by \$2 million.

We have heard over and over again, and we do agree it is critical that we support Federal funding for these programs. They serve to broaden public access to the arts in humanities for all Americans to participate in and enjoy. The value of these programs lies in their ability to nurture artistic excellence of thousands of arts organizations and artists in every corner of the country.

The NEA alone awards more than 1,000 grants to nonprofit arts organizations for projects in every State. These programs are also a great investment in our Nation's economic growth. Let us realize that the nonprofit arts industry alone generates more than \$36.8 million annually in economic activity. It supports 1.3 million jobs. It returns more than \$3.4 million to the Federal Government in income taxes.

I know that each of us in Congress can point to worthwhile projects in our districts that are aided by the NEA, the NEH, and the Institute of Museum and Library Services. In my district, Montgomery County, Maryland, the NEA funds, just as an example, the Puppet Theatre Glen Echo Park, just a few miles from the Capitol. It is a 200-seat theatre created out of a portion of an historic ballroom at Glen Echo Park.

The audience is usually made up of children accompanied by their families and teachers, representing the cultural and economic diversity of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. An NEA grant allows the Puppet Company to keep the ticket prices low so that many young families can attend the performances.

One reads every day in the papers about those groups that travel there for the performances. And in the last five years other institutions and individuals in Maryland have received \$18.2 million from the NEH and the Maryland Humanities Council for projects that help preserve the Nation's cultural heritage, foster lifelong learning, and encourage civic involvement.

By supporting the arts and humanities, the Federal Government has an opportunity to partner with State and local communities for the betterment of our Nation. Both the arts and the humanities teach us who we were, who we are, and who we might be. Both are critical to a free and democratic society. It is important, even vital, that we support and encourage the promotion of the arts and humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on the Slaughter-Horn-Johnson amendment package.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will move to strike the requisite number of words and take my own time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

As chairperson of the Congressional Arts Caucus, she has done a remarkable job in educating her colleagues on the importance of the arts, humanities, history and literacy programs here in the United States.

This amendment would restore \$22 million of urgently needed resources to the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

These funds will be used to continue and expand upon a number of important programs at these agencies, including the arts, education programs at the National Endowment for the Arts.

Currently over 5 million American children benefit from the arts education programs, including a number of my constituents in the Bronx and in Queens.

In my district, the BCA Development Corporation, which runs the WriterCorps project, recently received \$30,000 to support the Youth Poetry Slam. The poetry program is designed to use teens' natural penchant for competition and self-expression to introduce them to the written and to the spoken word.

It has been proven over and over again that children who are exposed to the arts remain in school longer, receive better grades and stay out of trouble, and hold themselves in higher self-esteem.

Additionally, the NEA provides grants to cultural and folk institutions throughout our country to demonstrate and show respect for the diverse ethnicities that make up our great Nation.

As an example of the importance of these funds, the Thalia Spain Theatre in Sunnyside, New York, received \$10,000 to support a series of folklore shows of music and dance from Spain and Latin America. The music and dance shows included Argentine, tango and flamenco, and classic Spanish dance, as well as Mexican folklore.

I am especially pleased at the funding award for the Thalia Spanish Theatre. I have worked very hard to make sure that the arts and cultural organizations cater to nontraditional and new audiences. That is why I am pleased to thank both the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for once again including my language into this bill to include urban minorities under the definition of an underserved population for the purpose of awarding NEA grants.

My district, which is composed of a diverse wealth of neighborhoods throughout Queens and the Bronx, has a number of ethnic groups that add to the tapestry of New York City.

My language will open NEA funding to more local ethnic arts groups and

more residents of Queens and the Bronx. It would also help fulfill the mission of the NEA to guarantee that no person is left untouched by the arts.

Once again, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA); the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), for all their hard work to include that language.

I want to also ensure that all Americans have equal access to cultural programs. Projects targeted at urban youth will greatly help keep these young people off the streets and away from the lure of drugs and crime. The arts also help to break down barriers. They bring communities together; and they offer hope, hope to struggling communities throughout our country.

That is why the Slaughter amendment today is so important. Additionally, this amendment will increase the funding for both the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute for Museum and Library Services. These two agencies both have strong reputations among both Democrats and Republicans for the wonderful work in restoring the folk, oral, and written traditions of America.

The NEH has been very active in providing seed money throughout the country, and particularly in New York City, to address the issues of electronic media in the classroom. A specific grant was given last year to assist in the training of teachers in new media techniques to communicate the humanities to our children.

This type of project represents the best of the NEH and of our government working directly with local communities to advance the education of our young and train them for the future.

The NEH and the IMLS have led the way in working to build and strengthen relationships between our Nation's libraries and museums and our children's classrooms to ensure that the knowledge, creativity, and imagination of every child of our great Nation is at the fingertips of every young Einstein, Rembrandt, and Twain to come in the future.

This is an excellent amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is a champion of the arts and the NEA and the people that speak for the National Endowment of the Arts. I just happened to disagree with the manner in which they fund the arts, and I will be happy to explain.

I want to tell everyone about a little girl that escaped from Vietnam; her name was Foo Lee. She participated in the arts caucus every year which have art students from the high schools submit their work and we pay for the student to come back here, out of our own pockets. Foo Lee escaped in a boat from Vietnam, and if anyone sees the

painting, we would actually get tears in our eyes, because she and her whole family escaped from Vietnam on a rickety boat, and she drew a picture of that. We can see the pain and the anguish.

Mr. Chairman, the little girl has a fantastic talent. We found out that Foo Lee's mom stayed behind when she came to the United States. She knew that if they were captured, that they would be all put into a re-education camp, and there is nothing education about a re-education camp in Vietnam.

So the mom, who was a gynecologist, actually stayed behind so that Foo Lee and the rest of the family could come forward. It took 2 years, but we finally got Foo Lee's mom into Lindbergh Field in San Diego on Christmas Day, and that little girl is still an artist.

I want to tell everyone that there are artists like that, and there are paintings of the children in our schools that paint in the hallway here. There is a lot of very gifted children and a lot of talent there. It should be cultured.

I respectfully disagree with the way that the National Endowment for the Arts deals with taxpayer funding.

I will come into the district of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), and I will campaign for the arts, not for the gentlewoman. I will not raise money for the gentlewoman, but I will come in and if the gentlewoman has something here in DC or wants to raise money for the arts, I will be happy to do that.

I openly seek from private industry to give and contribute to the arts. I would make a wager that with most of the majority, I give more money to San Diego Symphony and the Escondido Arts Center than most Members give out of your own pockets.

Again, I disagree with taking it out of taxpayer dollars for the National Endowment for the Arts in this way. And we have a lady named Mrs. Bell; her husband started Taco Bell. She lives in my district. The first time I met her she told me to take the bucket of lettuce out there and go feed the chickens, Congressman. That is how nonassuming she is.

She provided a grant to start an entire music system in Encinitas Elementary School System, and I think that is what we ought to do. If we want to support tax deductions for it, private contributions, industry investing in education and the arts, as I said, I will even come to the most liberal districts; I will come to the districts. I will even come to the district of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and fight for the arts.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree with this; and I would say to those, the individuals that have the beliefs in this, I know the Members mean well in this and see it as the way to invest in the arts. Some of us disagree with that, and I hope the Members understand that as well.

Whatever pro or con of this particular amendment, the bill we feel it

will be a killer to the particular bill, and if Members want the bill to pass, then I would reject this amendment. Whether pro or against this particular bill, it may not be the case, but we feel that the bill will go down, one of the reasons for this particular amendment.

We would like to pass the bill, and I would say to my colleagues, let us support the arts, but let us not do it through taxpayer-funded messages.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise today in support of the Slaughter-Johnson-Dicks amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

The arts and humanities are important components of American life. The arts really bring to life the struggles and challenges many people are confronted with on a daily basis. Moreover, the arts and humanities transcend cultural race, religion, income, age and geography.

□ 1600

Whether it is at the Kennedy Center or a theater in Chicago, the arts really help to enhance the quality of life for all Americans through a breathtaking array of cultural activity.

Statistics suggest that art programs in schools and music concerts tend to stimulate students' learning and improve overall academic performance. In my congressional district in Chicago, the NEA has had a significant impact on many of our great institutions and on improving the quality of life. For example, the NEA has supported the West Side Cultural Arts Council, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Chicago Black Ensemble Theater Corporation, the School of Art Institute of Chicago, the Black Ensemble's Little City Program, the Museum of Contemporary Art, the Illinois Arts Alliance, and the Field Museum of Chicago, just to name a few.

For me, increasing funding for the NEA is not an option, it is actually a priority, and it is a priority because public support for the arts and humanities is the finest expression of faith in the individual's ability to think, create and express ideas.

The arts and humanities can speak of things that cannot be spoken of in any other way. They foster a sense of community by advancing the understanding of history, of culture, and of ideas. Cultural diversity is something that we talk about a great deal in this country, and it is, indeed, a source of great strength to our Nation, a source of energy, a source of creativity.

Therefore, I believe that sustaining and supporting an increase of funding for the arts and humanities must indeed be a national priority, if we are to be able to pull together and shape the Nation, based upon the culture, the tradition, the hopes, the aspirations and the contributions of all of its people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge, in a vote, urge a vote in favor of an increase.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of all the Slaughter amendments to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities and for the Institute of Museum and Library Services. I only wish they could have been considered as one, rather than have been split up as they have been.

These are very modest amendments, and, personally, I would support significantly greater increases for each of these three agencies. The reason why is very simple. These agencies are good for the third district of Massachusetts, a district that I am proud to represent. They contribute to the economic vitality and cultural vibrancy of the communities I represent.

Let me highlight a few examples for my colleagues. The Institute of Museum and Library Services has provided grant support to expand and enhance educational programs and public outreach to the Worcester Art Museum, one of the premier museums in New England, as well as to the Willard House and Clock Museum in North Grafton and the Worcester County Horticultural Society. By supporting these museums, large and small, IMLS has helped foster leadership, innovation and a lifetime of learning for these communities.

The National Endowment for the Humanities has provided grant support to the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester to conserve and acquire books and manuscripts in the Society's collection.

Let me tell you a little more about the American Antiquarian Society, one of my favorite sites in Worcester. It is a precious resource for every single American. The Society houses the largest and most accessible collection of books, pamphlets, broadsides, manuscripts, newspapers, periodicals, sheet music and graphic arts material printed from the establishment of the colonies in America through 1876. It is a unique resource for the understanding of our history and culture. The NEH has provided support to nearly every aspect of the museum's operations, including outreach to the public and to school children. It has also helped leverage additional State and private support.

Mr. Chairman, I also have 16 colleges and universities in my district, and the IMLS and the NEH have provided invaluable research grants and support for their educational and cultural work.

The National Endowment for the Arts has provided direct support to activities in Worcester and Attleboro, and with its support of the Massachusetts Cultural Council, reaches schools and community centers throughout Central Massachusetts. These three agencies, Mr. Chairman, help the educational, community and cultural institutions in my district meet the challenges of the future.

Through their grant support, my communities can provide greater public access to the arts, the humanities, and the resources of our libraries and museums. They help these institutions incorporate and make available to the public new technologies, regardless of income.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support these amendments. They are modest but worthy investments in education and families and children and our cultural heritage and our future.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues tonight as we debate this to substitute the word "religion" every time the word "art" has been used here. I suggest that there is a great deal, in fact, an exact comparison, between almost everything that has been said in support of the funding for the arts that could be said, but certainly would never be said on this floor, if an amendment were proposed to support religion.

As the Managing Director of Baltimore's Center Stage put it, "Art has power. It has power to sustain, to heal, to humanize, to change something in you. It is a frightening power, and also a beautiful power. And it's essential to a civilized society. Because art is so powerful, because it deals with such basic human truths, we dare not entangle it with coercive government power."

For exactly the same reason that, certainly I know my friends on this side of the aisle would stand up and rail against anyone who would suggest that we should take public money and subsidize religious experiences, for exactly the same reason I ask you to think about what you are doing when you ask people to subsidize the arts.

The arts are, in fact, as close a resemblance to religion as I can possibly think of. They are expressions of the innermost feelings in our souls, and certainly worthwhile. Think of it this way: If we subsidized religion, could we not come to the floor as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) did with that beautiful and eloquent explanation of all of the wonderful things that happen in our country because we subsidize religion, all of the incredible things that go on in our own communities, the many benefits that we could bring to individuals in our own communities because we could subsidize religion.

Certainly it would be difficult to argue with the benefits of a religious experience. It is difficult to argue the fact that art is an uplifting, a wonderful thing, that we all enjoy, in our own specific way. But just as God is in the eye and/or mind of the believer, art is in the eye and mind of the observer, and I have no more authority, no more responsibility, to compel people in this country to support religion than I do having them support the arts. And that is really the most basic, I guess, comparison that I can make; and I ask my

colleagues to think about it. It is something somewhat more esoteric than the kind of debate we have been having, but I think just as germane.

Something that was written in 1779, "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." 1789. The author, of course, Thomas Jefferson, in the Bill for Religious Freedom.

What, may I ask, do you think is the difference between what he is warning us about here and what we are preparing to do with both this amendment and the funding of the arts in general? It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine a distinction, and although I understand entirely the altruistic intent on the part of the people who want to fund the arts and who want to increase the funding for the arts, I ask you to think about the basic issue that forces itself into the discussion here, and that is that when you compel people to contribute money for the propagation of opinions which one disbelieves in and abhors, it is sinful and tyrannical.

Art is in the eye of the beholder, and the minute that you fund the arts, you do exactly what they fear would happen when you fund religion, you politicize it. You will always then have people arguing about what is proper art, what is proper for public support, what kind of movie or what kind of play or what kind of books should be funded with public dollars. We will always have that because, of course, it is the nature of the business. If we fund it, we will attempt to regulate it; we will attempt to censor it. We should not censor art; we should not fund art.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from Colorado, and I thank certainly the sponsors on this side, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and others.

One great thing about our Nation, as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) knows and all of us in this Chamber knows is that there are differences that exist among us. We are tied together with some common threads, but what makes us so great is that there are people who wear different clothing, who cling to different political beliefs. Obviously there are those that harbor different political philosophies, as we see aired on this floor day in and day out.

What ties us all together really as Americans is that we all really sort of share the same dreams and same aspirations. I have constituents of mine in the Chamber today, and I can assure the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) they are good church members. They are members of Princeton Avenue Full Gospel Church back in my district, and all of them want their kids to go to a good school, and all of them want their parents to maintain their health benefits at work, to maintain a job and their health benefits.

But there are differences that exist among us that really make America what it is. The NEA and the NEH in many ways helps to foster that, sponsors those initiatives and those efforts, and I might add in my public school system, both NEA and NEH grants have done wonderful things to assist teachers and educators in passing along ideas and teaching lessons to kids who sometimes might not ordinarily get them. We have all seen the stats and the data that clearly demonstrated that kids that are exposed to arts and music early in life do better in their core subjects, the math and the science, the English and the history and the host of other core subjects that are so critical to a young person's development.

It is my hope, and I understand my friend from Colorado's passion about this issue, but the facts are the facts. We are not talking about religion here, we are talking about the arts. The Constitution speaks clearly, the founding of this country was predicated upon those seeking religious freedom.

So I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and even some on this side of the aisle, think about all of those museums and universities and schools, think about all those nonprofit and community organizations that benefit from these grants. Think of the young people's lives that we impact and touch and improve, and think about the heritage and the ways in which we are able to bring people together, despite our differences, and how these grants and initiatives help to do just that.

Seeing the look on a young person's face when they learn about their history and learn about their heritage and how it fits into this larger national fabric is truly phenomenal, as the Speaker knows, and I would hope that my colleague from Colorado knows as well.

I would ask all of my colleagues to look beyond the rhetoric from one moment, to look beyond the political contributions for one moment, to look beyond those political constituencies that would lambast the arts and humanities, and let us support an initiative and support an amendment that in many ways helps to bolster and promote what is great about our Nation, our ideals, our democracy and our freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the sponsors, and would urge support of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter-Horn amendment to increase the amend of funding that we provide to the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute of Museum and Library Services. It allows these groups to expand and continue what is truly important work that goes on around the country in these areas.

These are agencies that are charged with bringing our history, the beauty, the wisdom, culture, into the lives of all Americans, young, old, rich, poor, urban, rural. We in the Congress have said that preserving our national heritage and making it accessible to all Americans is a goal that is worthy of our support. It is time now to make sure that these agencies have the resources that they need to achieve this mission.

□ 1615

This is about our humanity, this is about our civility. This is what defines us as a people. These are the institutions that help to capture who we are and what we are about.

Many years ago I spent 7 years as the chair of the Greater New Haven Arts Council in my city of New Haven, Connecticut, so I know firsthand how the arts not only enrich lives, but contribute to the economic growth of the community.

Federal investment in the arts is not only a means of support for the endeavor, but rather, our dollars, which represent a small fraction of an annual budget, are used to leverage private funding and fuel what is an arts industry. This industry creates job, it increases travel and tourism, it generates thousands of dollars for a State's economy.

If Members cannot be persuaded on the humanity portions of this effort and the cultural and the preservation of our heritage, gosh, I would hope Members would be turned on the issue of the economics of a vibrant arts community.

In addition, the NEA is an important partner in bringing arts education to more American youngsters. Arts education is critical. It helps to plant seeds of art appreciation. It cultivates talent that is yet to be discovered in the young minds of our kids around the country.

In partnership with State arts agency, the Endowment provides \$37 million of annual support for from kindergarten through 12th grade arts education projects in more than 2,600 communities across the country.

When we are teaching youngsters music, we teach them mathematics. It is found and proven that the development of a musical education in fact increases the mathematical ability of youngsters today.

The National Endowment funds professional development programs for art specialists, classroom teachers, and artists. We are truly just beginning to understand the benefit of arts education and the way in which it helps to foster self-esteem for our youngsters, helps them to choose a constructive path rather than turning to violence. We need to continue to support these efforts.

We know that the arts builds our economy, it enriches our culture, it feeds the minds of adults and children. The NEA, the NEH, the Institute for

Museum and Library Services, need to have an increase in their missions. It is time we gave them our support.

Let us focus in on the legacy that we want to give to future generations on who we were and what we did. Let it flower in our music, in our painting, in our buildings. Let generations to come understand who we are and what we have done.

This is an expression of our humanity. Let us not shortchange it. Let us understand that it imbues who we are and how we live our lives today.

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

Mr. Chairman, first, I am opposed to the clean coal deferral because I think the program is important in terms of energy independence. We have many research projects in the clean coal program. We are going to be able to sell a lot of this technology to the Chinese because most of their power plants are fueled by coal. Yet they are growing more sensitive to clean air problems.

What this amendment does is defer \$22 million of clean coal funding so that the money would be available to do an increase in the National Endowment for the Arts. That is why all this discussion has been focused around the NEA. Without this window of money there is not anyplace to do an offset, which of course would be required for an NEA amendment.

Just so the Members understand, the vote will be on whether or not we should defer \$22 million of clean coal money which would be used for potential projects in developing clean coal technology and use that deferred money for an amendment later on.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman, who has done so much on this particular issue, realizes also that the administration requested a much larger deferral; that we can defer this money until the end of the fiscal year and the testimony is that it will not have any effect whatsoever on the programs, the substance of the programs. All the projects will go ahead, but it does make the money available for this amendment.

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman is correct.

Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the Administration did request more. I do not agree with them. I think that the Department of Energy needs to have this space, although they might feel differently, in the event that they have some projects that will fit the clean coal technology objective.

In any event, just so the Members understand this vote, and it will be the second vote this afternoon, the vote is to take \$22 million of clean coal money and make it available to do the increase that will be proposed by amendment in the National Endowment for the Arts program. That is why the de-

bate was revolving around the NEA. So that will come.

I might say, I have been advised by the leadership, and I think a memo that went out to this effect to all the offices, that they plan to finish this bill tonight. So I think we need to keep working on it if we want to get it finished. That is the present plan from the Republican leadership. I just want to advise Members of that. I hope that once we get by these two amendments we can reach some time agreements in order to get this bill finished in a timely way.

I would urge my colleagues and the colleagues on the other side of the aisle to vote against this second vote tonight. The first vote will be on the Sterns amendment to reduce the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. The second vote will be on this proposal to defer \$22 million of clean coal money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I appreciate the chairman's concern about the clean coal technology research money, and have for years supported it. I would hope that in conference he can move the money around in an appropriate way.

Mr. Chairman, it is very, very important, and it is difficult within our process, but it is very important for this Congress in this session to provide some modest increase in funding for the NEA, the NEH, and our museum folks.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell the Members why. Bill Ivey, the new head of the NEA, deserves to be recognized and supported. He has earned our support. He has not only brought that agency back on track, but he has brought it in compliance with the letter of all the reforms this House has adopted, and in compliance with the spirit of those reforms.

He has gone beyond that. He has developed a new NEA program called "Challenge America." Challenge America is to do exactly what this House said over and over again, particularly Republicans, what they wanted the NEA to do. That is to bring arts money to the service of local communities. If any Member has ever been in one of the HOT schools, stood there and listened to that fifth grader tell you what it means to go to a school that is a Higher Order of Thinking school, you would have had to become a believer.

One of the problems in America is that kids are not learning well. They are not learning to integrate logical thinking with intuitive thinking. Kids who have arts education develop better skills in those areas and do better life-long. This is not an issue. The research is overwhelming.

So for the NEA to take on Challenge America, to challenge our communities at the local level to better integrate arts into their curriculum so kids will



learn better, think better, and be stronger members of our Nation, that is a very good thing. Bill Ivey is doing it.

Secondly, look at the rural communities, at least in my part of the country. They are developing tourism as the way to save the rural economies. They are developing theaters, they are developing museums in their very old houses, and in Connecticut, resuscitating the old iron industry, which built the cannons that won the Revolutionary War for us.

So these areas of our country need this kind of Challenge American money to be able to develop the economy that will compliment the farm economy and create strong rural communities. What is the NEH doing? The NEH is out there helping these small communities develop the very museum capacity, that preserves our history and strengthens our communities.

I have seen it happen. They come in with expertise far beyond what any small community could mobilize. They connect that little museum planning committee with nationwide intellect, experience, and capability in both the area of planning exhibits, communicating with kids, and developing outreach programs that make museums strong economic entities, and also part of that chain of facilities that means that tourism can compliment a rural economy to make it strong.

The NEA and the NEH are not just about some abstract cultural strength of our country, they are integral to the development of the arts, theater, music, poetry, educated children, a strong work force, and strong economies in our cities and towns.

Anyone who has been involved in economic development of the cities knows that we cannot do it without the arts. So for us to put just a little money into the NEA, which is now on the right track and reaching our local kids and local towns, a little money for the NEH, a little money for the museum folks who are doing so much good in communities of all sizes to build institutions that will last for generations is right.

It would be simply a tragedy if we do not respond to the changes these organizations have made, and to their ability now to reach into every corner of America and help us achieve the goals we cherish: a strong cultural heritage; to value that of the past and create that of the future.

If this is not a perfect vehicle, we just have to set that aside. A lot of things are not perfect vehicles around here. But if we can save this money, pass the NEA amendment, then in conference with the Senate higher levels and the Senate NEA money, we will be able to make just a little tiny improvement in our funding for the arts, the humanities, and our museum development capability.

I think we owe this much to ourselves and to our children and the communities of America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to be able to rise in strong support of these amendment which are offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) who just finished speaking very eloquently, along with the gentleman from California.

These amendment provide \$15 million in addition for the NEA, \$5 million for the NEH, and \$2 million for the museum and library services. They are very modest amendments, and they have an excellent value for the dollars that are proposed.

The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities play an important role in our society that we should not allow to be trashed in the halls of this Congress.

Since 1995, the majority party has moved every year to either eliminate or cut funding levels for the NEA and for NEH. At the \$98 million proposed appropriation for fiscal year 2001, the funding level for the NEA is 40 percent what it was only in 1995. The NEH has not fared much better. The 2001 level proposed is 33 percent below what have provided in 1995. Both are at less than half the appropriation reached during the 1980s administrations of Presidents Reagan and Bush, both Republicans.

By the proposed underfunding of the NEA, this Congress would once again shift funding away from people whose opportunities in the arts are the most limited among all Americans, and that at a time when the NEA has redesigned the program to broaden its reach to all Americans.

The Challenge America initiative that has already been described so well by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) is aimed at making grants available to our Nation's small- and medium-sized communities. For such communities, often NEH and the NEA are the opportunity of last resort for exposure to arts and humanities in their common form.

The smaller communities in western and central Massachusetts use these funds to provide residents with theater productions, museums, local arts centers, and such.

□ 1630

If Congress refuses to increase funding for NEA above fiscal year 2000 levels, this Challenge America initiative will not grow and thrive and thousands of underserved communities will continue to be denied access to the arts.

Funding for the NEA and NEH represents a minuscule percentage of the overall Federal budget and contributes enormously to the cultural life of cities and towns throughout the Nation. Surely, these programs are as deserving of a \$22 million increase in funding in the combination of these amendments as the few thousand wealthiest families in America are deserving of

billions of dollars of tax give-away that the majority party pushed through this House only last week.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on the amendments before us.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to enter into a colloquy to clarify the committee's position on an important technology program for fuel economy. I recognize that the funding levels have placed severe restrictions on the committee's ability to provide funding for many of these worthwhile programs. For example, the transportation sector within the Department of Energy is reduced by \$5 million, resulting in a reduced funding for critical research in fuel cell and hybrid technology. Despite this restrictive allocation, I am still interested in developing new technologies to improve fuel economy on our passenger cars and sport utility vehicles. While some emerging technologies such as fuel cells receive Federal funding, there are other technologies such as engine boosting that need government investing to determine if they can become a viable solution to improve fuel efficiency, performance and air quality.

Finding a technological solution is particularly important in light of concerns about rising fuel costs, continued consumer demand for SUVs, and ongoing concerns about our air quality.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman is correct that our fiscal year 2001 allocation, which is \$300 million below the amount enacted for fiscal year 2000, prevented us from providing funding for new programs.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Reclaiming my time, I proposed increasing funding for the Department of Energy's Light Truck Program by \$5.3 million over 3 years to support technology development and demonstration activities for turbochargers and other boosting devices. Data from Europe on production cars shows that turbocharging enables the downsizing of engines to improve fuel economy while maintaining the performance and power of larger engines.

The program I proposed adapts and demonstrates current boosting technologies on SUVs here in the United States, and thus helps develop other new engine boosting technologies. Ultimately, these technologies may improve fuel economy on the SUV alone by 14 to 16 percent.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Developing and demonstrating energy-efficient technologies for transportation applications is an important goal. I understand the purpose of this initiative is to offer an alternative in the U.S. market and generate near-term fuel economy improvements and emission reductions.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Again reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his consideration of this important effort. As this bill moves forward through the legislative process I urge him to keep this program in mind and look for ways to provide some mechanism for getting it into the fiscal year 2001 in the event that additional funds become available in the future.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. We will certainly be mindful of this program and give it every consideration as we move forward in the legislative process.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter-Horn-Johnson amendment which calls for increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Over the past 30 years, our quality of life has been improved by the arts. Support for the arts and Federal funding for the NEA illustrates our Nation's commitment to our freedom of expression, one of the basic principles on which our Nation is founded.

Cutting funding for the arts denies our citizens this freedom, and detracts from the quality of life in our Nation as a whole.

The President's committee on the arts and humanities released the report entitled Creative America, which made several recommendations about the need to strengthen support for culture in our Nation. That report applauds our American spirit and observes that an energetic cultural life contributes to a strong democracy. This report also highlighted our Nation's unique tradition of philanthropy but also noted that the baby-boomers generation and new American corporations are not fulfilling this standard of giving. It saddens us that something as important as the arts, which has been so integral to our American heritage, is being cast aside by our younger generation as something of little value.

By eliminating funding for the arts, our Nation would be the first among cultured nations to eliminate the arts from our priorities. As chairman of our Committee on International Relations I have come to recognize the importance of the arts internationally, as they help foster a common appreciation of history and of culture that is so essential to our humanity. If we were to eliminate the NEA we would be erasing part of our civilization.

Moreover, I understand the importance of the arts on our Nation's chil-

dren. Whether it is music, drama or dance, children are drawn to the arts. Many after-school programs give our young people the opportunity to express themselves in a positive venue away from the temptations of drugs and violence. By giving children something to be proud of and passionate about, they can make good choices and avoid following the crowd down dark paths.

However, many young people are not able to enjoy the feeling of pride that comes with performing or creating because their schools have been cutting arts programs or not offering it altogether. We need to make certain that this does not continue to happen. I am doing my part by introducing legislation to encourage the development of after-school programs in schools around the Nation that not only offer sports and academic programs but also music and arts activities.

Increasing children's access to the arts will only benefit this country as a whole. It is our responsibility to make certain that our children have access to the arts. I strongly support increased funding for the NEA, and I urge our colleagues to oppose any amendment which seeks to decrease NEA funding and support the Slaughter-Horn-Johnson amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to let this opportunity go by without having said a few words in favor of this amendment. I do so in the context of my great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, recognizing that with the allocation that was provided him he has done the best work that could possibly be done by anyone on this bill. Within the parameters he was allowed to operate, he has provided us with the best bill that could be provided within those parameters. However, I think that there is something that we all would like to do beyond that which has been done for the arts, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. These are both very important entities for the American people.

It strikes me as somewhat ironic that many of the Members of the House availed themselves of a very unusual opportunity last night, and that was to go over to the Kennedy Center to see a live performance. It happened to be a performance of a great American novel, to Kill a Mocking Bird, a wonderful and striking story. Many people went over, and I am sure those who went did enjoy it. Now today, we find ourselves unable to provide the kind of funding that a civilized society such as ours ought to provide for the enhancement of arts and humanities within our country.

The amount of money that is being asked for in this amendment is, frankly, very modest. Nevertheless, even with that very modest amount of money, a very substantial difference

can be made. I would just point to one particular program that Bill Ivey has produced within the NEA, and I think everyone would agree that he is an outstanding chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. I refer to the Challenge America program. Now, this is a program that is designed to expand the NEA outreach initiative, and they are doing so all across the country. The NEA is reaching out into small towns and villages and counties in the most rural areas and in urban areas as well. They are providing people in those areas with opportunities to see important aspects of American and world art, aspects which they would not have the opportunity to see without this initiative.

The Challenge America program, reaching out into communities so that young people, young and old, can have the opportunity to see ballets, to see theater, to see a display of important art that is in the Smithsonian. They are taking their show on the road all across America, but that program will never see itself fulfilled, and many communities across the country will be denied the opportunity to see the kind of art that is available in our museums, as well as the great musical productions that are available and dance productions that are available, they will not be able to see them without additional funding that would go to the Challenge America program.

So for arts education, to enhance our cultural heritage, to give art programs for youth at risk, to provide access to the arts in underserved areas and for community arts partnerships, the Challenge America program is a model and we ought to be funding it. So if we pass this amendment, if we provide this modest additional funding for the NEA and the NEH, a great many people around our country will have the opportunity to enrich their lives and enhance their experience that they would not have without it.

So, Mr. Chairman, with particular and deep respect for the work that our chairman has accomplished, I respectfully hope that the majority of the Members of this House will adopt this amendment.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter amendment to increase funding for arts and humanities programs.

The National Endowment of the Arts (NEA) provides important funding for developing art education opportunities allowing each of and everyone one of us to explore our creative talents. In my state of North Dakota this funding has been used to support vital programs such as the North Dakota Council on the Arts' "Traditional Arts Apprenticeship Program" and the Plains Art Museum's educational outreach program. These programs are only a few examples of the important role that the arts can play in allowing each of us, whether young or old, to express, develop and explore all our creative dimensions. I strongly believe in the importance of the arts to all Americans, especially our young children, and I support funding for the program.

Some would suggest supporting funding for the NEA as proposed in the Slaughter amendment is an attack on coal. Only a small bit of light on this argument reveals that it is utterly baseless. I am a strong supporter of the Clean Coal Technology program which provides important funding for the development of new and innovative technologies to reduce environmental impacts from the burning of coal. However, not one dollar in funding for the Clean Coal Technology Program will be reduced under this amendment. Further the amendment will in no way hinder the operations of the program.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for her leadership and determination for support of the arts.

Since the earliest days of our Republic there has been an appreciation for the arts in the lives of Americans. Indeed, our second President John Adams wrote to Abigail Adams in 1780:

I must study politics and war that my sons may have the liberty to study mathematics, philosophy, geography and agriculture in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain.

How far we have strayed from that aspiration of our second President when the House of Representatives supports the arts by a slim margin and a meager budget.

Skimping on the arts is a false economy. The arts are their own excuse for being—to paraphrase Emerson. The arts are important to our economy creating jobs as well as ideas and works of beauty. And the poet Shelley once wrote that “the greatest force for moral good is imagination.” With the challenges facing our nation’s children it is clear that we need all of the imagination they can muster. We must encourage their creativity—for itself and for the confidence it engenders in them.

Children often express themselves through the arts more effectively and sooner than through other endeavors. The confidence they find through the arts enable them to face other academic challenges more effectively. It enables them to face life’s challenges with more.

Support creativity, support imagination, supports Ms. SLAUGHTER’s amendment.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud today to join with so many of my colleagues to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum and Library Services. Fulfilling our commitment to the arts will enrich the lives of many Americans, especially our children.

I would like to recognize the good work of the Illinois Arts Council and the Illinois Humanities Council. They provide critical leadership in the support and development of numerous arts and humanities programs that touch the lives of so many in Illinois. Among those wonderful and innovative programs in the Lira Ensemble in Chicago, the only professional performing arts company specializing in the performance, research, and preservation of Polish music, song, and dance. The Lira Ensemble and other arts and humanities programs contribute greatly to our communities. They deserve our support.

It cost each American less than 36 cents last year to support the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA in turn awarded over \$83 million in grants nationwide and over \$1.7 million in my home state of Illinois.

Economically, support for the arts and humanities just makes sense. The arts industry contributes nearly \$37 billion into our economy and provides more than 1.3 million full-time jobs. In addition, arts education improves life skills, including self-esteem, teamwork, motivation, discipline and problem-solving that help young people compete in a challenging and ever-changing workplace.

Let’s do the right thing for our communities and increase this funding now.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) as well as additional investment in the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the Institute for Museum and Library Service (IMLS). I congratulate my colleague from New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for the adoption of her amendment earlier in the day which adds funding to these important programs. Further, I am astonished at the lengths the majority is going to in order to deny the will of the House.

NEA has not had a funding increase since 1992 when its budget was almost \$176 million. In fact, in the 104th Congress when I arrived, efforts were made by the Majority to eliminate the NEA. The funding level in the bill under consideration today, \$98 million, is inadequate and should be increased within the context of a balanced budget. Congresswoman SLAUGHTER’S amendment does not make the program whole but it made a modest, much-needed increase in funding for the NEA.

We need additional funds to support grants for art education which we know is key to reducing youth violence and enhancing youth development. If we are serious about curtailing youth violence, cutting funds to an agency that is getting positive results with its youth arts project is counterproductive. Consequently, I commend Congresswoman SLAUGHTER for offering her amendment which would increase funding for the NEA by \$10 million and provide an additional \$5 million for the NEH and \$2 million for the IMLS.

In my district, NEA has successfully funded the Ailey Camp of the Kansas City Friends of Alvin Ailey, which is a national dance troupe. This 6-week dance camp has an 11-year history and has provided opportunities for more than 1,000 children. This camp provides a vehicle, through art, for children to grow and enjoy the experience of success. Beyond the dancing, they also have creative writing, personal development, anti-violence and drug abuse programs. Statistics confirm the success of this program on behavior and learning of these at-risk children.

The NEA funds several programs at the American Jazz Museum (AJM) in Kansas City, the only museum of its kind in the country. NEA funding helps the AJM preserve and present jazz so that people from all over the city, the country, and the world learn to appreciate one of the first original American art forms.

Four years ago, the NEA and the U.S. Department of Justice took the lead in jointly funding the youth arts project so that local arts agencies and cultural institutions across the nation would be able to design smarter arts programs to reach at risk youth in their local communities.

One of the primary goals of the youth arts project is to ascertain the measurable out-

comes of preventing youth violence by engaging them in community based art programs. This program has had a dramatic impact across the nation, and we must preserve adequate funding for NEA to continue it and to expand it.

We should also be requesting additional funds to expand the NEA summer seminar sessions which provide professional development opportunities to our nation’s teachers who are on the front lines in our efforts to reach out to our children. Mr. Chairman, art and music education programs extend back to the Greeks who taught math with music centuries ago. Current studies reaffirm that when music such as jazz is introduced by math teachers into the classrooms, those half notes and quarter notes make math come alive for students.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose any back door attempt to undo Congresswoman SLAUGHTER’S victory. It is the right thing to do substantively as well as institutionally. Please support additional funding for the NEA, NEH and IMLS to send a message that art and music in the classroom increase academic achievement, decrease delinquent behavior and contribute to reducing youth violence.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, today, we have the opportunity to award the National Endowment of the Arts its first increase in funding in 8 years. It should be touted that the NEA we fund today is not the NEA Republicans faced when they first came into the Majority in the 105th Congress. In fact, the NEA is different because of the changes we enacted.

In January 1996, after being reduced in size by 40 percent, the agency went through major structural reorganization. After the NEA was forced to consolidate programs and reprioritizing funding, Congress enacted a number of reforms which provided the NEA with greater accountability and a more stringent grant process.

In the FY 1996 Interior Appropriations bill, we codified the elimination of the use of subgrants to third party organizations and artists. Simply, that means if an art museum in Hickory, NC, receives a grant from the NEA, the grant money can only go to the projects the museum applied for. The funding cannot in anyway go towards projects or artists not mentioned on the application.

In fiscal year 1996, Congress prohibited grants to individuals except in literature. This is important as it stopped the focus of handing artists blank checks. This also enabled more funding to go to community centers and projects which deal with a greater number of people. Again, in 1996, we placed a specific prohibition on seasonal or general operating support grants. Applicants must now apply upfront for specific project funding or support. Grant terms and conditions require that any changes in a project after a grant has been approved must be proposed in writing in advance.

Then in 1998, Congress placed a percentage cap on the amount of NEA grant funds that could be awarded to arts organizations in any one state. Also in 1998, the agency created ArtsREACH, a program designed to place more grant funds in under-represented geographic areas.

These reforms and the NEA's commitment to arts education and community outreach programs represent the new NEA, not the NEA Republicans faced in the 105th Congress.

As I have stated in my Dear Colleagues, I am one of five Members of Congress who serve on the National Council of the Arts, which is the governing board of the NEA. I've been to nearly every National Council session, and I've been impressed by the depth of change at the agency over the past two years. Grants are going to smaller organizations located in small or medium-sized communities. These are the places that are most in need and where the agency is targeting its new programs.

It has been 8 long years since the NEA has seen an increase in funding. I'm not advocating a tremendous increase, but an increase that rewards the NEA for the good job they have been doing in recent years. Vote yes on this amendment, and support the new NEA.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague from New York, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER.

As Chairperson of the Congressional Arts Caucus, she has done a remarkable job in educating her colleagues on the importance of the arts, humanities, history and literacy programs here in the United States.

This amendment would restore \$22 million of urgently needed resources to the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

These funds will be used to continue and expand upon a number of important programs at these agencies, including the arts education programs at the National Endowment for the Arts.

Currently over 5 million American children benefit from the arts education programs including a number of my constituents in the Bronx.

In my district, the BCA Development Corporation, which runs the WriterCorps project, recently received \$30,000 to support the Youth Poetry Slam. The poetry program is designed to use teens' natural penchant for competition and self-expression to introduce them to the written and spoken word.

It has been proven over and over again that children who are exposed to the arts remain in school longer, receive better grades, stay out of trouble, and hold themselves in higher self-esteem.

Additionally, the NEA provides grants to cultural and folk institutions throughout our country to demonstrate and show respect for the diverse ethnicity's that make up our great nation.

As an example of the importance of these funds, the Thalia Spanish Theatre in Sunnyside, New York received \$10,000 to support a series of folklore shows of music and dance from Spain and Latin America. The music and dance shows include Argentine tango, flamenco, and classic Spanish Dance, and Mexican folklore.

I am especially pleased at the funding award for the Thalia Spanish Theatre. I have worked very hard to make sure that the arts and cultural organizations cater to non-traditional and new audiences.

That is why I am pleased that Chairman REGULA and Congressman DICKS for again including my language into this bill to include

"urban minorities" under the definition of an "underserved population" for the purpose of awarding NEA grants.

My district, which is composed of a diverse swath of neighborhoods throughout Queens and the Bronx, has a number of ethnic groups that add to the tapestry of New York City.

My language will open NEA funding to more local ethnic arts groups and more residents of Queens and the Bronx. It will also help fulfill the mission of the NEA to guarantee that no person is left untouched by the arts.

So I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of all of their hard work.

I want to ensure that all Americans have equal access to cultural programs. Projects targeted at urban youth will greatly help keep these young people off the streets, and away from the lure of drugs and crime. The arts also help to break down barriers, they bring communities together, and they offer hope.

That is why Mrs. SLAUGHTER's amendment today is so important.

Additionally, this amendment will increase the funding for both the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

These two agencies both have strong reputations among both Democrats and Republicans for their wonderful work in restoring the folk, oral and written traditions of America.

The NEH has been very active in providing seed money throughout the country, and particularly in New York City, to address the issue of electronic media in the classroom. A specific grant was given last year to assist in the training of teachers in new media techniques to communicate the humanities to our children.

This type of project represents the best of the NEH and of our government working directly with local communities to advance the education of our young and train them for the future.

The NEH and IMLS have led the way in working to build and strengthen relationships between our nation's libraries and museums and our children's classrooms to ensure that the knowledge, creativity and imagination of our great nation is at the fingertips of every young Einstein, Rembrandt, or Twain.

This is an excellent amendment and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter/Horn/Johnson amendment to increase funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). The arts and culture have a lasting, positive impact on communities across the nation, yet for years these agencies have been sorely underfunded. It is critical that we give them the increases they richly deserve.

The arts are an essential part of our culture, and the new millennium provides us with the opportunity to focus on the role that the NEA and the NEH play in projects that preserve our cultural heritage and promote our creative future.

The NEH preserves our cultural heritage through its work to preserve the events and historical documents that shaped our nation. NEH projects serve to define who we are as a nation and where we come from. They allow us to pass along our ideals to the next generation.

The NEH promotes our creative future through teacher training in the arts, arts in

schools outreach, and after-school arts programs. The NEA has proposed a new arts education collaboration to involve youth in the arts. Research has proven that providing youths with access to the arts leads to higher academic achievement and fewer incidences of drug abuse and violence. Kids exposed to the arts and music earlier in life do better in their core academic subjects. The arts improve both their creativity and critical thinking skills and raise their self-esteem. We are only just beginning to understand how our youths' lives are impacted through the arts.

Clearly, the arts and humanities serve as an essential and forceful vehicle to educate our citizens and help our struggling youth. They touch and enrich each of our children's lives. Yet, the United States spends the least among ten industrialized nations on the arts and humanities. Federal leadership and funding play the essential role in these efforts to make arts available in every community to every citizen.

This debate is not a debate just about arts. It is a debate about whether we are willing to be creative in America. There is not an industry in the United States that does not depend on the arts, does not depend on the imagination, does not depend on the ability to look at things, as they say, "outside the box."

I'd like to leave you with a quote from the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, which established the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

A high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of scholarly and cultural activity in order to achieve a better understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future.

We must ensure that these agencies have the resources they need to fulfill this mission. I encourage you to support the Slaughter/Horn/Johnson amendment and increase funding for the NEA, the NEH and the IMLS.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak once again about the importance of the arts in my district, and to show my support for an increase in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).

We are simply not doing enough to recognize the value and importance of the NEA to our national vitality. The network of financial support for the arts in our communities is very closely linked, and weakening any link is not in our public interest. Arts organizations rely on funding from a diverse pool of resources, and the NEA is often a linchpin in helping build and preserve a strong sense of community.

As many of you are aware, Minnesota's Fourth District has one of the highest concentrations of Lao-Hmong immigrants in the nation. The Hmong have worked very hard to adjust to a new language and culture, and the arts have done an amazing job of reaching out to the Hmong community. The NEA in particular has played an important role in helping the Hmong find ways to strengthen their cultural identity and creative expression.

Recently, the Center for Hmong Arts and Talent (CHAT) in St. Paul received a grant from the NEA to run a new, multidisciplinary youth arts program. This initiative was designed to allow professional artists to engage Hmong youth in typically American arts media through visual arts, video production and literary programs. These programs, which reach

kids aged 10–18 years, successfully work to increase understanding between different cultures.

Another example of the importance of NEA funding is a project by the Women's Association of Hmong and Lao (WAHL). In an effort to educate an increasingly U.S.-born Hmong population, WAHL capitalized on NEA funds to help preserve Hmong traditions such as PajNtaub story cloths. These beautiful story cloths, which depict Hmong lifestyle changes and cultural evolution, are a unique testament to the Hmong-American experience.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support an increase in funding for the NEA. We must ensure that this program remains a viable component in building valuable community arts projects nationwide.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Slaughter-Horn-Johnson amendment which increases funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by \$15 million, for the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million, and for the Institute for Museum and Library Services by \$2 million.

Investments in our cultural institutions, like the NEA and NEH, are investments in the livability of our communities. For just 38 cents per year per American, NEA supported programs help enhance the quality of life for Americans in every community in this country. For just 68 cents per year per American, NEH supported programs preserve our heritage by keeping our historical records intact and building citizenship by providing citizens to study and understand principles and practices of American democracy. In fact, Congress established the NEH because "Democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens."

Adequately funding the National Endowment for the Arts, in particular, is absolutely critical to the state of Oregon, which has suffered in recent years from cutbacks at the state and local levels. Portland and other cities in Oregon have managed to make this work by using public funds to leverage as much private investment as possible. Portland arts groups manage to attain about 68% of their financial resources from the box office, which is higher than the national average of 50%. Portland companies have stepped up to the plate—doubling their investment between 1990 and 1995. The public investment, particularly the investment from the NEA, is absolutely critical to preserving these opportunities.

A commitment to culture pays many dividends—dividends that promote our economic development and our understanding of the world around us. Economically, an investment in culture helps promote tourism. People flock to cities that support the arts and humanities, benefiting hotels, convention centers, restaurants, and countless other businesses related to entertainment and tourism. In fact, the nonprofit arts industry generates \$36.8 billion annually in economic activity, supports 1.3 million jobs, and returns \$3.4 billion to the federal government in income taxes and an additional \$1.2 billion in state and local tax revenue.

An investment in culture also helps previously disenfranchised groups gain access to new cultural experiences. The NEA, for example, provides fun and educational arts programs that help students and teachers develop arts, environment, and urban planning curricula. Public funds, like those from the NEA, are also critical to keeping ticket prices

low, giving lower income individuals and seniors the opportunity to attend cultural events. If ticket prices reflected the entire cost of the event, cultural events would by necessity be denied many of our citizens, especially the young and elderly.

We won't be able to meet these unrealistic budget caps by limiting spending on our Nation's cultural heritage. This approach is short-sighted and doesn't recognize the long-term economic and social benefits an investment in culture conveys to our communities and the Nation as a whole.

We have the tools, infrastructure and innovative spirit in place to make communities across the nation more livable through cultural opportunities. What we need to promote is a National commitment to improving the livability of our communities by investing in culture. We can develop and promote that national commitment through the NEA and the NEH.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).

My state of Minnesota benefits greatly from the NEA. Federal- and state-supported arts events in Minnesota stimulate growth in business, tourism and a healthy economy.

Most importantly, though, the arts help our children perform better in all subjects at school. A Minnesota Center for Survey Research poll at the University of Minnesota found that 95% of Minnesotans believe that arts education is an essential or important component of the overall education of Minnesota's children.

I would like to share with you some of the many exciting arts activities that take place in my district. NEA funding supports arts programming and artists-in-residence programs in schools throughout my district, including Hopkins High School, Orchard Lake Elementary School in Lakeville, Zachary Lane Elementary School in Plymouth, Wayzata High School, Excelsior Elementary School and the North Hennepin Community College in Brooklyn Park.

Several other organizations in my district provide additional educational opportunities for both adults and children. Stages Theatre, Inc. in Hopkins is a theater company dedicated to giving young people a professional setting in which to develop their theater performing skills, as well as an outstanding venue for young audiences. The Bloomington Art Center, an art school and gallery, offers classes, exhibition spaces and theatrical experiences to both vocational and professional artists of all skill levels and ages. The Minnetonka Center for the Arts is a community arts education facility that employs professional artists and educators to teach the arts to people from ages three to 90. Without these and many other NEA-sponsored facilities, my constituents would have far less access to the arts.

We in Minnesota are fortunate to have a healthy and vibrant community, both artistically and economically. For the third year in a row, Minnesota was named the "Most Livable State" by Morgan Quitno Press, in large part due to our citizens' access to the arts.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support an increase in NEA funding to continue this trend of excellence in education, community development and quality of living.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: The amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk designated the amendment, as modified.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 15-minute vote, followed by a 5-minute vote on the Slaughter amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 152, noes 256, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—152

Aderholt	Collins	Gutknecht
Archer	Combest	Hall (TX)
Armey	Condit	Hansen
Bachus	Cox	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Crane	Hayes
Barrett (NE)	Cubin	Hayworth
Bartlett	Cunningham	Hefley
Barton	DeGette	Heger
Bateman	DeLay	Hill (MT)
Bilirakis	DeMint	Hilleary
Bishop	Dickey	Hostettler
Bliley	Doolittle	Hulshof
Blunt	Dreier	Hunter
Boehner	Duncan	Hyde
Bonilla	Dunn	Istook
Boyd	Ehrlich	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Bryant	Everett	Jones (NC)
Burton	Fletcher	Kasich
Buyer	Fossella	King (NY)
Callahan	Gekas	Kingston
Calvert	Gibbons	Largent
Canady	Gilchrest	Latham
Cannon	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Goodlatte	Linder
Chambliss	Goodling	Lucas (KY)
Chenoweth-Hage	Goss	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Graham	Manzullo
Coburn	Green (WI)	McCrey

McInnis Royce Taylor (MS)  
 Metcalf Ryan (WI) Taylor (NC)  
 Miller (FL) Ryan (KS) Terry  
 Miller, Gary Salmon Thornberry  
 Myrick Sanford Thurman  
 Ney Scarborough Tiaht  
 Norwood Schaffer Turner  
 Nussle Sensenbrenner Udall (CO)  
 Packard Sessions Udall (NM)  
 Paul Shadegg Vitter  
 Pease Shuster Walden  
 Peterson (PA) Simpson Wamp  
 Petri Skelton Watkins  
 Pickering Smith (NJ) Watts (OK)  
 Pitts Smith (TX) Weldon (FL)  
 Pomo Spence Weldon (PA)  
 Portman Stearns Weller  
 Radanovich Stump Whitfield  
 Riley Wicker Whitfield  
 Rogan Talent Wilson  
 Rogers Tancredo Young (AK)  
 Rohrabacher Tauzin

Smith (MI) Tanner Walsh Doyle  
 Smith (WA) Tauscher Waters Edwards  
 Snyder Thomas Watt (NC) Eshoo  
 Souder Thompson (CA) Waxman Etheridge  
 Spratt Thompson (MS) Weiner Evans  
 Stabenow Thune Weygand Farr  
 Stark Turner Wise Fattah  
 Stenholm Towns Wolf Filner  
 Strickland Trafficant Woolsey Foley  
 Stupak Upton Wu Forbes  
 Sweeney Visclosky Wynn Ford

LaHood Phelps  
 Lampson Pomeroy  
 Lantos Porter  
 Larson Price (NC)  
 Rahall Lazio  
 Leach Ramstad  
 Lee Reyes  
 Levin Rivers  
 Lewis (GA) Rodriguez  
 Roemer LoBiondo  
 Lowey Rothman  
 Luther Roukema  
 Frank (MA) Maloney (CT)  
 Franks (NJ) Maloney (NY)  
 Frelinghuysen Frost  
 Markey  
 Martinez  
 Gephardt Mascara  
 Matusi  
 Gonzalez McCarthy (MO)  
 Gordon McCarthy (NY)  
 McDermott  
 Gutierrez McGovern  
 Hall (OH) McKinney  
 Hastings (FL) McNulty  
 Hill (IN) Meehan  
 Hilliard Meek (FL)  
 Hinchey Meeks (NY)  
 Hoefel Menendez  
 Holden Millender-  
 McDonald  
 Holt Miller, George  
 Horn Minge  
 Houghton Mink  
 Hoyer Moakley  
 Insee Mollohan  
 Jackson (IL) Moore  
 Jackson-Lee (TX) Moran (VA)  
 John Morella  
 Johnson (CT) Murtha  
 Johnson, E. B. Nadler  
 Jones (OH) Napolitano  
 Kanjorski Neal  
 Kaptur Oberstar  
 Kelly Obey  
 Kennedy Olver  
 Kildee Ortiz  
 Kilpatrick Owens  
 Kind (WI) Pallone  
 Kleczka Pascrell  
 Kucinich Pastor  
 Kuykendall Payne  
 LaFalce Pelosi

NOT VOTING—26

Becerra Hinojosa Rangel  
 Blumenauer Hooley Serrano  
 Boucher Jefferson Shows  
 Campbell Klink Toomey  
 Cooksey Lewis (GA) Velazquez  
 Costello Lofgren Vento  
 Danner McCollum Wexler  
 Engel McIntosh Young (FL)  
 Greenwood Oxley

□ 1705

Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. WELDON of Florida, SHUSTER, UDALL of Colorado, BACHUS, PACKARD and BISHOP changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendment on which the chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated 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 207, noes 204, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—207

Abercrombie Frank (MA) McHugh  
 Ackerman Franks (NJ) McIntyre  
 Allen Frelinghuysen McKeon  
 Andrews Frost McKinney  
 Baca Gallegly McNulty  
 Baird Ganske Meehan  
 Baker Gejdenson Meek (FL)  
 Baldacci Gephardt Meeks (NY)  
 Baldwin Gillmor Menendez  
 Ballenger Gilman Mica  
 Barcia Gonzalez Millender-  
 Barrett (WI) Gordon McDonald  
 Bass Granger Miller, George  
 Bentsen Green (TX) Minge  
 Bereuter Gutierrez Mink  
 Berkley Hall (OH) Moakley  
 Berman Hastings (FL) Mollohan  
 Berry Hill (IN) Moore  
 Biggert Hilliard Moran (KS)  
 Bilbray Hinchey Moran (VA)  
 Blagojevich Hobson Morella  
 Boehlert Hoefel Murtha  
 Bonior Hoekstra Nadler  
 Bono Holden Napolitano  
 Borski Holt Neal  
 Boswell Horn Nethercutt  
 Brady (PA) Houghton Northup  
 Brown (FL) Hoyer Oberstar  
 Brown (OH) Hutchinson Obey  
 Burr Inslee Olver  
 Camp Isakson Ortiz  
 Capps Jackson (IL) Ose  
 Capuano Jackson-Lee Owens  
 Cardin (TX) Pallone  
 Carson John Pascrell  
 Castle Johnson (CT) Pastor  
 Clay Johnson, E.B. Payne  
 Clayton Jones (OH) Pelosi  
 Clement Kanjorski Peterson (MN)  
 Clyburn Kaptur Phelps  
 Conyers Kelly Pickett  
 Cook Kennedy Pomeroy  
 Coyne Kildee Porter  
 Cramer Kilpatrick Price (NC)  
 Crowley Kind (WI) Pryce (OH)  
 Cummings Kleczka Quinn  
 Davis (FL) Rahall  
 Davis (IL) Kolbe Ramstad  
 Davis (VA) Kucinich Regula  
 Deal Kuykendall Reyes  
 DeFazio LaFalce Reynolds  
 Delahunt LaHood Rivers  
 DeLauro Lampson Rodriguez  
 Deutsch Lantos Roemer  
 Diaz-Balart Larson Ros-Lehtinen  
 Dicks LaTourette Rothman  
 Dingell Lazio Roukema  
 Dixon Leach Roybal-Allard  
 Doggett Lee Rush  
 Dooley Levin Sabo  
 Doyle Lewis (CA) Sanchez  
 Edwards Lipinski Sanders  
 Ehlers LoBiondo Sandlin  
 English Lowey Sawyer  
 Eshoo Luther Saxton  
 Etheridge Maloney (CT) Schakowsky  
 Evans Maloney (NY) Scott  
 Ewing Markey Shaw  
 Farr Martinez Shays  
 Fattah Mascara Sherman  
 Filner Matusi Sherwood  
 Foley McCarthy (MO) Shimkus  
 Forbes McCarthy (NY) Sisisky  
 Ford McDermott Skeen  
 Fowler McGovern Slaughter

Abercrombie Blagojevich Conyers  
 Ackerman Boehlert Cook  
 Allen Bonior Coyne  
 Andrews Borski Cramer  
 Baca Boswell Crowley  
 Baird Boyd Cummings  
 Baldacci Brady (PA) Davis (FL)  
 Baldwin Brown (FL) Davis (IL)  
 Ballenger Brown (OH) DeFazio  
 Barcia Capps DeGette  
 Barrett (WI) Capuano Delahunt  
 Bentsen Cardin DeLauro  
 Bereuter Carson Deutsch  
 Berkley Castle Dicks  
 Berman Clay Dingell  
 Berry Dixon  
 Bilbray Clement Doggett  
 Bishop Clyburn Dooley

Phelps  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (NC)  
 Lazio  
 Ramstad  
 Reyes  
 Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Roemer  
 Rothman  
 Roukema  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Sabo  
 Sanchez  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Sawyer  
 Schakowsky  
 Scott  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Slaughter  
 Snyder  
 Spratt  
 Stabenow  
 Stark  
 Strickland  
 Stupak  
 Tauscher  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thurman  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Visclosky  
 Waters  
 Watt (NC)  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Wexler  
 Weygand  
 Wise  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn

NOES—204

Aderholt Dickey Isakson  
 Archer Doolittle Istook  
 Armey Dreier Jenkins  
 Bachus Duncan Johnson, Sam  
 Baker Jones (NC)  
 Barr Ehlers Kasich  
 Barrett (NE) Ehrlich King (NY)  
 Bartlett Emerson Kingston  
 Barton English Knollenberg  
 Bass Everrett Kolbe  
 Bateman Ewing Largent  
 Biggert Fletcher Latham  
 Bilirakis Fossella LaTourette  
 Bliley Fowler Lewis (CA)  
 Blunt Gallegly Lewis (KY)  
 Boehner Ganske Linder  
 Bonilla Gekas Lipinski  
 Bono Gibbons Lucas (KY)  
 Brady (TX) Gilchrist Lucas (OK)  
 Bryant Gillmor Manzullo  
 Burr Goode McCrery  
 Burton Goodlatte McHugh  
 Buyer Goodling McInnis  
 Callahan Goss McIntyre  
 Calvert Graham McKeon  
 Camp Granger Metcalf  
 Canady Green (WI) Mica  
 Cannon Gutknecht Miller (FL)  
 Chabot Hall (TX) Miller, Gary  
 Chambliss Hansen Moran (KS)  
 Chenoweth-Hage Hastert Myrick  
 Coble Hastings (WA) Nethercutt  
 Coburn Hayes Ney  
 Collins Hayworth Northup  
 Combest Hefley Norwood  
 Condit Herger Nussle  
 Cox Hill (MT) Ose  
 Crane Hilleary Packard  
 Cubin Hobson Paul  
 Cunningham Hoekstra Pease  
 Davis (VA) Hostettler Peterson (MN)  
 Deal Hulshof Peterson (PA)  
 DeLay Hunter Petri  
 DeMint Hutchinson Pickering  
 Diaz-Balart Hyde Pickett

Pitts	Shadegg	Tauzin
Pombo	Shaw	Taylor (MS)
Portman	Sherwood	Taylor (NC)
Pryce (OH)	Shimkus	Terry
Quinn	Shuster	Thomas
Radanovich	Simpson	Thornberry
Regula	Sisisky	Thune
Reynolds	Skeen	Tiahrt
Riley	Skelton	Trafficant
Rogan	Smith (MI)	Vitter
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Wamp
Royce	Souder	Watkins
Ryan (WI)	Spence	Watts (OK)
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Salmon	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Sanford	Stump	Weller
Saxton	Sununu	Whitfield
Scarborough	Sweeney	Wicker
Schaffer	Talent	Wilson
Sensenbrenner	Tancredo	Wolf
Sessions	Tanner	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—24

Becerra	Greenwood	Oxley
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Rangel
Boucher	Hooley	Serrano
Campbell	Jefferson	Shows
Cooksey	Klink	Toomey
Costello	Lofgren	Velazquez
Danner	McCollum	Vento
Engel	McIntosh	Young (FL)

## □ 1721

Messrs. BERRY, TURNER, POMEROY and BISHOP changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. BASS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to ask a question because I know the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and a number of others are being asked a lot of questions by Members on both sides of the aisle.

As I understand it, the intention announced earlier by the leadership was for the Committee rise at 6 o'clock so that Members might catch their airplanes.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going anywhere. My plane has been canceled a long time ago.

I rise to ask a civil question, and I would like a civil response if possible. If I could just ask. My understanding is that the Chicago airport has canceled a number of planes, that Detroit is closed, that the New England area is having rapid cancellations. And so Members are simply trying to figure out what their plans are.

I would simply inquire of the gentleman, either the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) or the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, I would simply like to ask if the leadership intends to keep the commitment which was announced to the House or whether the rumors are true that we hear that they now intend to be in until 9 o'clock.

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do appreciate your inquiry.

You know, we talk about this every year, it is appropriations season. All the Members are anxious about continued progress on appropriations bills.

We had ended the week last week with a colloquy in which we encouraged every Member to understand we would be working and working late each night this week, including this evening.

The floor managers of the bill have worked very hard. We worked out an agreement last night that we thought would give us good progress. We had high hopes of continuing this work and completing it by 6 o'clock today. But as we can see, we are approaching that hour; and we are not near completion.

It is the consensus of opinion that in order to maintain our schedule so that we can fulfill all of our work requirements in a timely fashion as the year proceeds that we must complete this bill before we leave this evening. That, of course, always is difficult under the 5-minute rule.

Wherever possible, the floor managers do work out time agreements. I would encourage all the Members with amendments to continue to be cooperative, as they have been, with the floor managers. And as we work our way through these, I am confident we will complete this bill this evening. And tomorrow morning when we get up early and enjoy the sunshine and look forward to the rest of our weekend back home and flights that are not bedeviled by bad conditions across the country, we all are going to feel so good that we finished this up tonight, as we will do.

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

Let me simply say that the problem, as has been brought to my attention by a number of Members, is that the schedule published by the leadership indicates legislative business, no votes after 6 p.m.

As I have said, my plane has long been canceled. I will be here today. I will be here tomorrow. I will be here Sunday. But I regret that the leadership has seen fit to upset the ability of each individual Member to get back to their district, planes allowing.

And so if it is the intention of the leadership to go back on the understanding that was reached last night, then I very reluctantly move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would hold that motion and if the gentleman would continue to yield, our agreement that we made last night was in full understanding of the need and the commitment to complete this, where the floor managers said, and I think in good faith and with all good intention, that they would do everything they could to finish by 6 o'clock.

## □ 1730

Unfortunately, given their best efforts, they have not been able to achieve that. We have not been able to

achieve that. We still have a clear understanding of the need to complete the work.

Mr. Chairman, I should say to the Members that as we proceed this evening, we will as we do on all other evenings try once we get past this section of the bill to work through a series of holding votes and rolling them so that they can have a pleasant hour or two for their evening meal as we continue on the work with our commitment to complete the bill as soon as possible.

Mr. OBEY. If I could simply respond to the gentleman, I was in the meeting when the commitment was made. The gentleman was not in the meeting where we discussed the times.

I know that last night, I asked the staff of the distinguished majority leader whether they were indeed certain that they wanted to have the vote on the rule on HUD today, because I told them that it was my reading of the interior bill that with all of the amendments pending, they would not be able to finish by 6 if they followed through on that rule. We were told that the intention of the leadership was that we were leaving at 6, that the committee should do its best to be done by 6, but there was a clear understanding that the Members would be allowed to leave as scheduled at 6 o'clock.

## PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 218, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—183

Abercrombie	Condit	Frost
Ackerman	Conyers	Gedjenson
Allen	Coyne	Gephardt
Andrews	Cramer	Gonzalez
Baird	Crowley	Gordon
Baldacci	Cummings	Green (TX)
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Gutierrez
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hall (OH)
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bentsen	DeGette	Hill (IN)
Berkley	Delahunt	Hilliard
Berman	DeLauro	Hinchee
Berry	Deutsch	Hoefel
Bishop	Dicks	Holden
Blagojevich	Dingell	Holt
Bonior	Dixon	Hoyer
Borski	Doggett	Inslee
Boyd	Dooley	Jackson (IL)
Brady (PA)	Doyle	John
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Capps	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Capuano	Evans	Kaptur
Cardin	Farr	Kennedy
Carson	Fattah	Kildee
Clay	Filner	Kilpatrick
Clayton	Forbes	Klecza
Clement	Ford	Kucinich
Clyburn	Frank (MA)	LaFalce



Lampson  
Lantos  
Larson  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)

NOES—218

Aderholt  
Archer  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Billrakis  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boswell  
Brady (TX)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Cook  
Cox  
Crane  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fletcher  
Foley

Murtha  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Phelps  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schakowsky  
Sherman  
Sisisky

Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

McHugh  
Fowler  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Minge  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Ose  
Packard  
Paul  
Pease  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu

Sweeney  
Talent  
Tancredo  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune

Becerra  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Boucher  
Campbell  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Danner  
Engel  
Greenwood  
Hinojosa  
Hooley

Tiaht  
Traficant  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)

Horn  
Istook  
Jefferson  
Kasich  
Klink  
Lofgren  
Martinez  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McIntosh  
Nadler  
Oxley

Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—34

□ 1749

Messrs. TERRY, HOEKSTRA and CRANE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TOWNS and Mr. HILLIARD and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROYCE:

Page 66, line 21, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by 237,000,000)".

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, in 1996, the President and the Congress agreed to provide no new money to the Clean Coal Technology Program. Taxpayers are footing the bill for technology to be used by private companies.

In my view, government has no business favoring certain companies with tax breaks and subsidies. The free market is there to allocate resources in the most efficient way possible. Federal involvement only serves to distort the marketplace by giving selected businesses special advantages, corporate subsidies, put other businesses that are less politically well connected at a disadvantage.

Corporate welfare has led to the creation of what some have termed the statist businessman who has been converted from capitalist to capital lobbyist. Companies should invest their own money in research and development activities on what they believe are promising technologies, rather than look to the Government for funding.

And private industry is much better suited to identify and target technologies that are commercially viable. The best thing government can do to promote economic growth is to get out of the way, get out of the way and let

entrepreneurs and the mechanisms of the marketplace determine how the economy's resources will be directed.

Private industry can flourish without this corporate welfare. Clean Coal Technology, as it is called, is supposed to help the electric industry, but it is not even interested in the technology. According to the Congressional Research Service, based on current trends, the technology of choice for new construction will be natural gas fired plants.

In 1994, the General Accounting Office found that a number of Clean Coal Technology demonstration projects were experiencing problems and difficulties, and in a report released this March, the GAO found that the problems they identified then still continue today. Only worse, eight of the 13 remaining projects had serious delays or financial problems; six of eight are behind the schedule of completion date by 2 to 7 years; two of the eight projects are bankrupt and will never be completed.

Instead of just deferring money, we should be investigating how we can get the obligated funds back from these bankrupt projects. Congress has had a history of rescinding money from this program due to the failure of projects being completed. In fact, for the past 3 years, over \$400 million has been rescinded.

At the very least, I think we should defer the amount that President Clinton has requested to be deferred; and on top of that, we should also defer what the President wanted to rescind. And that would be the total amount of \$326 million, which is what this amendment would do.

I believe, frankly, that it should not be spent on bankrupt and mismanaged programs, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the point was made that the industry should make their own expenditures, and I want to point out to the Members that for every dollar of Federal money in the Clean Coal Technology program, there are two dollars of private money. This has been a partnership, but it has been a partnership where industry has carried the heavy end of it, and we have had some real successes.

I wish I could take every Member to Tampa, Florida, to visit the plant that was built under this Clean Coal Technology program. It is a greenfield plant. The efficiency is probably almost double that of the normal plant, and the emissions are very negligible. They capture every part of a lump of coal, the sulfur, the various other components.

As I said, I was there. They are getting everything but the squeal out of that lump of coal, and they are doing it under a very efficient system. So it does work. It is an important program, because as we talk about the continued effort to clean up our air, to clean up

our water, we need to have a clean coal program on stream.

Let me point out that whatever else we may think about it, we are going to be using coal for the foreseeable future as a major source of power generation. Our committees invested a lot of money in boiler technology, in addition, to the clean coal technology, because we have a plentiful supply of coal. Perhaps in actual BTUs, the coal supply of the United States is the equivalent of most of the known oil in the world today.

If we are to have energy independence, if we are to have electricity to fuel a growing economy, we need to use coal and to use coal in a clean, environmentally safe way. It requires clean coal technology.

Many of these projects are under way. I do not think it is an appropriate time to take out the money or to make it difficult for the Energy Department to continue on the Clean Coal Program.

A few weeks ago or a few days ago, we voted to bring China into the WTO. One of the compelling reasons was that China could grow the economy and become a market for United States products. China alone plans to build eight to 10 power plants a year, a year, eight to 10 a year for the next 20 years. That is 160 power plants. 75 percent of those will burn coal, because this is the fuel that they have.

If my colleagues are concerned about the environment, I think it is essential that we develop this technology. We will have a market for it in China, and not only will we have a market in the process of cleaning up the air in China, this, of course, adds to the cleaning of air in our global environment.

For those who talk about Kyoto and the Kyoto Protocol, the premise is that any impact on the environment of air emissions, wherever it occurs in the world, has a deleterious impact on all of us.

□ 1800

If we can use this technology, sell it to China, persuade them to use it in the generation of power as they expand their economy, we will be doing ourselves a favor, not only economically, but in terms of the environment.

For all of these reasons, I urge Members to vote no on this amendment. I do not think it is an appropriate time to give up on the technology that has such an enormously bright future.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. There has been an awful lot of talk on this floor the last few days about our dependence on foreign energy, particularly upon foreign oil. Well, this amendment and similar amendments have come up every year since I entered the Congress in 1993, and every year Members of the Pennsylvania and West Virginia delegations take this opportunity to remind our colleagues of some very important facts.

Number one is that we have more recoverable coal in this country than the whole world has in recoverable oil. Yes, that is true. There is more recoverable coal in this country than recoverable oil in the whole world. We should be re-investing in alternative sources to use that fuel that we have available, not disinvesting.

I am honored to represent the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), and we have anthracite coal that is high in Btu and low in sulfur and meets every EPA standard of the Clean Air Act.

Technology has been around for decades where we can turn waste coal and raw coal into diesel fuel and gasoline. The Germans did it during World War II, the South Africans did it during the embargo. I am sure many of my colleagues have been receiving the same complaints I have been receiving about high gas prices here in the United States. We should take this opportunity to be reinvesting in alternative ways so that we can perfect that technology so we can use our own natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. Let us take advantage of our own natural resources and not disinvest. Let us reinvest in clean coal technology.

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

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, there is nothing new being developed under the Clean Coal Technology Program except for new ways to squander taxpayers' money.

The clean coal program idles environmental innovation. It duplicates initiatives already under the 1990 Clean Air Act. It has been consistently found time and time again, GAO report after GAO report, to manage inefficiently.

Mr. Chairman, the demand for clean coal is also falling in the energy market place. The Clean Coal Technology Program under the Department of Labor has spent nearly \$2.5 billion since 1986 in grants to help private industry develop commercial technologies to burn coal in less polluting ways. What that essentially means is that we have given \$2.5 billion already to private companies for commercial technologies to make a profit on it to sell it. In other words, it is industrial policy. We are picking winners and losers in the marketplace with Federal subsidies, subsidizing the research and development end of their budget, thereby engaging in what many people call corporate welfare.

Mr. Chairman, this is also a very redundant program. We already have an innovative system for cleaning up our air in the 1990 version of the Clean Air Act. We have emissions trading. Which

is a situation in which private companies already have an incentive to reduce pollution through emissions trading under this act.

This program is, plain and simple, a boondoggle. In the last 3 years, Congress has rescinded \$400 million in funding as the clean coal technology projects have proven that they cannot be completed in a timely and efficient manner, if completed at all.

In the most recent GAO report, released this March of the year 2000, the GAO found that problems identified in the mid-1990s found that a number of clean coal demonstration projects have experienced difficulties meeting costs, schedule, and performance goals. As the 2000 report finds, these problems continue today and have become worse.

Two of the eight projects studied out of the 13 are in bankruptcy. Eight more are heading to bankruptcy. This program is wasting taxpayers' money, they do not work, they are not on schedule, it is industrial policy, it is corporate welfare, it is antienvironmental, it duplicates the Clean Air Act, and, more importantly, according to the Congressional Research Service, conventional wisdom within the electricity industry based on current trends is that generating technology and fuel costs, that the technology of choice for new construction will be natural gas-fired plants.

This is a thing of the past. Why we should continue to subsidize these corporate budgets is beyond me. I urge passage of this amendment.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would invite the gentleman to go to the Tampa Power Company and visit their plant if the gentleman thinks it does not work. It is remarkable what they have accomplished in that program. It is a greenfield plant, so they had the advantage of starting from scratch, but they are taking what is normally about a 30 percent efficiency in the use of the BTUs in a lump of coal and getting about 60. That illustrates the value of the program, plus the fact that they can use any kind of coal because they do a pressure cooker process which extracts the sulfur and the other things that have value and it reduces emissions to almost a negligible point. So I think it illustrates it does work. I do think there is a lot of opportunity to sell this technology.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and I clearly respect the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the leadership he has given on this issue and many others, I simply think it comes down to the point where we have the mechanism in place under the 1990 Clean Air Act to reduce emissions. Emission trading is a market-based initiative that is actually serving this public good, without having to obligate taxpayer money, without having to have the Department of Energy pick this company to

give money to over that company to give money to, thereby engaging in industrial policy.

I think that there can be merits pointed out, but the point is the demand is losing, many of these projects are inefficiently managed, the GAO report is consistently telling us these things are not well managed.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think this is a useful debate, and that is, of course, as the projects go on stream and succeed, they do pay back the investment of the United States government. So it becomes a kind of seed money type that will allow them to sell the bonds to make these projects work. My concern is that we are going to have an enormous demand for power as the economy of this country expands, and I think coal is going to be the fuel of choice simply because there is so much of it. We ought to figure out how to get it done in an energy-friendly way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has expired.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think one can clearly contest the point whether coal is going to be the fuel of choice or not. I think natural gas has a good case for it. I think that around the country, according to the Department of Energy itself, natural gas usage will increase 44 percent between the year 2000 and 2020, with electricity utilities expecting to represent 60 percent of this total increase. So it comes down to a philosophy. I do not think the Federal Government should be doing this.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not have a dog in this fight. The most agriculture I have in my district is at the swap meet. I do not have any coal fields, I do not have any natural gas, but I will tell you what my concern is. In my heart I understand the gentleman's amendment, any waste fraud and abuse we want to eliminate. But I take a look at our dependence on foreign oil, and my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), looks at our military constraints and the problems that we have with oil reserves and those things. He does a very good job of that.

In Utah, one of the reasons we lost the fight, but in the fight with the Antiquities Act, the President made a monument of the cleanest coal in the world. And, guess what? Mr. James Riady was the recipient of that because it gave him a collective position on coal to sell to China. The President then gave China \$50 million to put a coal plant in. Where does Riady crack his coal? In China. Now we have to buy that coal back. Look at the workers that have been put out of work in Utah.

I look at the Antiquities Act also and my concern for renewable resources, or at least resources that we could use, instead of dependence on foreign resources. If they take, for example, ANWR, which is a postage stamp in a large area, but I think the President will probably under this go and try and make a national monument in ANWR, one of our largest reserves of oil in the world.

I look at another thing that we did in this House, some conservatives along with the others, the fusion-fission program, which was showing promise, we canceled that research. Natural gas is another area in which I think we ought to invest. I do not know how beneficial the clean coal is. I do know I have been to some of my colleagues' districts that have coal miners and workers, and I know how much they are hurting, and that bothers me. But do we have jobs? Corporate welfare? No.

So I would reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment, just because we may have some bad research in coal, but we may have some good. My concern, I think like the gentleman from Washington, is where do we get our resources when we run short in natural emergencies? We are going to have to rely on those.

I am part of the problem myself. My bill stopped offshore oil drilling off of the coast of California, because I do not want to be like Long Beach and have our beaches all polluted. So I would say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), I am part of the problem as well. I understand that. But, on the other hand, we also need to be able to have resources so that this country can work.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the fossil energy program because, contrary to some of the arguments made on this floor, it has produced meaningful results that have benefited all Americans. Let me give the Members some examples.

Let us talk about cleaner air. Fifteen years ago the old technology that could effectively remove smog-causing nitrogen oxide pollutants from a power plant cost \$3,000 per ton of NO<sub>x</sub> reduced. But DOE's clean coal research helped develop better lower-cost combustion technologies. Today that research has reduced pollution control costs to less than \$200 a ton, and 75 percent of the coal-burning plant capacity in this country uses these new low-polluting burners.

Let us talk about sulfur emissions, one of the pollutants associated with acid rain. Today sulfur emissions from power plants are down 70 percent since 1975, even though the use of coal has increased by more than 250 percent. Many utilities installed scrubbers to reduce sulfur pollutants, and more will likely be installed in the future. But in the 1970s, scrubbers were expensive and unreliable. Today, largely because of

DOE's research, scrubbers are much more affordable and reliable, and they cost only one-fourth as much as they did in the 1970s. That alone has saved the United States ratepayers more than \$40 million a year, and more than \$40 billion since 1975.

Let us talk about the future. Until the 1990s, the only way to use coal to generate electricity was to burn it, but then came the Clean Coal Technology Program. Today, because of this program, residents can get their electricity from power plants that turn coal into a super clean gas, much like natural gas, and it burns it in a turbine. It is the forerunner of a new generation of high efficiency, virtually pollution-free power plants. It would not have been possible without the DOE research program.

The track record for fossil energy research is a good one, and when you realize that 85 percent of our energy comes from fossil fuels, it is important we have this research, because it benefits every American who turns on his light switch, or, for that matter, breathes the air.

Let us remember one thing: Coal is our most abundant source of energy. It is an energy source which no foreign nation can hold us hostage with. We should vote to keep these results coming in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Royce amendment.

□ 1815

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE). I am sure it is meant in good will, but the fact is that it defers too much money to next year. His amendment would defer \$237 million.

I come from a district where we have two of the largest coal operations in the United States. The Port of Los Angeles has a major coal facility. So does the Port of Long Beach. Most of that coal moves to Asia. That coal could be a lot cleaner than it is, as many residents could tell us. As the coal train comes from Colorado and Utah and travels through little towns and large towns.

So I think it is just overreach to wipe out all of the funding in this section. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) on this issue, and I would hope all Members of the House would also vote No on the Royce amendment. Vote down this particular amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment. I want to tell the chairman that I think he is absolutely right. The administration suggested a higher level of deferral. We gave 67. The House in its good judgment added 22, or 89; something a little higher than that if necessary might be appropriate.

But to do the whole thing, to defer the entire program I think would be a mistake. I think we have to continue this important research and work towards a cleaner coal technology. Mr. Chairman, I urge a vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. I think the purpose of it is quite clear. They are trying to kill a fly with dynamite. I think they believe if they take away all of the money, there will not be any for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the museums.

Frankly, the clean coal portion of this legislation is very important. I just want to urge that everybody look or search their minds here and really understand what is happening with this amendment.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for saying this should not be voted for, and I join him in that. I hope that everyone will vote no.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENERGY RESOURCE, SUPPLY AND EFFICIENCY  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out energy conservation activities and for fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), performed under the minerals and materials science programs at the Albany Research Center in Oregon, \$1,139,611,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$2,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in the Biomass Energy Development account: *Provided*, That \$153,500,000 shall be for use in energy conservation programs as defined in section 3008(3) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4507): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 3003(d)(2) of Public Law 99-509, such sums shall be allocated to the eligible programs as follows: \$120,000,000 for weatherization assistance grants and \$33,500,000 for State energy conservation grants: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 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. 28 offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 67, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$45,000,000) (increased by \$20,000,000) (increased by \$3,500,000) (increased by \$9,500,000) (increased by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$7,000,000)".

Page 67, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$23,500,000)".

Page 67, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 67, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$3,500,000)".

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to particularly thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), Mr. UDALL, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for their support of this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is also supported by a very broad coalition of environmental and public interest organizations, including the League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, and U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses, among other things, the very serious national problem of millions of lower-income Americans being unable to properly weatherize their homes for the winter or for the summer. The result is that their limited incomes literally go drifting out the window of their underinsulated homes.

In addition, from an environmental point of view, this Nation wastes billions of dollars in higher than needed energy costs. That is money that is just going through the windows, through the doors, and through the roofs.

For those of us who are concerned about protecting the financial well-being of lower-income Americans and for those of us who are concerned about the environment, this is a very important amendment. This amendment increases funding for energy efficiency investments by \$45 million, including \$20 million for the highly successful weatherization assistance program.

The \$45 million offset for this amendment is the fossil fuel energy research and development program, otherwise known as power generation and large-scale technologies. This amendment would bring that program down from \$410 million, that is a lot of money, \$410 million to \$365 million.

Mr. Chairman, last year 248 Members voted in favor of an amendment to cut the fossil fuel energy research and de-

velopment program by \$50 million. Unfortunately, despite our vote to cut this program that is widely regarded as corporate welfare, the conference committee not only ignored our vote, but added more than \$50 million to this controversial program.

Some of us are determined, and when it comes to corporate welfare versus the needs of millions of low-income Americans all over this country, we are going to stand up against corporate welfare.

Mr. Chairman, the energy efficient programs that this amendment supports have been enormously successful and have saved Americans some \$80 billion over the last 20 years. Yet, funding for these programs has been consistently shortchanged.

According to the Alliance to Save Energy, funding for Federal energy-efficient programs have been reduced by almost 30 percent since 1996. In other words, we are increasing funding for weatherization efforts which have been cut in recent years, which is what this amendment is about, in order to cut a dubious program which has seen significant increases in recent years; more money for low-income people to weatherize their homes, less money for a program that has gone up in recent years, which many regard as corporate welfare.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would also increase funding for the State energy program by \$3.5 million. That program helps homeowners, schools, hospitals, and farmers reduce energy costs.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the fossil fuel energy research and development program, let me quote from the report of the fiscal year 1997 Republican, I say it again, Republican budget resolution. I would hope my Republican friends would hear this.

"The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars on research and development since the oil crisis of 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 for the oil, gas, and utility industries. Much of it duplicates what industry is already doing. Some has gone to fund technology in which the market has no interest."

That is not the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), that is the 1997 Republican budget resolution.

Let me quote from the 1999 Congressional Budget Office report, which says, "The appropriateness of Federal government funding for such research and development is questionable. Federal programs in the fossil fuel area have a long history of funding technologies that, while interesting technically, had little chance of commercial feasibility even after years of Federal investment. As a result, much of the Federal spending has been irrelevant to solving the Nation's energy problems."

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, that is the CBO, 1999.

Mr. Chairman, I can well understand why some of my friends from various States are here to defend this program. I can understand that.

The reality is that unlike the weatherization program, which is well distributed to all 50 States, the lion's share of fossil fuel research money goes to relatively few States. In fact, over 50 percent of the designated funds goes to four States, while 38 percent of that money goes to two States. This amendment is good environmental policy, it is good public policy, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Sanders amendment. Let me say that we have tried to strike a carefully balanced allocation of funds in the fossil fuel account. We have recognized that fossil fuels cover a lot of areas.

What the gentleman is attempting to do is just rearrange the chairs on the deck in what he would consider to be a more efficient way. But I would point out, and we have this experience, we only need to drive down the street and look at gasoline prices to recognize that we need to have research into making automobiles more fuel efficient, into burning our fuel in a more efficient way also.

We are now up to importing 52 percent of our oil, and predictions are that it will rise to 64 percent by 2020. Members can imagine how subjected we will be to OPEC pricing and to the price of fuel. Of course, that reflects then in the price of consumer goods.

This country is so dependent on energy, and every dimension of our industrial economy is tied to energy use. Our lifestyle is tied to energy. What we have tried to do in this bill, in the allocation of the fossil research money, is to ensure we get the best possible use of the resources.

This is an interesting statistic: One-third of the world's population, 2 billion people, do not even have access to electricity. Of course, that again is going to cause a tripling of consumption over the next 50 years as the lesser developed nations try to expand their economy. It is a market for our clean coal technology, and it will be a market for other technologies that will be developed under the fossil program.

As has been pointed out by a speaker earlier, we have more coal in this country than the rest of the world has of recoverable oil in terms of Btus. We need to conserve our natural gas, but we also need to have the development of technology that will cause the production of natural gas to be more efficient.

That is part of the fossil research. We can get gas from deeper and more complex formations. We can get a better extraction, because we need all these energy sources. We need coal, we need gas, we need petroleum simply because, as a Nation, if we just look at the statistics and project our energy needs over the next say 40 or 50 years, they are going to be enormous.

We are the people who are laying the foundation for an adequate and efficiently produced source of energy. Whether our children and grandchildren will enjoy the same quality of life that we have, which is tied to energy consumption, clearly is being determined by the way we use these resources.

What we have tried to do on the committee, because it is our responsibility, working with the minority Member and myself and the other members of the Committee, is to say, this is the best we can do to allocate the resources in terms of energy production.

In weatherization, as the gentleman knows, we have increased it from \$135 million to \$139 million. That is a commitment on our part because most of our funding was level, but we felt that the weatherization program deserved some additional funding.

All these programs are important. I think that tonight to just simply rearrange all of these ways in which we have tried to address energy need is not the way to go.

The committee, working with the Department of Energy, has exercised what we consider to be our best judgment of the use of our Nation's resources to provide the energy needs of tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow, and to ensure that future generations will have the same opportunities that we have had, because they are tied very dramatically to energy.

I think that the result of this amendment will be to decrease the domestic energy supply availability. I hope that the committee, the Members of the full committee and the House will support the judgment of the Committee on the Interior.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made the point that the committee had increased funding from \$135 to \$139 million. What the gentleman is talking about is the money that was included in the supplemental.

Mr. REGULA. For weatherization, yes.

Mr. SANDERS. But the gentleman knows that Senator LOTT has declared that supplemental dead on arrival, and what we are looking at is \$15 million less.

Mr. REGULA. There is a conference on the supplemental next week, and I think it will be addressed. But again, this is important to this Nation's future.

□ 1830

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS). As many of my colleagues are aware, the amendment before us is the latest incarnation of the gentleman's perennial crusade to hamper important energy research and development efforts.

At a time when all of our constituents have been rightfully concerned with our Nation's energy security, an area of great importance to our overall national security, I believe that a move to indiscriminately slash \$45 million from energy R&D will produce unwarranted and detrimental effects that will only exacerbate the current situation and fester throughout the summer driving season.

Let us keep in mind that the United States currently imports 54 percent of its crude oil from other countries, more than at any time in our history. If we do not take aggressive actions to alter this trend, by 2020 we could be importing 64 percent.

In a recent "dear colleague" sent out by the proponents of the Sanders amendment, the claim is made that the intention of the amendment is to reduce our dependence on overseas oil. Now, how can this be achieved if \$45 million is being moved away from research into areas such as fuel cells and methane hydrates, both of which represent abundant energy supplies, and transferring the funds to support the purchase of caulking, weather stripping, and storm windows?

Now, this is not to say that we should not pay attention to improving energy efficiency of low-income households. We should, but not at the disproportionate expense of critical R&D efforts that will reduce our dependence on overseas oil as well as produce a whole host of other beneficial outcomes.

Let me be clear. I have been a strong supporter of efforts such as the weatherization program and LIHEAP. So my concern about this amendment does not rise out of opposition to weatherization but out of an interest to achieve appropriate funding proportionality.

Whenever one program of merit is pitted against another, it is critical for Members to move beyond the wordsmithing, smoke screens, and surface sentiment and to look to the facts of the matter. If Members take time to do a brief cost benefit analysis, they will find that supporting energy R&D efforts is the most efficient and effective investment we can make.

Consider the following: Despite the fact that the weatherization program has not been authorized since 1990, its funding level has continued to receive increases. \$128 million in fiscal year 1997; \$124 million in fiscal year 1998; \$133 million in fiscal year 1999; and \$139 million in fiscal year 2000.

While so many important and authorized programs are underfunded in

this year's Interior bill, the weatherization program is slated for a \$4 million increase. On average, the program weatherizes 70,000 dwellings a year, yet it requires just 40 percent of the funds be spent on weatherization, materials and labor.

Fossil energy research and development, on the other hand, continues to do more and more with tighter budgets. Fossil energy has been essentially flat funded since fiscal year 1997 and this bill's funding levels represent a 2 percent decrease from last year's level.

In response to this trend, FE has sharpened its focus and, as a result, has heightened its efforts with regard to high efficiency projects, including efforts to develop new and more effective technologies that will help U.S. producers recover more oil from domestic fields and to develop cleaner fuels to meet future vehicle emission standards.

Without question, fossil energy is about a lot more than coal. In addition, FE R&D significantly contributes to your State, both in terms of funding and jobs. In fiscal year 2000 alone, FE projects supported a total of 248,575 jobs, something worth considering when Members cast their vote.

Finally, I want to recognize the good work done by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), given the current budgetary constraints. Their leadership can always be counted on and is much appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment to increase our funding and in support for critical Federal programs to promote energy efficiency, but I take somewhat of a different approach from the lead sponsor of this amendment. I want to make it clear that I support this amendment not because of the programs that it cuts, because there are some very good fossil energy research and development programs this bill funds, and if more money is found later perhaps these cuts can be restored. I support this amendment because I believe that we must make a more serious commitment to energy efficiency.

Energy efficiency, energy efficiency, energy efficiency, that should be our mantra. That must be our commitment.

The United States is the world's largest consumer of oil, and this week the price of oil surged past \$31 a barrel for the second time this year. The last time that happened many of my constituents were faced with enormous costs for home heating oil, costs that they could not meet with some tragic consequences. This time, they are faced with rapidly escalating gasoline prices, gasoline prices that have exceeded \$2.50 a gallon in some sections of the coun-

try. That is having a devastating negative impact on families.

Meanwhile, the oil-producing nations are deadlocked as to whether or not to raise their production of oil. If they do not raise production, then rising demand will quickly outstrip supply and prices will further escalate. If they do raise production, then several weeks or months down the road the American consumer will feel a little relief, but we are dependent on the OPEC nations, overly dependent, I believe, because we are one of the world's largest importers of foreign oil.

I think this amendment will provide some help where help is needed. The energy efficiency programs we fund will help us develop cleaner, more efficient technologies that allow us to do more with the same amount of energy. We add \$9.5 million to make buildings more efficient so that homeowners and businesses can heat their homes in the winter and cool them in the summer without having heart arrest when opening their energy bills. We add \$7 million more to make transportation more efficient so Americans can go further down the road with fewer visits to the fuel pump, not to mention the fewer pollutants emitted along the way, and that is a major issue.

We add \$5 million more for efficient industrial technologies so that our businesses get the competitive edge they need in the global marketplace.

This amendment also boosts funding for the crucial weatherization program to insulate and weatherize the homes of low-income families; \$20 million will go to weatherization programs to help an additional 10,000 families, each of which could save up to \$200 worth of energy costs every year.

Now for us in Washington, \$200 a year for a family budget to save does not sound like much, but let me say to so many families that means everything. We have to be aware of that.

The amendment also boosts funding for the State energy program by \$2.5 million to help schools and hospitals and farmers and small businesses reduce their costs by becoming more energy efficient, and let me add if we can do that we provide some much needed relief on the property tax burden.

Do not forget, the money we would have sent overseas to pay for all of that oil is kept right here in the domestic economy.

Mr. Chairman, I feel this amendment is a wise investment in energy efficiency, and a wise investment in a more energy secure future. I urge my colleagues to support the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind energy efficiency amendment.

Let me close by saying, energy efficiency, energy efficiency, energy efficiency. That should be our mantra. It must be our commitment.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Just to set the record straight, my good friend, the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) a moment ago talked about the energy efficiency programs going up. That is true in recent years, but in 1995 it was budgeted at \$215 million. Today it is at \$120 million; a huge decline in funding.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be an original sponsor of this amendment that will expand funding for the low-income weatherization program, the State energy program, and other critical energy conservation and research measures.

I commend my colleagues from both Vermont and New York, and others who have been supporting this amendment this year and in previous fiscal years, in trying to work in a bipartisan fashion to advance the cause of energy efficiency.

I think my friend from New York stated it so well and so eloquently, that we as a country, especially with the bad weather conditions we experienced last winter and the terribly high gas prices that are sweeping the Nation but especially in the upper Midwest today, need to start developing a long-term energy efficiency program that makes sense for the consumers in this country and lessens our dependence on fossil fuel energy consumption and foreign oil production.

Just to respond to my friend from Pennsylvania, I understand his concern in regards to a system of the offsets in the program that affects his local area, but this is, I believe, the right policy direction that we should be moving in, because these energy programs are not a luxury but a necessity to many, many families across the country who cannot afford their own weatherization preparations.

I do have a parochial interest in this as well, Mr. Chairman, because the first weatherization assistance program that was set up in the Nation was established right in my congressional district in western Wisconsin back in 1974. Since that time, over half the States have developed their own weatherization or energy efficient programs, and what a marvelous result we are seeing coming from these programs.

The average family who has been able to weatherize their home under this program is realizing a 23 percent efficiency upgrade with their energy consumption needs. What that means in a nutshell is more money for these low-income families for other purposes rather than for escalating energy costs, money that could be spent on food, for instance.

In fact, just recently there was a constituent back in my hometown of La Crosse that wrote a letter in regards to the weatherization program. It was a single mother who was trying to make it on her own and trying to make ends meet and she was informed by some friends about the existence of this program. She applied and was qualified. In

the letter that she wrote and I quote "I had no insulation, drafty windows, a poor chimney lining and a list of real energy zappers, much of which I was unaware. My bedroom wall had frost on the interior and my blanket would stick. Not any more. I am so fortunate to live in an area with these kinds of resources. Thank you so much for helping me and my family enjoy the American dream."

I am also pleased that this program is fiscally responsible and environmentally advanced. By diverting money from the fossil fuel energy research and development program, we are looking to the future in developing new technologies. These programs will make us less dependent on fossil fuels and foreign oil supplies at exactly the time when we need to be less dependent on them. If erratic temperature variations that we have recently seen were not enough, we are now seeing what comes from our reliance on overseas oil, with gas prices reaching the upper Midwest beyond \$2.00 a gallon. Currently, 70 percent of our energy supply comes from fossil fuels which are non-renewable and environmentally detrimental. With cleaner, more efficient energy supplies we boost the economy and become a leader in cleaner energy.

Our Nation continues to thrive in an era of economic growth but not every American family is fortunate enough to participate in this prosperity. The weatherization program, LIHEAP, Energy Star and State energy programs are ideal tools to help our Nation's citizens who are most in need. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which would expand funding these vital programs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment. This amendment purports to benefit energy efficient programs by cutting \$45 million from the Department of Energy's fossil energy research activities. In reality, this amendment will cut energy efficiency research.

□ 1845

Today, 70 percent of the electricity generated from this country comes from fossil fuels. Our Nation's demand for electricity will continue to increase with the rapid growth of our high-tech economy. Do we really want to cut funding for research that will allow us to use nonrenewable resources more efficiently? Do we really want to cut funding for research that will further reduce the impact of fossil energy on the environment? The answer is no.

Funding for fossil energy research supports national laboratory and university efforts to improve the fuel efficiency and reduce the emission of fossil energy facilities. Although it does not fall under the budgetary category of energy efficiency, fossil energy research is in reality energy efficiency

research relating to fossil fuels and fossil energy.

The United States is already benefiting from the improved efficiency and environmental protections of fossil energy research. For example, three-quarters of America's coal fire power plants use pollution boilers developed through private sector collaboration with the Department of Energy.

Future research efforts promise to reduce the release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere by sequestering carbon. Other research could lead to the capture and use of by-products from fossil energy generation for other commercial purposes.

Scientists are attempting to construct better filters that can screen out pollutant-forming impurities from the hot gases of power plants. Let us not halt this kind of progress by cutting important fossil energy research.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment to H.R. 4578, the Interior Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001.

The Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment would cut funding for the Fossil Fuel Energy Research and Development program by \$45 million and increase funding for energy efficiency programs by the same amount. Included in this increase would be an increase of \$20 million in the Weatherization Assistance Program.

The Weatherization Assistance Program provides assistance to low-income American families to improve their energy efficiency and lower their energy cost. Two-thirds of those served by this program have incomes under \$8,000 per year, and almost all of them have incomes under \$15,000 per year. Many of the beneficiaries were elderly or disabled and many are families with young children. Weatherization assistance enables those families to heat their homes in the winter and cool them in the summer.

Mr. Chairman, I recall it was just 2 years ago, I believe, that we witnessed seniors dying in Chicago. Many of them were trapped in high-rise buildings, and we could not even get assistance to them. They literally suffocated in their homes because of the heat, and they had no air conditioning. I do not think that we want to see the reoccurrence of the kinds of deaths that we saw as a result of the weather and the heat at that time.

Low-income families spend an average of \$1,100 per year on energy expenses for their homes. These expenditures comprise 14.5 percent of their annual incomes. By contrast, other families spend a mere 3.5 percent of their annual incomes on home energy expenses.

The Weatherization Assistance Program enables low-income families to

save an average of \$200 per year in heating costs. These savings can be used for other basic human necessities such as food, clothing, housing, and health care.

The Fossil Fuel Energy Research and Development program funds government research on fossil fuel technologies that benefit, for the most part, the oil, gas and utility industries. This program was funded at \$34 million above and beyond the amount requested by the President, although, the Interior Appropriations Act as a whole was funded at \$1.7 billion below the President's request.

Why are the Republicans increasing funds for this corporate welfare program? The oil, gas, and utility industries do not need this program. They sincerely can afford to do their own research.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment. Cut the corporate welfare and support funding for energy assistance for low-income Americans.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in support of this legislation. There is a tragedy here that we are choosing between important issues that are before the country. There is no question that we have to address alternative energy and finding ways to make coal burn cleaner.

But the choice today is one that is presented to us that puts thousands and thousands of senior citizens and other Americans in harm's way, really. It puts them in a situation where, this winter, as we see high gas prices will soon be changing once again to high oil prices, in a position where they may not be able to make it through the winter.

Additionally, of all the things this Congress does, weatherization creates more energy for less money than almost every other expenditure, because when one weatherizes a house, the benefits of that weatherization do not just occur in that heating season or that cooling season, the benefits of that weatherization last for the life of the house. If that house lasts for 100 years, those benefits last for 100 years.

When we look at what we ought to be doing and what we do in this Congress, when there was a crisis in the Farm Belt, the Congress responded. First, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle chose Freedom to Farm. When that program failed, we came in with additional revenues for farmers. Our friends in California that do not have enough water, the Federal Government subsidized bringing water to those farmers. We in New England do not get a lot of those kinds of benefits.

But other senior citizens and working people, many of them very poor, do face some of the harsher winters in this country. Across this country, many citizens need the help of this weatherization program. But this not only



helps the individuals, it helps our national dependence on foreign energy. Because every time one weatherizes a home, for every barrel of oil that family does not use, it is a barrel of oil we do not have to import. It helps our trade balance. It helps the families. It helps the country.

Pass this amendment. It is the right thing to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment, which cuts corporate welfare and boosts energy efficiency programs that benefit consumers and the environment. This amendment restores \$45 million to programs that help low-income families reduce energy costs, that help States implement efficiency programs, and that foster investments in new efficiency technologies. All of these programs have been cut in recent years just as America's energy needs have been rising.

This amendment renews our commitment to energy efficiency as a cornerstone of our energy policy. The offset is the fossil fuel R&D account which has been identified as corporate welfare by consumer and taxpayer watchdogs, including the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste.

On top of direct appropriations, we also subsidize the fossil fuel industry through exemption from environmental laws. For instance, America's oldest and dirtiest coal-fired power plants are still exempt from Clean Air Act emissions standards that were enacted 30 years ago. These grandfathered power plants continue to spew tons of pollution into our air, adding to smog, acid rain, mercury poisoning, and global warming. While industry profits from this exemption, the public suffers increased respiratory problems and expensive environmental cleanups.

If America is to create a sustainable and cost-effective energy policy, we must reduce our dependence on highly polluting fossil fuels. Improving energy efficiency is an important first step toward that goal.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin the summer months with the threat of brownouts and rising fuel costs, now is the time to make a commitment to energy efficiency. This amendment is a small but significant step toward a 21st century energy policy that lowers consumer costs and protects public health and the environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment. I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) for offering this.

Those of us from the Northeast, and particularly those of us in all of the

colder States of this country, realize this past winter the real problems that can beset low-income and fixed-income senior citizens and people throughout our district when we saw rocketing prices when it came to home heating oil.

When it came to energy efficiency, we looked at the high cost of renovations. We realized that the people back in our districts, regardless of all the Beltway talk that we may hear here today, clearly understand that it is often beyond their means to be able to afford the energy efficiency and weatherization that they need to have to be able to heat their homes.

This problem we incurred this winter was attributed to four different issues: one they said was the production of crude oil; the second was the storage capacity in many of the communities around the country; third was the lack of alternative fuels; fourth, which is what we are discussing here tonight, the lack of energy-efficiency programs, weatherization programs to stop consumption as we have presently going of the high, high cost of energy and fuels.

Today and tonight we are offering an amendment particularly for those communities that have older architecture, older problems with regard to weatherization and alternative fuels.

Let us put back some of the money into the weatherization program that we have stripped out over the last 10 to 15 years. Let us put back the kinds of rhetoric that we have been fusing into actual dollars in terms of not only words, but deeds. Let us put back into those programs to help those seniors, those people on fixed income, the real alternatives for more energy efficiency.

Let us put back into the real problems of this government money to make sure that our senior citizens and our low-income people have weatherization programs. But I would also point out there goes more than just that.

If one takes a look at the old architecture that besets many of our older homes and our older communities, one will also find another problem. It is called lead paint. Many of the same problems with lead paint are the same problems with weatherization, the high cost of renovation.

When we talk about weatherization programs, we often couple in our communities the opportunity for renovation for lead paint as well. If we put more money into weatherization programs, we can double our effort in lead paint reduction as well.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this amendment. It does wonders in a very small way but a very efficient way to make sure that our seniors of low income have an opportunity for energy efficiency.

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

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to stand here in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS). Not only is it sensible at this moment, but it gives us a rare opportunity, I think, also to highlight what has happened over the course of the last year when we have been, indeed, slow to react.

This initiative that the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is offering really is part of a great legacy in this House of Representatives. The legacy was established by Silvio Conte, a Republican Member of this House. He began the low-income heating oil program that so many Americans have benefited from who live below poverty guidelines.

Now, we ask ourselves tonight, why is this amendment necessary? Last Friday, the average price for a gallon of gasoline rose to \$1.67 per gallon. Some people across this Nation are paying more than \$2 per gallon. These high prices are caused by low stocks, the results of the high prices experienced this past winter when oil dealers did not replenish their stocks.

The summer driving season is in front of us, and the price of gas is unlikely to drop while demand remains so high. As the price of oil remains high as well, stocks are unlikely to be replenished. This will result in low stocks for the winter again.

This is a dangerous cycle for all across the Nation who live below poverty guidelines. Many people in the Northeast last winter had to make the horrible choice between heating and eating. Anybody who has stood in a grocery checkout line, that is on the minds particularly of senior citizens.

□ 1900

Now, we do not want that to happen again. We can act this evening to avoid another catastrophe from occurring this winter.

The Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve would protect low-income homeowners in the Northeast from having to choose once again between food and fuel. The Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve is an environmentally conscious way to ensure enough fuel is on hand to combat another harsh winter.

I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) for calling attention in this timely manner to an issue that is going to be in front of us once fall sets upon us. But we have a chance to act tonight, to take the initiative, to grab the high ground and to proceed with a sensible plan. I hope all the Members of this House will stand in support of the Sanders amendment.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders-Boehlert-Kind amendment perhaps from a slightly different perspective than my good friend from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

I really have no problem with the Energy Department's fossil energy research and development program. I do

not consider it welfare. I think we need to continue to do research into fossil energies, into alternative fuels, into the whole range of possibilities that will make our country less dependent on foreign oil and energy. But one of the components, perhaps the most important component, of our energy policy in this country should be reducing the use of energy and saving resources, and the low-income weatherization program is a demonstrated effective method of doing that.

We are faced as Members of this Congress with budget constraints. And as the chair of the subcommittee has indicated, sometimes that means we do have to rearrange the chairs on the deck and make some choices. When I make those choices, I have to keep in mind the things that my mother used to tell me. And one of those things is that a bird in hand is worth more than a lot of birds in the bush. The research may well yield some fascinating results in the future, but what we do know is that home weatherization will yield immediate results in the present and that the low-income energy weatherization program has been a vital and important success story as a means of saving energy.

So I do not have any particular beef with doing research in the long run. We need to do that. And, of course, there is going to be plenty of money in this bill to do that. But in the meantime people are freezing to death and people are without the weatherization program that would reduce the heat in their apartments, and that is a choice that I have no problem making in favor of the amendment, even though I have no particular beef with the longer-term research.

So in that context I want to encourage my colleagues to do what makes sense in the immediate future and do something that we know works. This amendment will allow us to support and finance and put our money, at least in part, in something that has been a proven success story, the weatherization program. I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Nearly 70 percent of the electricity generated in the United States today is fueled by a combination of coal, oil and natural gas. These traditional fuels are abundant, particularly coal, which accounts for 90 percent of our Nation's energy reserves.

At current rates of consumption, the United States has enough coal to last throughout the next 2 centuries, and that is just here in the United States. Coal generates nearly 40 percent of all electricity worldwide, a number that is growing as we stand here and debate this issue.

Here are the facts, Mr. Chairman. We have an abundant supply of coal. It is

responsible for over half of the energy generated in this country, and its use is going to increase here in this country and worldwide. The only question that remains is are we or are we not going to make it cleaner? Now, let me just emphasize that. We are going to use more coal in this country and worldwide. The only question that remains is are we going to make it cleaner and cleaner, which I support and every Member that represents a coal region in this Nation supports. That is why we support the Clean Coal Technology Program, because we want it to become cleaner and cleaner.

I have to say that I am surprised at how cuts to the fossil energy research budget have been framed in this debate, as if cutting these funds is some sort of a good environmental vote. Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, as a result of Federal funding, since 1970 overall U.S. emissions of pollutants from coal-based electricity generation have been cut by a third, even as coal use has tripled. What a success story.

For those of my colleagues who have stood up and argued for the environment and argued for efficiency, I am pleased to tell them that technologies now being researched, coming out of the Clean Coal Technology Program, will produce a near zero emissions power plant with double the efficiency of today's utilities. This technology will also be exportable to developing countries as they build new power plants to meet their ever-growing needs and as we become increasingly concerned about global warming and global greenhouse issues.

Mr. Chairman, that is good for the environment and it is also very good for our economy. Do not be fooled, my colleagues. Cutting fossil energy research and development is an anti-environmental vote. I urge defeat of the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding to me.

In terms of the environment, I would point out to my colleagues that my amendment is supported by the League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources—

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman if he can make the argument substantively that cutting the Clean Coal Technology Program is good for the environment rather than just citing a number of organizations? Can he make it with me, please, right here and now?

Mr. SANDERS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I certainly can. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) indicated earlier, when we conserve energy we are doing something extraordinarily important for the environment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Well, reclaiming my time, the Clean Coal Technology Program, one of its real strengths is the conservation of the use of energy to generate electricity. As a matter of fact, the Clean Coal Technology Program has increased efficiency, as I said in my comments, while it reduces emissions.

It is good for the environment, it is good for the economy, it is an environmentally good program while it affects efficiencies.

Mr. SANDERS. I would just point out that all the environmental groups support the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of programs that work to increase energy efficiency and affordability. I know all too well how important it is to have an energy efficient home. During the home heating crisis this past winter in my home State of Connecticut, my constituents were faced with exorbitant home heating costs.

While the amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS may make home weatherization more affordable, I must reluctantly oppose it. By using the Department of Energy's fossil energy research and development program as an offset, this amendment will take money from one energy efficiency program and give it to another. That is not good policy.

Both the Low Income Weatherization Program and the fossil energy research program work toward the goal of energy efficiency and affordability. Energy efficiency starts with the fuels we use. We must ensure that these fuels are as efficient as possible, while at the same time we must ensure that we are using efficient energy practices. This includes building energy efficient homes, driving fuel efficient cars and using clean, dependable, and efficient electricity generation technologies.

I fully support increasing resources for both programs, just not at the expense of one another. The allocation for the Department of the Interior, as reflected in this bill, is simply inadequate. I therefore must oppose Mr. SANDERS' amendment.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, during the upcoming debate on H.R. 4578, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001, we will be asked to consider the need to reduce funding for fossil fuel research to increase funding for weatherization, state energy programs and energy efficiency research and development. I am a strong advocate of energy efficiency technologies because this research offers us the potential to minimize our dependence on foreign oil. It also holds the key for a cleaner environment in the future by encouraging technologies that reduce emissions. It is an area that is poised to become accepted by the market, with a small investment by the federal government, and is certainly an area in which business and environmental proponents can find much common ground. I also support providing assistance to low-income individuals to meet their energy needs.

Despite my unwavering support for energy efficiencies, I find that I cannot support this amendment. In short, the benefits to be achieved are more illusory than real and the costs incurred if this amendment passes substantial. It is worth noting that the line items funding fossil fuel research and energy conservation research have been combined. This

amendment cuts the total funding for both programs, resulting in a reduction to our energy conservation efforts. At the very time we are desperately searching for ways to use energy more efficiently, we are cutting the one conservation research program that may actually bear fruit.

Second, the major premise of this amendment is that there is nothing valuable to be gained from fossil fuel research. It is this premise with which I disagree. The fact is that fossil fuels—oil, coal, natural gas—are critical to this country's energy mix, and will continue to be far into the future. The U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that demand for oil and natural gas will grow during the next two decades by 35 percent, to 24.6 million barrels today. We have made it difficult to invest in market-ready alternatives to coal, oil and gas to supply our energy needs and renewable alternatives cannot yet substitute for these resources on a broad scale. Until we do have marketable, viable alternatives, our only real solution is to invest in research and development efforts to explore, extract, and utilize fossil fuels cleanly and efficiently. This is the goal of the fossil fuel research and development program—a goal that supports environmental objectives to reduce environmental consequences and national security objectives to reduce the need for foreign oil.

Recently, the Department of Energy released a report noting the accomplishments resulting from investment in fossil fuel research. The report, titled "Environmental Benefits of Advanced Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Technology," lists 36 specific improvements resulting from fossil fuel research. These improvements have resulted in fewer dry holes, more productive wells, smaller environmental footprints, and less harmful waste to manage. Additionally, private-public efforts like the Petroleum Technology Transfer Council (funded principally through the fossil fuel program), have provided the technological means for independent producers to reduce the environmental impact of their efforts, largely by supplying technological answers to current problems. This has been critical to help these small producers (who account for 25 percent of our domestic oil and gas supply) to comply with environmental regulations and to implement best management and industry practices.

In short, faced with a budget that has been reduced by \$300 million from fiscal year 2000, the subcommittee has had to make difficult decisions about program funding; many important programs were reduced and others flat funded. In my view, the better solution is not to starve one energy program in favor of another as this amendment seeks to do. A better use of our time is to figure out how we might reallocate our financial resources and research efforts to support and develop all of these promising technologies.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, 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:

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PRODUCTION  
(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances under this head, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

The requirements of 10 U.S.C. 7430(b)(2)(B) shall not apply to fiscal year 2001 and any fiscal year thereafter: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

For necessary expenses in fulfilling the third installment payment under the Settlement Agreement entered into by the United States and the State of California on October 11, 1996, as authorized by section 3415 of Public Law 104-106, \$36,000,000, to become available on October 1, 2001 for payment to the State of California for the State Teachers' Retirement Fund from the Elk Hills School Lands Fund.

ECONOMIC REGULATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, \$1,992,000, to remain available until expended.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$157,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 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. 29 offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 69, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this tripartisan amendment is being supported by, among others, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN). It has strong bipartisan support.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide \$10 million for the establishment of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve. Stand-alone legislation that I introduced back in February, calling for a 6.7 million barrel home heating oil reserve, garnered 98 cosponsors, including 24 Republicans and 27 Members who are not from the Northeast.

In addition, and importantly, authorizing legislation that passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 416 to 8 included language to establish a home heating oil reserve in the Northeast.

Not only does this amendment enjoy strong bipartisan support, it also has the backing of the Clinton administra-

tion. Let me just quote from a letter that I received yesterday from Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson.

"The floor amendment you intend to offer to the Interior, Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001 would appropriate \$10 million for the home heating oil reserve. As you are aware, the House recently passed H.R. 2884, reauthorizing the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with the added provision to create such a reserve. Your amendment, therefore, is consistent with both the President's proposal and the views expressed previously by the House and I support your amendment." That is from Bill Richardson.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to everyone that we are experiencing an energy crisis in this country. The price of gasoline is skyrocketing. We are feeling that all over the country. This can only mean one thing. If we do not act forcefully now, next winter we are going to have a disaster on our hands that was worse than last winter, which was a real tragedy for millions of people.

Mr. Chairman, we must make certain that the huge increases in home heating oil prices that we experienced last winter does not happen again. Not this winter, not any winter. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear that this is not just an issue that affects the northeast. A home heating oil reserve would also provide positive benefits to the entire country. Since diesel and jet fuel can be used as a substitute for heating oil, industry experts believe that if a heating oil reserve were in place, not only would the price of heating oil be reduced, but diesel and jet fuel prices would also be reduced all over the country.

Mr. Chairman, winter is not a natural disaster. We in Vermont know, and I think the rest of the country knows, that it takes place every year. Yet we continue to be unprepared for a severely cold winter. In fact, fuel oil shortages have taken place in the Northeast about once every 3 years. Most recently these shortages have occurred during the winters of 1983, 1984, 1988, 1989, 1996, 1997, 1999, and 2000. Enough is enough.

□ 1915

Mr. Chairman, the offset for this amendment is a pretty conservative one, and it is a simple one. It should not meet much controversy. If this amendment passes, \$10 million of the \$157 million already in the bill for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve would be used for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.

So this is more of an accounting transfer than a real significant offset. We are taking money out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. There is \$157 million in it. We are moving \$10 million over for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, this is a sensible approach to protect millions of people

who really were hurt last winter and in the past by skyrocketing home heating oil costs, and I would hope that we can win strong bipartisan support for it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the concern that the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has. We have the same concerns in the Midwest. We have the same concerns as a lot of places. Should build reserves for diesel fuel, for jet fuel, for ethanol, for all forms of energy?

We have the SPR. This amendment proposes to take \$10 million out of SPR. We cannot just do that arbitrarily. It has to be made up some way. The money is to operate SPR, and we cannot cripple it or that reserve will not be available if needed in the period of critical defense needs, which is the main objective. We had requests to do all kinds of programs similar to this.

Now, I would point out that heating oil has a very short shelf life. So to maintain a reserve would mean it has to be turned over in a short time, something like every 3 months. That is a very expensive proposition. It means frequent government sales or exchanges. It will take a couple million barrels to set up the reserve, which will, of course, create a heating shortfall immediately.

These things ought to go to the authorizing committee to begin with and hold some hearings. I think what we are reflecting here is the fact that we do not have a national energy policy.

I was here in the 1970s when we had critical shortages. Everybody said we have got to set up a policy. Then the shortage went away, and there is no policy. I think what the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is addressing is the absence of a national energy strategy. I would suggest that he take his case to the administration because we need leadership from them on an overall policy. We cannot pick one area of the country.

It is interesting to note that in the six New England States there is not one refinery because they will not let them build a refinery. Now, it is hard to produce heating oil without a refinery. And one of the problems is that their area is impacted by the environmentalists who have made it impossible to build a refinery in New England.

How many refineries does the gentleman have in New England? They are shaking their heads. I do not think they have any. And they have had some difficulty getting gas pipelines up there, too.

All I am saying is that they ought to have a policy in New England or other parts of the country that need help. Therefore, we need a national energy policy. But to try to address one instance is not going to be a long-term solution.

I understand it is proposed that this heating oil reserve be put in New York Harbor. Why not put it in New Eng-

land? I think we ought to build the facilities where the need is.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, because the capacity already exists in New York Harbor and it does not make sense to build new capacity when we already have existing capacity.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it may be that as the home heating oil shortage continues New York State will use that capacity for themselves. And there may be other States, Pennsylvania. But I think if we are going to create these kind of facilities, we ought to put them where the people are. But I dare say that they will not get any cooperation from their area in building facilities in Vermont or New Hampshire or Connecticut.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would mention that New York State and Pennsylvania are also eligible to use the oil from the reserve in New York Harbor.

Mr. REGULA. Well, that is probably true. But I suspect, knowing the size of these States, that they can use the entire, what is it, 10 million-barrel capacity in New York Harbor. That would probably be used up by those States.

All we are focusing on here is that we need a long-term energy policy. And my concern is that the minute the shortage eases, and we hope it will, we will go back and nothing more will happen. This will not be a long term solution.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not argue with him that we need a long-term energy process.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would simply argue, and I make no pretense that this is going to solve all the energy problems in New England, but I think what the experts tell us is that it will help reduce sharp increases in home heating oil prices, which will save a lot of money for senior citizens who need those savings.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I question this capacity for 10 million barrels. Is it empty at the present time?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, it is not 10 million barrels, as a matter of fact.

Mr. REGULA. Two million barrels? Is that what New York Harbor has is 2 million barrels?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, is it empty now?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, it is not empty now, as I understand it, but they do have the capacity.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the oil is there, if it is already in place, why are they not using it?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me why we did not build a new facility; and the answer is that there is excess capacity available in New York Harbor.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, so that facility in New York Harbor is not being used to its fullest capacity?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman proposing that we purchase the home heating oil and put it in there?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, what we are proposing is that 2 million barrels be available to be released at the discretion of any President, the President, when heating oil prices zoom up. And what experts tell us and what we know to be the fact is that that will have an impact on those prices and in fact lower them.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will respond, I think it is important we get these facts out. What is the daily consumption in a normal winter period of home heating oil in New England, the six States that comprise New England?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not have those facts in my pocket.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, what I am getting at is this. Is 2 million barrels going to solve the problem?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, no, it is not. But this is what it will do. What it will do is send a message that the Government is prepared to act.

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

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, in fact, my friend will remember that the one time, to the best of my knowledge, that SPR oil was threatened to be released by President Bush had a very significant impact around the time of the Gulf War in terms of lowering oil prices.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, well, given that as a solution, why have we not, then, threatened to use SPR oil this time?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, many of us thought that we should, and I am one of those who thought that we should. There is wild ovation from all over the Northeast.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman talked to the President? He can do it by his own action.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I sat down with the President, along with many other Members of the Northeast; and that is almost a unanimous request that came out of the Northeast, release the SPR. That was our opinion, and it is my opinion today.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I assure the people in Ohio would like it because gasoline has now spiked at \$2 a gallon.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, then I ask the gentleman to work with us, not against us.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I want to work with the gentleman with SPR. But I just think we need to have a coordinated plan as we do this. And I think what we are talking about here is temporary. Let us get a long-term energy policy. Let us determine if not only how to address problems with home heating oil but diesel fuel, because our industry is so dependent on that.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, let me rephrase. My view is let us move short term and long term, but let us move short term, as well.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think I am reluctant to take \$10 million out of SPR because we need the money to operate it unless they can get the \$10 million somewhere else that will not impact on the ability to manage SPR oil, because that too is an emergency source for the entire country, I would resist the amendment.

I think if they could develop another source of financing, since apparently the facility is up and running. Do I understand it correctly, that it can handle the 2 million barrels?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. REGULA. And is that the full capacity of this, what is it, a tank farm?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, yes, it is.

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

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

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, it is our understanding that there is far more capacity than the 2 million barrels of home heating oil capacity we are asking for.

This, as the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) said, will really give us a beginning to what we hope, as the chairman has said, would be a long-term national energy policy. But we recognize that, with the winter only about 5 months away, that if we do not get this in place now, we could encounter the same kind of problems with lack of supply.

In the Northeast, and when I say "Northeast," it is not just New England; we are talking about the Hudson River, we are talking about Bridgeport, Connecticut. What we had was a problem with getting the oil from the Gulf Coast States, the home heating oil, up to our States fast enough.

This would provide us a closer capacity in closer proximity to where the demand is, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Is-

land, in a quicker way. It is a short-term response to a long-term problem, without a doubt.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman, how do we address the problem that if we go in the marketplace at this point, and, of course, this bill would not take effect until next year, for all practical purposes, or on October 1, and buy 2 million barrels, is that not going to in itself push the price up considerably?

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, not based upon the consumption that we have nationally. But certainly, what we saw this past winter in the Northeast, the consumption of 2 million barrels would go very, very quickly.

Remember, the SPR is not home heating oil. The SPR is crude. And so, for us to be able to not only trade or to move that product to refineries and then finally get it to the marketplace would take a long time.

This would be to make available almost immediately in the time of need, which is triggered only by the President, that we could get that into the market very quickly.

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

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what the chairman has discussed with us this evening is the exact same conversation we had with Secretary Richardson, the President, the Secretary of Commerce, and a host of other people.

We came up with the only solution that would help us right now. We concur 150 percent that we need to have a national energy policy that includes not only production; it requires conservation, and it requires capacity in various parts of this country for diesel, for home heating oil, for a host of others.

Until we have that, we cannot just put our head in the sand and say to the people in the Northeast, well, we will wait for 3 or 4 years before we have this. We need to do this now, otherwise we could be in the same situation we were this past January and February, where prices spiked up 78 cents in 3 weeks. We know that in the Midwest it is happening right now with gasoline. It happens all the time.

We need to have the capacity to move in there quickly to level off the marketplace so it does not spike in that way ever again.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, would this oil be available to the Midwest, also?

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, we would hope so. But maybe we need a little bit more capacity to do so.

Actually, in the Midwest this past year, past January and February, their increases were about 10 to 25 cents a gallon, where we were seeing 78 cents a gallon, simply because our rivers were

iced up, as well as we did not have the capacity. We need it.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can find a long-term solution. Because I have been through a couple of these in my time in Congress, and we tend to go back and forget all about it whenever the price goes down.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me and others in having a long-term energy strategy because we are an energy-dependent Nation; and if we fail to do that, we will be back with this same old problem at some future time.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would agree wholeheartedly. It is not only with home heating oil. It is also with regard to diesel, and it is also with regard to energy conservation and weatherization, the program we talked about earlier.

We need to have it, but we need this amendment now; and I ask my colleagues to support it.

□ 1930

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

I rise in support of this amendment. I agree absolutely with the gentleman from Ohio that this Nation has no energy policy and that is part of the reason we are in such a desperate situation. I would remind the Members that we are almost twice as dependent on imported oil now as we were during the Carter years. It is because we have been backward looking in many of our policy areas, including the tax code. I join with those who would like to see us work on a more comprehensive energy policy. Frankly I think the coal research, to be able to burn clean coal is part of that.

There are many facets to this. I would just like to put on the record, and it has probably been put on the record before so I will make it very brief, but to me it is an absolute outrage that in 1998 the Department of Energy completed and announced a 2-year study on regional storage facilities. They then buried the study because it indicated that it would be good for not only the Northeast but for the entire country if a reserve was established in the Northeast. It would be cost effective to keep a government stockpile of some heating oil in the Northeast and it would benefit not only the Northeast but other parts of the country, particularly the Midwest. I personally think that had that stockpile been established and had the President acted promptly to release some reserve, that OPEC would have been motivated to reduce its cut in production far earlier and we would not have had those months of shortage that helped send prices up.

While I am well aware that OPEC's decision was not the only factor in that constraint of supplies and that increase of prices, nonetheless it was a significant one and we were not in a position to be able to rapidly deal with it. A

stockpile in the Northeast would be beneficial to the interests of the Nation as well as to the Northeast, and therefore I support this amendment and commend the gentleman from Vermont for bringing it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding. I would like to point out that on April 13, the House passed the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through fiscal year 2003. What we did in that act in section 3 is the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve. And then the act under section 181, subsection A, notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Secretary may establish, maintain and operate in the Northeast a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve. A reserve established under this part is not a component of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve established under part B of this title. The reserve established in this part shall contain no more than 2 million barrels of petroleum distilled.

The bottom line is we have already established this through, frankly, the good work of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS). It has been authorized, and we are really trying to carry out the provisions. I would like to point out to my colleagues that the Energy Department in their study in 1998 made it very clear that a 2-million barrel reserve would stabilize prices. That is the effort we are trying to do. It is not perfect, we have got problems in a whole host of different areas, but this makes sense to move forward. It will not solve all our challenges, but it will, in fact, stabilize prices and carry out the act.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with the gentleman from Ohio that we need a long-term solution. But it is unlikely that this Congress is going to pass any long-term solutions. Back in 1976 when we were passing new fuel economy standards for automobiles, raising it up to an average of 27½ miles a gallon per automobile, the average automobile as of 1976 still only got 13 miles a gallon, which was the same as it was in 1930.

Now, if we had passed a law 4 or 5 years ago or if we would pass a law this year that says that the average automobile should get 40 miles to the gallon, we are not going to have many problems with oil. That is the crux of our problem. That is where we put most of the oil in our society, right into gasoline tanks. SUVs, trucks, automobiles. They are unbelievably inefficient. But we are not going to pass any fuel economy standards. So as a result, what we are seeing in the Midwest right now is another energy crisis. Prices have spiked up to \$1.80, two

bucks, \$2.20, \$2.45. Why? Because there was a pipeline that went out from Texas up to the Midwest. We had a similar kind of unanticipated problem in the Northeast back during the winter. OPEC started raising prices. What was the protection for our American citizens? Nothing. Or the Strategic Petroleum Reserve which if it goes unused is nothing. And it was not used. It should have been.

So we cut a deal in the classic Austin-Boston sense that made this institution work so well for so many years. John McCormick and Sam Rayburn; Tip O'Neill and Jim Wright. We cut a deal earlier this year. For the Texans, what we said is we will give you a guarantee of \$15 a barrel for your oil, for your stripper wells, and we will have the oil purchased by the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In return, the Texans said to those of us up in the Northeast, all of those from the oil States said to those of us up in the Northeast, "We'll give you the authorization for the construction of a regional home heating oil reserve." Austin-Boston, what makes the whole place click.

It is still hung up over in the Senate but the gentleman from Vermont is just asking quite sensibly for \$10 million, so that the Department of Energy can have the money to make it work. We have already passed it through the House. So we know that there is plenty of oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. There is nothing in a regional petroleum reserve. We have already passed it through this place. So by working together, we make sure that Texas and Oklahoma and Louisiana, the oil patch, we make sure that the Northeast, and we would make sure if the Midwest needed help that we helped them as well. Because this oil is the blood that ensures that our economy is supplied with the energy that it needs in order to function fully.

What we have seen over and over again is short-term disruptions without adequate supply of the blood of our economy to supplant that which was temporarily cut off. As a result, we have seen catastrophic economic consequences. All that the gentleman from Vermont is asking for is a very small amount of money coming out of an already large Strategic Petroleum Reserve fund which will work to ensure that when, and I am afraid this is going to happen, Mr. Chairman, when the refineries of America in response to the problems in the Midwest that are going on right now have to use more of their refining capacity to produce more gasoline over the next several months to deal with their problem now, they are not going to have enough capacity as a result that they have dedicated to providing for the home heating oil to the Northeast this coming winter.

So their problem today becomes our problem later on this year. We need a regional petroleum reserve. If we do not get one, we will have a mess on our hands in the Northeast. The Congress today has it within its power to give us

the money that we need to put in place something that will protect our economy this coming winter because what is happening today to them is happening to us this coming winter. We are all part of one big economic artery system. If we do not take care of each other, then all of us ultimately are going to be harmed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Will the gentleman describe the New York facility? I am a little confused. What is the capacity of this facility in New York Harbor in total barrels? He is talking about buying 2 million barrels and putting it in a reserve. But is that the maximum capacity, or is that just part of it?

Mr. MARKEY. The capacity ultimately is unlimited. We are talking about unused storage facilities all across the Northeast that could be used for these purposes. I would defer to the gentleman from Vermont for the specific figure.

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

Mr. SANDERS. To the best of my understanding, there is a 5.75 million barrel capacity in New York Harbor.

Mr. REGULA. Is this a tank farm?

Mr. SANDERS. Amerada Hess.

Mr. MARKEY. Yes, it is a tank farm.

Mr. SANDERS. I am not all that familiar with tank farms. And in Albany, New York, it is my understanding is another close to 3 million barrel capacity, excess capacity.

Mr. REGULA. Am I correct, then, that these facilities are essentially empty now, so they would be available to receive oil?

Mr. SANDERS. I do not know.

Mr. MARKEY. There is sufficient excess capacity in these facilities in order to accommodate the oil. We would probably wind up with the Federal Government leasing part of the facilities that are now controlled by these oil companies in order to accommodate this purpose. We would have to pay them a fee but the oil that was stored in there would then be for the use of the region, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, New England.

Mr. REGULA. The \$10 million would be to have the Energy Department go into the market and buy the \$10 million worth of oil and put it into storage; is this the objective of the amendment?

Mr. MARKEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Again I would appeal to my colleagues that when we look across the



country, we find that in recent months, we have spent an enormous amount of energy, the Congress, to provide funds to fight fires in the West. We helped provide flood control for regions that are hit with floods. We worked together to relieve disasters of earthquakes.

What is clear is that there is a pending disaster in the Northeast and our colleagues in this House together can provide a very small amount of resources to make sure that a crisis does not turn deadly. This is not a complicated situation. Using resources made available by the Federal Government, using existing storage capacity, leasing that storage capacity, keeping number 2 heating oil available so that while the free marketplace may be advantaged by a short supply that in a cold snap drives up prices and profits, Government at that point is responding to a crisis that is much more expensive and that may put human lives in danger.

It is a small thing to ask for a region of the country that pays so much in taxes and that has done so much for other regions of the country. We have not turned our backs on the West with earthquakes and fires and droughts. We have not abandoned the South, not just now but for decades. It is our taxpayers that built the utilities that power much of the South and the West. Now in this crisis we need to have some help, not a great deal of help but enough to make sure that our people are not put in danger this coming winter.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of what the gentleman from Vermont and the other Members of the body from the northeastern States are doing here today with this amendment. I want to commend the gentleman from Vermont for his very strong leadership in dealing with this and making certain that we do not let it pass by. The amendment is simple. Without busting the caps, without taking money from other programs, the amendment provides \$10 million for a Northeast home heating oil reserve. In the event of a sustained price hike, a healthy reserve can be open then to the market to drive prices back down to affordable and reasonable levels. It is something that we all should support. In fact, this body already has voted to support it and has voted for it overwhelmingly. When the reauthorization of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve legislation passed the House earlier this year, it called for the establishment of a Northeast home heating oil reserve, and that legislation passed by a vote of 416-8. This amendment deserves the same measure of support.

Mr. Chairman, the residual effects of the crisis that we in the Northeast endured last winter are being felt in ripples across the country. The cold weather and the astronomical heating bills, of course, are gone, for the mo-

ment but the ongoing shortage of crude oil in this country has rippled into high gasoline prices, and those prices are getting higher. I am hearing this week that in Chicago and other places in the Midwest, we are running into gasoline prices at the tank that are running somewhere in the \$2.50 plus range and are expected to go even higher.

□ 1945

There are many steps that we can take to comprehensively address this problem as a whole. Among other things, we should accelerate the development of alternative energy sources and demand greater fuel efficiency from every category and class of vehicles that is used in transportation. Those kinds of long-term measures take a period of time. Right now, we need a better emergency plan.

Winter will be back, and we will have done absolutely nothing, because if we do not do at least this as a starter today, we will have done absolutely nothing, because those long-term measures, which are so obvious and obviously needed for, indeed, our long term and will take a good deal of lead time to implement. So I support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) for his strong support, but just say while my name is on the amendment, the truth of the matter is that all of the Members throughout New England in a bipartisan way have come forward to get the bill authorized in New York and elsewhere, in the Northeast and elsewhere in the country.

So this really has been a joint bipartisan effort, and I thank the gentleman, and I look forward to seeing this amendment pass.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, during debate on this bill, it had been my fervent hope to offer an amendment to help America address her primary strategic vulnerability, and that is our over dependence on imported foreign oil. Nearly two-thirds of the energy that the U.S. uses is imported, most from the Middle Eastern monarchies that comprise OPEC. They yank a chain around our necks at whim.

Headlines in my local Ohio newspapers tell the story of gas prices soaring; the New York Times this week reported on rising prices coast to coast, some price hikes among the highest in U.S. history.

Yet this bill, which has within its authority the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, does absolutely nothing to remedy the current situation, nor put America on a saner path to the future.

I have been urging the Clinton Administration and the leadership of this Congress to release some of the Reserve to help dampen price hikes here at home. At the same time, my amendment would place more emphasis on promoting renewable biofuels by directing the Departments of Interior and Energy to

swap some of the current oil reserves and purchase 300,000,000 gallons of ethanol and 100,000,000 million gallons of biodiesel as a boost to a more self-sufficient future for America. [Amendment]

Biofuels are competitively priced and hold significant promise as one major solution to move America toward energy self sufficiency. Properly administered, swaps of crude oil from the Reserve can yield funds that can then be directed toward biofuels purchases. Further, with the involvement of the Department of Agriculture the biofuels alternative can be shaped to benefit on-farm storage of biofuel inputs and yield income to rural America at a time when it is in deep recession.

Yet, I am being told I cannot offer this amendment Thurs. It has not been made in order. The basic attitude here is more of the same; more of the same. That inertia is not what made America great. Boldness made America great.

Using biofuels to plot a path for cleaner and more renewable energy sources is right for America's energy future. It is right for rural America. It is right for the environment. And it is right for America's national security.

Sadly, this amendment and others have been muzzled by the leadership of this great institution. But the American people will not stand for inertia. At some point, those who block progress will pay the price. Rising gas prices here at home matter a great deal to the American people. Our efforts to plot a more secure energy future will not be diminished by this blocking tactic on this bill. For this primary reason, it is my intention to oppose the legislation, and use every opportunity on succeeding bills to draw the American people's attention to the do-nothing decisions this bill represents.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE MARCY KAPTUR TO H.R. 4578, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2001

Page 69, Line 10: After "until expended." Add "Provided, That the Secretary of Energy shall annually acquire and store as part of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve 300,000,000 gallons of ethanol and 100,000,000 gallons of biodiesel fuel. Such fuels shall be obtained in exchange for, or purchased with funds realized from the sale of, crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve."

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS to provide funding for a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.

Just last winter, our nation, and particularly the Northeast United States suffered a period of extremely cold temperatures. Coupled with the skyrocketing costs of oil, many Americans received a real sticker shock when they had to pay their energy bills.

While only 12 percent of Americans heat their homes with oil, that number rises to 40 percent in NYS and 46 percent in my congressional district.

On average, my constituents who heat their homes with oil told me they saw their fuel bills double overnight. These same people ended up paying more than \$1,000 extra just to heat their homes for the winter.

I refer my colleagues to one of my constituents from the Bronx. She tends to her 93-year-old father in the Williamsbridge neighborhood. She saw her bill jump from \$246 to \$346 in one month.



Or Thomas Donohue of Woodside who saw his monthly energy bill double to \$410,000 a month during this past January.

On average, my constituents who use home heating oil witnessed an eye-popping increase of \$1,000 to heat their home for just the 3-month period of winter.

This is ludicrous.

While the wealthy could afford this increase and the poor had some of the costs borne by assistance from such worthwhile programs as the Low Income Home Energy Assistance program (LIHEAP); it was the working and middle class, seniors on a fixed income and small businesses that suffered most.

I had a small trucking company in my district tell me that they had to lay off workers because it became too expensive to operate the trucks—it was cheaper to not work at all.

And I heard from far too many seniors who informed me that they had to wear a winter coat in their apartment because they could not afford to keep their homes warm.

Due to this horrible reality, many here in Congress worked in a bipartisan manner to address this crisis.

One solution was to call for the establishment of a home heating oil reserve in the Northeast. Acting somewhat like the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, this home heating oil reserve would serve a storage place for millions of gallons of home heating oil, that could be released to the public in times of crippling high prices—as we saw this past winter.

This would ensure that small business don't have to lay off workers in times of high gas costs; and that seniors do not have to wear their winter coats indoors during the cold winter months.

The President supports the idea of this reserve, as does the Secretary of Energy. The House of Representatives also overwhelmingly supported this idea, included as part of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, on a vote of 416 to 8.

Unfortunately, the bill we debate today does not include any funding for the creation of this reserve. If created this reserve would help soften the blow of any future price swings and provide much needed assistance to millions of Americans, including many of my constituents by providing a readily available, local, low-cost energy source to make it through the toughest parts of the winter.

Anyone who has ever visited New York City in January knows that heat is not a luxury—it is a necessity. Unfortunately, I had a number of constituents who were forced to view heat as a luxury this past winter after seeing their bills double, and realizing they did not have the money to pay their heating bills.

I had constituents who wore down jackets throughout the day in their homes—this is wrong Mr. Chairman.

Today we have the opportunity to address their situation and I hope that all Members will support the Sanders amendment.

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

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, further

proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

Amendment No. 28 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS); and

Amendment No. 29 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the nos prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was refused.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order that a quorum is not present.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 28 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 29 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was refused.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will count. A quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 285]

Ackerman	Deal	Horn
Aderholt	DeFazio	Hostettler
Allen	DeGette	Houghton
Andrews	Delahunt	Hoyer
Armey	DeLauro	Hulshof
Baca	DeLay	Hunter
Bachus	DeMint	Hutchinson
Baird	Deutsch	Hyde
Baker	Diaz-Balart	Insole
Baldacci	Dickey	Isakson
Baldwin	Dicks	Istook
Ballenger	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Barr	Dixon	Jackson-Lee
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	(TX)
Barrett (WI)	Doyle	Jenkins
Bartlett	Dreier	John
Bass	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Bateman	Dunn	Johnson, E. B.
Bentsen	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Berkley	Ehrlich	Kanjorski
Berman	Emerson	Kaptur
Berry	English	Kelly
Biggert	Eshoo	Kennedy
Bilbray	Etheridge	Kildee
Bilirakis	Evans	Kilpatrick
Blagojevich	Everett	Kind (WI)
Blunt	Farr	King (NY)
Boehlert	Fattah	Kingston
Boehner	Fletcher	Klecza
Bonilla	Foley	Knollenberg
Bonior	Forbes	Kolbe
Bono	Fossella	Kucinich
Borski	Fowler	Kuykendall
Boswell	Frank (MA)	LaFalce
Boyd	Franks (NJ)	LaHood
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Brady (TX)	Frost	Lantos
Brown (FL)	Gallegly	Largent
Brown (OH)	Ganske	Latham
Bryant	Gejdenson	LaTourrette
Burr	Gephardt	Leach
Burton	Gibbons	Lee
Buyer	Gilchrest	Levin
Calvert	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Canady	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Goode	Linder
Capps	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Capuano	Goodling	LoBiondo
Cardin	Gordon	Lowe
Carson	Goss	Lucas (KY)
Chabot	Graham	Lucas (OK)
Chenoweth-Hage	Granger	Luther
Clay	Green (WI)	Maloney (CT)
Clayton	Gutierrez	Maloney (NY)
Clement	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	Markey
Coble	Hansen	Mascara
Coburn	Hastert	Matsui
Collins	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (MO)
Combust	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (NY)
Condit	Hayes	McCrery
Cook	Hayworth	McGovern
Cox	Hefley	McHugh
Coyne	Herger	McInnis
Cramer	Hill (IN)	McKeon
Crowley	Hill (MT)	McNulty
Cubin	Hilleary	Meehan
Cummings	Hilliard	Meek (FL)
Cunningham	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Davis (FL)	Hoefel	Menendez
Davis (IL)	Holden	Metcalf
Davis (VA)	Holt	Mica

Miller (FL) Regula  
 Miller, Gary Reyes  
 Miller, George Reynolds  
 Minge Riley  
 Mink Rivers  
 Moakley Rodriguez  
 Moore Rogan  
 Moran (KS) Rogers  
 Morella Rohrabacher  
 Murtha Ros-Lehtinen  
 Napolitano Rothman  
 Neal Roybal-Allard  
 Nethercutt Royce  
 Ney Rush  
 Northup Ryan (WI)  
 Norwood Ryan (KS)  
 Nussle Sabo  
 Oberstar Salmon  
 Olver Sanchez  
 Ortiz Sanders  
 Ose Sandlin  
 Owens Sanford  
 Packard Sawyer  
 Pallone Saxton  
 Pascrell Schaffer  
 Pastor Schakowsky  
 Paul Scott  
 Payne Sensenbrenner  
 Pease Sessions  
 Pelosi Shaw  
 Peterson (MN) Shays  
 Peterson (PA) Sherman  
 Petri Shimkus  
 Phelps Simpson  
 Pickering Skeen  
 Pickett Slaughter  
 Pitts Smith (MI)  
 Pombo Smith (NJ)  
 Porter Smith (TX)  
 Portman Spence  
 Price (NC) Stabenow  
 Pryce (OH) Stearns  
 Quinn Stenholm  
 Radanovich Strickland  
 Rahall Stump  
 Ramstad Stupak

□ 2010

The CHAIRMAN. Three-hundred-sixty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for a recorded vote.

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 193, noes 195, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—193

Abercrombie Cardin  
 Ackerman Carson  
 Allen Clay  
 Andrews Clayton  
 Baca Clement  
 Baird Clyburn  
 Baldacci Condit  
 Baldwin Conyers  
 Barcia Coyne  
 Barrett (WI) Cramer  
 Bass Crowley  
 Bentsen Cummings  
 Berkley Davis (FL)  
 Berman Davis (IL)  
 Bishop DeFazio  
 Blagojevich DeGette  
 Boehlert Delahunt  
 Bonior DeLauro  
 Borski Deutsch  
 Boswell Dicks  
 Boyd Dingell  
 Brady (PA) Dixon  
 Brown (FL) Doggett  
 Brown (OH) Doyle  
 Capps Edwards  
 Capuano Eshoo

Sununu  
 Sweeney  
 Talent  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Thune  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Visclosky  
 Vitter  
 Walden  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Waters  
 Watkins  
 Watt (NC)  
 Watts (OK)  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Weygand  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson  
 Wise  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee (TX)  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kelly  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind (WI)  
 King (NY)  
 Kleczka  
 Kucinich  
 LaFalce  
 Lampson  
 Lantos  
 Larson  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 LoBiondo  
 Lowey  
 Lucas (KY)  
 Luther  
 Maloney (CT)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Mascara  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (MO)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McKinney

NOES—195

Aderholt  
 Archer  
 Arney  
 Bachus  
 Baker  
 Ballenger  
 Barr  
 Barrett (NE)  
 Bartlett  
 Bateman  
 Bereuter  
 Berry  
 Biggart  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Blunt  
 Boehner  
 Bonilla  
 Bono  
 Brady (TX)  
 Bryant  
 Burr  
 Burton  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Canady  
 Cannon  
 Castle  
 Chabot  
 Chambliss  
 Chenoweth-Hage  
 Coble  
 Coburn  
 Collins  
 Combust  
 Cook  
 Cox  
 Cubin  
 Cunningham  
 Davis (VA)  
 Deal  
 DeLay  
 DeMint  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dickey  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 English  
 Everrett  
 Ewing  
 Fletcher

McNulty  
 Meehan  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Menendez  
 Millender  
 McDonald  
 Miller, George  
 Minge  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Mollohan  
 Moore  
 Morella  
 Strickland  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Phelps  
 Pomeroy  
 Price (NC)  
 Quinn  
 Rahall  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Sabo

Sanchez  
 Sanders  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Scott  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Snyder  
 Stabenow  
 Stenholm  
 Strickland  
 Stupak  
 Sweeney  
 Talent  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thurman  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Visclosky  
 Walsh  
 Waters  
 Watt (NC)  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Wexler  
 Weygand  
 Wise  
 Woolsey  
 Wynn

Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thornberry  
 Thune  
 Tiahrt  
 Traficant  
 Upton

Vitter  
 Walden  
 Wamp  
 Watkins  
 Watts (OK)  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson  
 Wolf  
 Wu  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—47

Barton  
 Becerra  
 Bliley  
 Blumenauer  
 Boucher  
 Callahan  
 Campbell  
 Cooksey  
 Costello  
 Crane  
 Danner  
 Engel  
 Filner  
 Green (TX)  
 Greenwood  
 Hall (OH)

□ 2022

Hinojosa  
 Hoekstra  
 Hooley  
 Jefferson  
 Kasich  
 Klink  
 Lazio  
 Leach  
 Lofgren  
 Martinez  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McIntyre  
 Moran (VA)  
 Myrick  
 Nadler

Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. GEKAS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Mr. MOORE and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, what remedy exists under the rules if six or more Members of the House are standing in the well holding their card asking to be recorded, and a rude and unprofessional Member refuses them the right to vote, under our rules?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no remedy under the rules to reopen the quorum call.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 214, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—169

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Allen  
 Andrews  
 Baca  
 Baird  
 Baldacci  
 Baldwin  
 Barcia  
 Barrett (WI)  
 Bass  
 Bentsen  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Bishop  
 Blagojevich  
 Boehlert  
 Bonior  
 Borski  
 Boswell  
 Boyd  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brown (OH)  
 Capps  
 Capuano

Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brown (OH)  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardin  
 Carson  
 Clay  
 Clayton  
 Clyburn  
 Condit  
 Conyers  
 Coyne  
 Cramer  
 Cummings  
 Davis (FL)  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeFazio

DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Deutsch  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Dixon  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Evans  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ford  
 Frank (MA)

Frost	Maloney (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Gejdenson	Maloney (NY)	Rush
Gephardt	Markey	Sabo
Gonzalez	Mascara	Sanchez
Goodling	Matsui	Sanders
Gordon	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Scarborough
Hill (IN)	McKinney	Schakowsky
Hilliard	McNulty	Scott
Hinchey	Meehan	Sherman
Hoeffel	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Holden	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Holt	Millender-McDonald	Snyder
Hoyer	Miller, George	Stabenow
Inslee	Mink	Stenholm
Jackson (IL)	Moakley	Strickland
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Mollohan	Stupak
John	Murtha	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Tauscher
Jones (OH)	Neal	Taylor (MS)
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Olver	Thurman
Kildee	Owens	Tierney
Kleczka	Pallone	Towns
Kucinich	Pastor	Turner
LaFalce	Payne	Udall (CO)
Lampson	Pelosi	Udall (NM)
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Larson	Phelps	Waters
Lee	Pickett	Waxman
Levin	Pomeroy	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Price (NC)	Wexler
Lipinski	Reyes	Weygand
Lowey	Rivers	Wise
Lucas (KY)	Rodriguez	Woolsey
Luther	Rothman	Wu
		Wynn

NOES—214

Aderholt	Fletcher	Lewis (CA)
Archer	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Army	Fossella	Linder
Baca	Fowler	LoBiondo
Bachus	Franks (NJ)	Lucas (OK)
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Ballenger	Gallegly	McCrery
Barrett (NE)	Gekas	McHugh
Bartlett	Gibbons	McInnis
Bass	Gilchrest	McIntosh
Bateman	Gillmor	McKeon
Bereuter	Gilman	Menendez
Biggert	Goode	Metcalfe
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Mica
Bilirakis	Goss	Miller (FL)
Blunt	Graham	Miller, Gary
Boehlert	Granger	Minge
Boehner	Green (WI)	Moore
Bonilla	Gutierrez	Moran (KS)
Bono	Gutknecht	Morella
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Bryant	Hansen	Nethercutt
Burr	Hastert	Ney
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Northup
Buyer	Hayes	Nussle
Calvert	Hayworth	Ortiz
Camp	Hefley	Ose
Canady	Herger	Packard
Cannon	Hill (MT)	Pascrell
Castle	Hilleary	Paul
Chabot	Hobson	Pease
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)
Chenoweth-Hage	Horn	Petri
Coble	Hostettler	Pickering
Coburn	Houghton	Pitts
Collins	Hulshof	Pombo
Combest	Hunter	Porter
Cook	Hutchinson	Portman
Cox	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Crane	Isakson	Quinn
Cubin	Istook	Rahall
Cunningham	Jenkins	Ramstad
Davis (VA)	Johnson (CT)	Regula
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Riley
DeMint	Kasich	Rogers
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Dickey	Kind (WI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	King (NY)	Roukema
Dreier	Kingston	Royce
Duncan	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Dunn	Kolbe	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Kuykendall	Sanford
Ehrlich	LaHood	Saxton
Emerson	Largent	Schaffer
English	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Everett	LaTourette	Sessions
Ewing	Leach	Shadegg

Shaw	Talent	Wamp
Shays	Tancredo	Watkins
Sherwood	Tauzin	Watt (NC)
Shimkus	Taylor (NC)	Watts (OK)
Simpson	Terry	Weldon (FL)
Skeen	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Weller
Smith (TX)	Thune	Whitfield
Souder	Tiahrt	Wilson
Spence	Trafficant	Wolf
Stearns	Upton	Young (AK)
Stump	Vitter	Young (FL)
Sununu	Walden	
Sweeney	Walsh	

NOT VOTING—52

Barr	Green (TX)	Rangel
Barton	Greenwood	Roemer
Becerra	Hinojosa	Rogan
Bilely	Hooley	Salmon
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Serrano
Boswell	Kilpatrick	Shows
Boucher	Klink	Shuster
Callahan	Lazio	Sisisky
Campbell	Lofgren	Skelton
Clement	Martinez	Smith (MI)
Cooksey	McCollum	Spratt
Costello	McDermott	Stark
Crowley	McIntyre	Toomey
Danner	Moran (VA)	Velazquez
Engel	Nadler	Vento
Filner	Norwood	Wicker
Forbes	Oxley	
Ganske	Radanovich	

□ 2042

Mr. BACA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SHAYS changed his vote from "present" to "no."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would apologize to Members for failing to notice them in the Chamber attempting to record their presence until after he had announced the result of quorum call No. 285. The Chair mistakenly believed that he had embarked on a subsequent vote and that it was too late to permit Members to record their presence.

The Chair specifically apologizes to the following Members: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and if any other Member feels similarly afflicted, if they would notify the Chair, the Chair would be happy to include them in a subsequent announcement.

□ 2045

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say the chairman has been extraordinarily even-handed and polite with all Members and has done an extraordinary job, and I regret that this happened.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my thanks to the chairman who has done a wonderful job today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer amendments that occur on page 85, line 7 and 21 and on page 86 line 19, notwith-

standing the fact that that portion of the bill has not yet been read for amendment.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain to the Members here that we are going to have something happen that, in my 24 years here, is unprecedented. We have had a good working comity with the other side. I have throughout my career tried to work effectively with the Republican side on every piece of legislation that I have ever been involved with.

But just a few hours ago, we won an amendment. The gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) won an amendment to take \$22 million out of the clean coal deferral account. She wants to then have an amendment to add this \$15 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and \$2 million for the Institute of Museums and Library Services.

I am told, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has confirmed, that he is going to offer an amendment to take the \$22 million and give it to the Indian Health Service. I just wish that we were not \$507 million below the President's budget request. I think this is very unfair.

We have offered offsets on all of our amendments here today. This amendment that he is offering is not offset. We have tried to play the game by the rules. But I really regret that we are going down this road, and it is going to make it hard to cooperate on this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, just to respond to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and I understand his concern and the frustration that he feels, but let me just add if I might that there are differences on both sides as to where the priorities should be in terms of the funding. I would say that, if the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) wishes and the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) wishes, it is very easy to ask for and have a rollcall and decide that they do not want to put these dollars that have now been taken out, have been reserved, and not put them into Indian Health Service and reserve them for the purpose for which they would like. It is a matter of simply establishing priorities.

Some people feel that if we have these dollars available now in the bill that the Indian Health Service should be the first priority.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we asked unanimous consent to present this amendment en bloc so that the House would have a chance to work its will, could have a vote up or down, a vote to

take \$22 million of the Clean Coal deferral and give it to these other programs.

Every time the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) stands up to offer that amendment, the side of the gentleman from Arizona objects to it. I just think we are trying to have a spirit of comity here to work with my colleagues on getting these bills passed, and this is not the way to do it.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again, the gentleman from Washington is correct. But the rules of the House do permit somebody to object from considering this en bloc, and that was done. Now we are faced with the issue of trying to decide on the priority, where do we want to place this money. The money has now been reserved, and my colleagues have an option. It does not have to go to Indian Health Service.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, why cannot we have a vote, as we did earlier, to put the money into the National Endowment for the Arts, Humanities and Museum Services, which clearly was the intent of the House when we had this prior vote.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington can have that vote.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, it happens that the Indian Health Service comes before the National Endowment.

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct.

Mr. DICKS. So the effort here by the majority, again, is to take the money now in front of it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I think I have got the time, do I not?

Mr. KOLBE. No. The gentleman from Washington yielded back the time. I have got the time.

Mr. DICKS. We are having so much fun.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand the frustration of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). But the gentleman may now have the opportunity to say that this is of such priority, a highest priority, and ask the House to defeat the motion to place this money in Indian Health Service, and then it would be available.

If that does not occur, when the opportunity arises, when we get to the section about the NEA and NEH in it, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) or the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) can offer another amendment and take the money from another place.

Mr. DICKS. But this was not so tactical, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me. I appreciate that.

If the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) were serious about the amendment, he would have an off-

set. Everybody here had to have an offset today. We offered offsets. There is no offset here. He is taking our offset, the money that we voted on, and using it for this amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and this will be my final comment on this, I would just say that the offset is available at this point. It is now open, and it can be considered. This body can work its will as to whether to place it here or to place it in another location.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to put these numbers in perspective so that what is happening here can become transparent.

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) earlier asked a unanimous consent request so that she could consider all four portions of her amendment at the same time. The Committee on Rules has granted that many times to other Members. They chose not to grant it to her. She renewed her request here on the floor. She made her intention quite known when she offered her original amendment. Her original amendment, the first of four parts, was adopted by the House. Clearly the House expressed an intention to follow through on the Slaughter amendment.

Now we are being asked to believe that the majority party is sincere in offering an amendment to put \$22 million from that source into Indian Health.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, is that the exact amount of the Slaughter amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, to put that in perspective, the majority party has brought to this floor a bill which cuts the Indian Health Service by \$507 million, and we objected to that. We objected to that in our minority views.

Now we are being asked to believe that their effort to put \$22 million from a tiny minuscule portion of the amount that they have already cut from the Indian Health Service, and we are asked to believe that that is somehow going to make a wonderful difference in the lives of Native Americans.

It is obvious from the size of the numbers that this is a transparent attempt to block our ability to fund the arts as the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is trying to do.

We do not want to deny Native Americans every dollar that they need. But when this amendment passes, it must be clearly understood why it is here. It is here procedurally to block us from fulfilling the clearly stated wishes of the House earlier this evening when they adopted the Slaughter amendment.

So the offering of this amendment is simply an effort by the majority party

which will be successful in denying the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) the opportunity to complete her amendment. So it ought to be seen for what it is.

After you have done this tonight, do not go home and brag to your folks about how much you care about the arts because it is clearly transparent that you would do anything possible to deny us the ability to raise the amount of funds for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, \$72,368,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Appropriations under this Act for the current fiscal year shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; and reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services.

From appropriations under this Act, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

None of the funds made available to the Department of Energy under this Act shall be used to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriations Act.

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, private or foreign: *Provided*, That revenues and other moneys received by or for the account of the Department of Energy or otherwise generated by sale of products in connection with projects of the Department appropriated under this Act may be retained by the Secretary of Energy, to be available until expended, and used only for plant construction, operation, costs, and payments to cost-sharing entities as provided in appropriate cost-sharing contracts or agreements: *Provided further*, That the remainder of revenues after the making of such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That any contract, agreement, or provision thereof entered into by the Secretary pursuant to this authority shall not be executed prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full comprehensive report on such project, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

No funds provided in this Act may be expended by the Department of Energy to prepare, issue, or process procurement documents for programs or projects for which appropriations have not been made.

In addition to other authorities set forth in this Act, the Secretary may accept fees and contributions from public and private sources, to be deposited in a contributed funds account, and prosecute projects using such fees and contributions in cooperation with other Federal, State or private agencies or concerns.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE  
INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, \$2,084,178,000, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That \$12,000,000 shall remain available until expended, for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund: *Provided further*, That \$394,756,000 for contract medical care shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, up to \$17,000,000 shall be used to carry out the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used for 1-year contracts and grants which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total obligation is recorded in the year for which the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act (exclusive of planning, design, or construction of new facilities): *Provided further*, That funding contained herein, and in any earlier appropriations Acts for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002: *Provided further*, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts provided herein, not to exceed \$228,781,000 shall be for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs associated with contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements between the Indian Health Service and a tribe or tribal organization pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, prior to or during fiscal year 2001: *Provided further*, That funds available for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT:

On page 71, line 24 after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$22,000,000)".

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds \$22 million to the

Indian Health Service to provide urgently needed medical service to the American Indians and Alaska Natives and to recruit and retain essential medical personnel for the provision of these services.

As a Member who represents several Indian tribes, I have been on my reservations repeatedly to see the decrepit facilities that are currently in existence for Indian Health Services.

I happen to be very involved in the diabetes issue. Alaska Natives and American Indians are 2.8 times as likely to have diagnosed diabetes as non-Hispanic whites of similar age. Nine percent of all American Indians and Alaska Natives 20 years or older have a diagnosis of diabetes. Between 1991 and 1997, the prevalence of diabetes increased to an all major high.

Indian tribes in every single State in which Indian populations reside have terrible health problems, from dental problems to diabetes problems, to heart disease. It is an epidemic in some cases around this country. Diabetes is prevalent among Native Americans, in some cases at a rate of 65 percent of a particular tribe. It is a disgrace.

Anybody who has been on an Indian reservation, whether it is in my State or elsewhere, and looks at the Indian health care facilities is stunned to see how bad they are. This is a good expenditure of \$22 million. Goodness knows they need it. It can be used to the benefit of the Indian population, American Indians and Alaskan natives.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues that this is a good expenditure of money for an account in this bill that is woefully underfunded. The President's budget has been previously terribly underfunded for the Indian populations in this country. We owe them that. We owe them \$22 million. Let us serve the needs for diabetes and dental health care and other health care needs of our Indian population.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit in my seat and hear mendacious statements made concerning American Indians. It is mendacity. It is mendacity because the same gentleman that stood to issue this for American Indians, and there is no one here who has supported them more than I have, but it pains me to see unfairness being done. This is very unfair, Mr. Chairman. The same gentleman who has so nobly stood here tonight and spoke out for the American Indian voted for these cuts in the report that he signed on and voted upon.

This is mendacity, Mr. Chairman. It does not come out right. It is shameful. It is immoral that we should let this go. These Indians need the health care, but did not someone know before now they needed it? Why use the mental gymnastics my colleagues are using to hide the real motive. If my colleagues want to vote down the motion for humanities and the arts, do that.

□ 2100

Be a man. Be a woman. Vote your conscience and vote it down. But don't come back with some kind of gymnastic statement to hide the real motives. This is shameful, and I will stand here and say that.

I have Indians in my district. I have fought hard for Indians, and for all minorities, and for anyone who is underserved. So it does not serve us well tonight, Mr. Chairman, and we should say shame on anybody that votes for this amendment. I think each one of you should go against it and restore what she won in a very honest way, and give the Indians what they need. There is enough money to go around for every Indian Nation.

What's wrong with that? What is wrong with my tax dollars going to help the Indian Nation? Each one of you, even if you do not have Indians in your district, you have a heart and a soul in you, I hope. And some of us have some mental capacity. And if you have it, now is the time to use it, and be sure that you give to the Indians what is due to them.

I stood on this floor once before and I said "White men speak with a forked tongue." Why should you do this? There is no reason for you to do this. I am very shamed by this, Mr. Chairman, and I love everyone on this floor. This is wrong. Democrats, Republicans, Dixiecrats, I do not care what party you are from, you have done the wrong thing here tonight.

If you want to vote her amendment down, vote it down. But if she wins it, give it to her, and then go back and give the Indians what they deserve.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. No, don't clap; I have some other things that aren't so nice to say, too.

I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment. We won fair and square a very tough vote to set aside money so we could provide some increase in funding for the NEA and the NEH and the museum services. We won by a small margin. But for the first time in a long time, this House expressed its support for increasing funding. Now, that is very significant, and we did it under very difficult circumstances, because the amendment actually didn't provide the money to the NEA, it just set money aside to be used later.

Now we find ourselves in the unfortunate situation of someone else using that money for a worthy purpose. I am going to oppose that worthy purpose because that could have been funded in the underlying bill. And, in fact, this money is specifically available because Members on both sides of the aisle thought that it would be used to fund an increase in the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the museum services.

However, one of the problems we are running into, and this is very serious, is that I cannot count on the votes of my Democrat colleagues for the bill if Republicans join you in a motion to recommit on the arts. Now, if 40 of you will come forward and tell me that if the arts money passes on the motion to recommit you'll vote for the bill, we can have NEA funding. But because I can't count on that, and I don't know, maybe by the time we get there we'll be able to do that, but for this moment I am making this bill an issue for the arts.

And I will call for a recorded vote. It will put some people on both sides of the aisle in an awkward position to choose between funding for Indian health and funding for the arts. But on the motion to recommit, I can certainly not urge my Members to vote for your motion to recommit if your Members have not signed in blood that they will vote for the bill if we get the money.

So that is just the reality, folks. Life's tough. We passed it once, we need to pass it again. We need to win this vote again, to reject this amendment, so that we can use this money for the arts as we intended to. Then you're going to have to help pass the bill. Because those who oppose the arts money won't vote for it. And if you don't, we still won't have money for the arts. So you can't have it both ways.

I have voted for many bills on this House floor because I got some key breakthrough in it. And if we get this arts money through this vote and another vote, that will be a key breakthrough. But we cannot pass the final bill without those arts supporters voting for it, warts and all. A lot of warts will come off in conference. But in conference we will get arts money if we stick to our guns. But that means voting this amendment down, voting the arts amendment up, and voting for the bill, regardless of what is in it other than the arts money.

Life's tough. If you're for the arts, you'll do it. If you're not for the arts, you'll vote for some of the amendments and not all.

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

I would like to bring a little reality back to the debate. If you would follow the logic of the gentlewoman, then the only issue that we should be concerned about in this bill is the arts. We care about the arts, we care about the humanities, we also care about the Native Americans, we care about America's national parks, we care about America's national forests, we care about America's energy resources, and we recognize, in contrast to you that we have an obligation on all of those fronts to meet national needs and human needs.

To follow the course suggested by the gentlewoman would have us acquiesce in the fact that only 1 month after this House posed for political holy pictures

and said that they wanted to spend \$900 million on public land acquisition, they bring forth a bill that has only \$164 million to do that. Do you really believe that's sincere? Ha.

Look at the national parks and refuges; \$100 billion below last year. Take a look at the Forest Service; \$96 million below. Do you really believe we ought to go home and explain those cuts? You just had people stand here and tell us we needed more lumber for housing; you had people stand here and tell us how much you loved the land. Now you're asking us to swallow a bill with these reductions?

If you want to provide a bill which meets our responsibilities, instead of making us choose between saying no to the arts and no to Native Americans, say no to your rich friends. Be willing to sweat a little about your campaign contributions and instead say, no, we're not going to give \$200 billion in tax cuts to the 400 richest people in this country.

And don't require, as a price for passing a minimum wage bill that gives \$11 billion in benefits to the poorest workers in this society, don't require a legislative extortion which in return makes this Congress also give \$90 billion in tax relief to people who make over \$300,000 a year. If you want middle-class tax relief, yes! You want to use middle-class tax relief as a Trojan horse to reward your rich friends; sorry, count us out!

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

Mr. Chairman, I heard earlier from another Member that we were going to attempt to inject a little reality into the debate. The preceding attempt was in vain, so let me do it for us assembled here tonight.

My colleagues, there are differences of opinion honestly held. But I would caution us all not to become so obsessed with process that we fail to deal with the issue at hand. The reality is the gentleman from Washington has offered an amendment that I think is all together proper and one that we should all support because it adds greatly needed funds in an area where the need is acute: \$24 million for the—I am sorry, \$2 million—\$22 million, forgive me, I stand corrected, and I thank my colleagues for that really unprecedented bipartisan cooperation to get the numbers right here tonight, \$22 million to help Americans who have been ravaged by a horrible disease.

That is the question. Not the other process, not the alleged road map of intrigue. This is the simple question, an up or down question on helping these Americans.

Now, something else important to remember with reference to Indian Health Service budgeting and what has been appropriated. We have, in fact, added \$30 million to that process. But this is a House where we do take into account different priorities and differences of opinion honestly held, so I

will resist the temptation to go into a barn burner and just point out the facts. Twenty-two million dollars to Indian health services for the most vulnerable Americans, the most vulnerable to diabetes, the first Americans, who are too often the forgotten Americans, I think, is all together proper.

And those who want to impugn others with political intrigue can do so. And some have said in this Chamber that life is tough. But I think all of us, regardless of our party affiliation or political dispensation can stand here in good conscience and cast an "aye" vote because it is the right thing to do for the people who need the help.

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

Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that most of us would rather be home right now, life isn't really very tough for us. Tough is not choosing whether you're going to underfund one group or underfund another. Tough is being in the groups that are underfunded.

We have it, after all, relatively easy. The people who have it tough are the struggling artists who could use some extra funds so they can make a creative contribution, or the Indian children who are being underfunded. And what is striking about this debate is the implicit acknowledgment that the Republican Party's budget is wholly inadequate to the moral needs of a great Nation. What we have is a dispute, including an intramural Republican dispute, about who among worthy people are we going to hurt the worst.

Yes, it is a terrible situation, and people will decide differently as to who they are going to stiff. But let's be very clear. We are in this situation where we have to choose. And people have said Indian health is woefully underfunded, and if we pass the gentleman's amendment it will be woefully underfunded plus 1 percent or 2 percent. People are admitting that the Republican budget gravely underfunds Indian health. Many of us believe it underfunds a number of other things.

There's virtual unanimity in this place that we don't have enough money to go around. Why? The economy is doing well. Revenues are coming in at a greater than expected pace. The problem is we have this philosophical commitment that holds amongst some Republicans that says government is bad. The problem is that while government is bad, virtually all of the components that make up government are pretty good. And that's why you're in this bind. Everybody wants to take credits for supporting the individual components.

Clean coal research. A lot of people want to do that, and they are upset it is getting cut back.

The arts. Indian health. There are virtually no programs in this entire budget, in this entire appropriation, that anyone denounces.

We have this terrible paradox. You know what your problem is? You have

a whole that is smaller than the sum of your parts. You have the entity that you despise, government; but it's made up of a lot of components that you like. So you do two things, you pass a budget that puts too little money into the pot and then we fight about trying to get these inadequate things out of the pot.

What this debate confirms is the inadequacy of the budget. And the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and I admire her courage in getting up as she did, but I have two differences with her. First of all, she says, well, a lot of warts will come out in conference.

□ 2115

Let me translate that. In the conference, thanks to the intervention of the President of the United States, pretending that the budget they are trying to operate under makes any sense at all will stop, the pretense of that grave mistake we made in 1997. And let me not be that generous. I did not make it. I voted against that budget in 1997. We have been lying about it and cheating on it and avoiding it and evading it and denouncing it ever since. But it is still there.

So what we are being told is vote for an appropriations bill which is admittedly inadequate, vote for an appropriations bill that has too little money for all of these important purposes, but vote for it if we can get a couple more nickels in the arts because in conference it will be made better.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I just want to get the record on the 1997 deal.

This administration has cut Medicare more than the 1997 budget required.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree. The gentlewoman has said that the President has also cut Medicare. And I will say for this purpose, a plague on both the Houses.

Yes, the President was wrong and they were wrong. And if they take some comfort that the President was in this regard wronger than them, they are entitled to it. But they were both wrong, and some of us told them so at the time.

They collaborated in cutting Medicare to an unreasonable level, and they also collaborated in putting caps on the budget.

The gentlewoman is the one who got up and said, vote for this budget, warts and all, i.e., vote for this inadequate, underfunded budget. Because in conference we will not be bound by the pretense of what we did in 1997 made any sense. But they are still hobbled by this philosophical commitment to hating government in general, even though on program after program after program they want to improve government in the particular.

It does not work, and that is why we are in this terrible bind.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, time is drawing late tonight. I think we have heard a great deal of debate about the role of government and how much money we should spend and whether we are going to balance the budget or we should not balance the budget. But, quite frankly, that is what the process is.

If you look at the history of this immediate amendment, some folks on this side of the aisle voted for that amendment to cut because they really believed it should not have more money going in to coal research. And some people voted for it because they believe there should be money in coal research. That was the issue. And that issue cut a certain amount of money. And that is open for debate on whether we should add it to other things.

Now, we have had a lot of debate. We can stand here tonight and pontificate, and we can posture and we can go well into the wee hours of the morning. There are no flights out of here. It is raining outside. And we can have a great old time, just a donnybrook.

But if we want to get the job done that the American people send us here to do, we can carry on a civil debate, we can discuss the merits of it, we can vote on these issues. I think everybody knows where they are, whether they are for it or against it. I am not sure how many people are getting their minds changed in this great debate. But let us go forward, and let us get our work done. Let us carry through on what you feel strongly about and what these folks feel strongly about. Let us do our work, and I ask that we move forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, in most of my public life, I have been involved in the health care of Indians both in the Congress and before I came here. And it is rather sad to stand here tonight and tell my colleagues the status of health care of Indians in this country.

When we compare them to all the races in the United States, the Indian people suffer a death rate that is 627 times higher from alcoholism, 533 times higher from tuberculosis, 249 percent higher from diabetes, 71 percent higher from pneumonia and influenza. It is the saddest state of health care that we have in the United States. There is no other population that compares to this.

But do my colleagues know what they should not do to people who suffer from these health care problems, to people who have a death rate that is 627 percent higher from alcoholism, 533 percent higher from tuberculosis, 249 percent higher from diabetes, and 71 percent higher from pneumonia and influenza? They should not take those people and use them as a political pawn. They should not do it. They simply should not do it.

They did not have the courage of their newfound convictions to put full funding for them in the budget or to even put this \$22 million in the budget. But here tonight, in their crusade against the arts and the humanities, they are prepared to enlist the Native Americans of this country, the grand tribes of the grand nations, and to use them for cannon fodder in their crusade against the arts.

I ask my colleagues to think about a community they might come from where they have a 627 percent higher death rate from alcoholism than everywhere else in the Nation and think about if what they would do to those people is to use them.

In a terribly cynical, cynical approach to deny the arts their money, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Slaughter) her amendment, and the due process in this House, I do not think we should do this.

It is tempting; it is exciting to put one over on the Democrats. We get one up. We get back to where we were. But in the end, we have used these people.

I sit on the Committee on Resources. I sat there my entire time in Congress. And when we built the great water projects of the western United States, they always had an Indian component in it, water was going to go to the Indians, Central Arizona project. Up there in the Dakotas, water is going to go to the Indians.

Do my colleagues know what? Thirty, 40, 50 years later, the Indians are still waiting for the water, folks, but the white folks all got their water. They are still waiting for the water in Arizona. They are in court. Of course, they have to go to court to get their water, they cannot get it in Congress.

Quinten Burdick, the last thing he did was come to me and said, can we strike a deal to finally give the water to the Indians? We flooded their lands 30 years ago.

Time and again we have marched out the Indians of this country from the Indian nations and used them for political purposes. Tonight we march out the most unfortunate, those who suffer from these kinds of health care problems. And my colleagues have not found it in their heart in the last 6 years to deal with them. Budgets below the President.

The President has not done a great job, either. But let us not suggest that this is the answer. Put the politics aside. Recognize that they lost an amendment earlier today. Recognize that there may be, the bill has got a long way to go, there may be in fact money for the arts. I do not know whether there will be or not. But let us not do this to the Indian nations of this country.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that last year we put \$150 million for Indian health, more



than the President requested. Now this year he got some religion. But in the 6 years that we have been funding the Interior bill, the amount of money committed to Indian health has been substantially more than the previous 6 years under the Democrat control.

So let us not denigrate our efforts on behalf of the Indians.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Let me say to the gentleman that that debate between him and the President, this President, or any President, between the Committee on Appropriations, and any administration is an honest debate. That is about priorities.

This is not about a priority. This is about a political trick. Fortunately, the chairman is not engaged in it. And we appreciate that.

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

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have heard very sincere remarks on both sides of the aisle. I would like to suggest something that might solve this problem. And there is no reason there cannot be a new rule of the House.

One thing is that any amendment that gets a majority vote in the House and needs to be funded, I would suggest that we have a section at the end of the bill and that we permit in conference, because we know the Senate will come in with a higher mark generally on this bill, and we would work that out with them, with us and our own conferees; and they would have a mandate of the House of the majority on whether it be Indian health, arts, whatever.

It seems to me, and I have checked it with the parliamentarian and they have said, well, that could be seen as violating the rule of legislating on an appropriations bill. We do it all the time. We go through the Committee on Rules. There is no reason, by unanimous consent, that we could not do that tonight to solve this problem.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair rule on that and see if we could solve that. That would solve a lot of problems, get away from the partisan diatribes, and get to the people's feelings, which have been well expressed on both sides of the aisle.

Would the chairman rule on that if that is possible?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not going to rule in anticipation of an amendment that has not been offered.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, if we write it out, will the Chair be inclined to accept it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, being neither clairvoyant nor anything close, cannot rule in anticipation of something that has not happened yet.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I will first try a unanimous consent request to deliver on the previous gentleman's intent.

I would make a unanimous consent request that we fund the arts, the additional amount which was passed in the previous vote, and that we increase funding for Indian health by the amount proposed by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT). I make that as a unanimous consent request in the spirit of the gentleman who just rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not able to entertain that unanimous consent request because it is not in the form of an amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would hope it would be offered as an amendment and hope that, if there is sincerity on both sides, that that is where we will end up.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman could ask the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) if he would, by unanimous consent, amend his amendment to cover both these issues, which would cover the intent of that; and the gentleman from Washington could amend his amendment.

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

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot do that. Because there is \$22 million dollars to deal with; and I made an amendment, and I want a ruling on this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, then, we would hope that wiser heads can prevail and the ranking member and the chairman can work on this as I speak and as others speak, because I think there will be a number of speeches.

There are few Members in this House who represent more tribes than I do. And we have heard a great deal, wonderfully, in the last few moments for the first time, I think, in my career on the floor of the House about concern for the condition of the Indian people and their health and their well-being. And that is wonderful.

And I will admit that the Clinton administration has not been a tremendous advocate in these areas. And the gentleman has done a good job. But there is a different situation before us tonight.

For whatever reason, the administration is now advocating significant increases, perhaps seeing the past problems and understanding better the problems of the Indian people. I have not seen that concern reflected in either the Republican budget, which passed the House, the subcommittee budget, which passed in the Committee on Appropriations, the full committee budget, or the consideration before us here tonight.

We are talking now about 4 percent, 4 percent, I would say to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. NETHERCUTT) of the increase proposed by the President.

How many additional doctors, doctors' visits, nurses, nurse practitioners, treatments for persistent TB, treatments for alcoholism, very expensive, how much can we pay for with a 4 percent increase? A pathetic amount. Yes, we might help a few. But the needs are greater. The needs are much greater. And I have not seen that concern before here. I am pleased to see it tonight.

□ 2130

But I am discouraged to see it being used in an attempt to thwart money for the arts, that won fair and square in a tough vote that was held for 25 minutes on the floor of the House while the whip and others on that side attempted to twist arms because a very strong political base on that side opposes the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. You lost the vote fair and square. It is not a lot of money in the context of this bill. We could do better than \$22 million, I believe, for the American Indian people. And we can do at least as well as the vote which prevailed by the gentlewoman from New York with great persistence.

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

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I just want to assure the gentleman that I am one who increased NEH in conference last year, and perhaps the way to handle this is to deal with it in conference when we have a chance to analyze how much money there is and is not and have a chance to work through it.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. That is the same stale song we have heard from that side on every bill. What they are saying is, "This is only the second step. We know these bills are inadequate, but somebody else will make them responsible down the line." That is, in my view, a very poor recommendation to go to the public with and ask to be returned to this body.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman. In reclaiming my time, this is truly a serious issue. Again, I would hope that perhaps cooler heads can prevail, and they can find other offsets in the bill. I hope we could find \$100 million for Indian health and that we could find the minimum amount that the gentlewoman already gained for the arts and humanities.

The arts and humanities are important. They are important to us as a culture, as a Nation. They are important to kids who drop out of school. They are important to people to enrich their lives.

And health is vitally important for people to be able to enjoy some of those cultural privileges of their own culture, of the culture that might be provided in the amendment by the gentlewoman from New York.

I am just bemused. I am saddened, and I am hopeful that we can somehow come to an accommodation of both needs in this bill. I think the money is there.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendments that were offered today were offered on behalf of the Arts Caucus of the House of Representatives, a bipartisan group. One of the things that helped us win this afternoon were the 25 votes of the Republican Members for which I am extraordinarily grateful. I thank my co-chair, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), for the hard work that he has done and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for her tenacious fight to try to do something here. I am certainly grateful to all the people over here on my side who saw to it that we got that victory this afternoon and I thank them.

I cannot tell my colleagues how sad this makes me. I am used to not doing very well on this subject. I appreciate that there are lots of things I could come up with every year that might please the crowd. I have always tried, the 14 years I have been here, to deal with you as honestly and frankly as I can. I have been persuaded over the years of the great benefit that these three programs do to the people of the United States.

We are asking not for us. We get to go see *To Kill a Mockingbird*. We get invited to all the good things. I am talking about all the other people out there, the people we represent, who will line up to get to a performance when a play comes to town, and who will struggle to make sure that their children are associated with the arts in school.

I appreciate again what everybody does. This is the first year, frankly, that we have been able not to just try to keep it alive. People were elected here, I understand that, to kill the NEA for some reason. It was like the Holy Grail. This little agency, when I came here I think it had \$178 million worth of budget. It is down to \$98 million. It will probably never rise again. Who knows? But it seems to loom so large in people's minds and in a way that I think is totally wrong.

The agency has transformed itself in every way the Congress has asked. Its leadership has been extraordinary. Members of the House sit on the advisory committee. There is not a single soul in this House that could not go back to their district and point with great pride what little bits of seed money that came to them from the National Endowment for the Arts made them be able to build things in their own communities of which they could be proud.

This amount of money that we have here would have done a lot for them. I do not know how many little regional theaters may go dark now because we cannot fund the arts in this country.

We should understand that we fund it cheaper than any other country on the face of the Earth. I do not know how many children may not ever be able to see an artist perform.

I remember an artist who told me one day that her father and mother had scrounged up enough money to take her to see the Music Man, and that she had never seen anything like it in her life. She said to herself, "That's exactly what I want to do." She did it. She grew up, and she remembered what that meant to her as a very young person. And now Mary Steenburgen tells us that every time before she goes on stage, she reaches down to take that imaginary little girl by the hand and says, "Let's go out and do our best tonight, Mary. There may be children here."

In my own district, a young man who won the Arts Caucus program here so that he could hang some art down in the tunnel, he was 17 or so, and was severely troubled. We could not find him to tell him that he had won. He had left home. He had dropped out of school. But my staff in Rochester persisted. They finally found him. They said, "Look. You've got to go to Washington. You've got to go for this celebration and see how they hang this picture and how it says something in the State of New York that you have been chosen." He did. We gave him an enormous good time.

The next time I saw that young man was at a meeting again trying to keep the foundation of the arts alive. He said to me, "I am now a student at Pratt. There was something about that validation of hanging in the Capitol of the United States of America that made me think, by George, I may be worth something." It completely turned him around.

I saw little children in Harlem learning to dance at the age of 3. They were so cute you could hardly believe it. You wanted to hug and squeeze them, but they were not there for that. They were there to learn discipline and to learn dance. We know what this does to the human spirit. The National Endowment for the Humanities explains to us all the time and to everybody else who we are, who we were, where we are going, where we have been, and that is important, because we do not want to be the only society, do we, that only leaves behind their Styrofoam?

I know that we are not going to win this battle here tonight. So, Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. REGULA, take your \$22 million, because, as I said, it has been said here before and much better than I, I do not believe this amendment was intended to help the Indians. I believe this amendment was intended to use them. So take it. I hope that it will be of some help to them. And these little agencies will limp along, and we will try again next year.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will be the first to commend the gentlewoman for her wonderful speech and her wonderful remarks and her heartfelt feelings about the arts in this country. I have many of the same feelings despite what this amendment may mean to her. And I know all of us feel passionately about how to spend the taxpayer dollars. It is tough. We are in the majority. We have to make this budget fit together.

There was a comment earlier about how much money we spend on Indian health care. We are \$30 million of an increase from last year. It could be \$500 million that we need to spend. I would spend it gladly. This House has been energized by the idea that Indian health is a problem in this country.

I will respect the gentlewoman's feelings about having kids see the arts. I am a dad. I know. But I also feel passionately that as I see little Indian kids suffering, and I mean this, I have spoken at diabetes health care conferences for Indian health in San Diego and elsewhere in this country. It is a dramatic problem. If we were all king and queens, we could wish more money everywhere. But we cannot.

So my sense is this: There is \$22 million I think that Indian health care kids and families would benefit from. That is a priority of mine. I voted for the National Endowment for the Arts allocation in this country. We are dealt the hand we are dealt. We have to make this budget fall together. We want to pay down this national debt. We want to save Social Security. Our defense condition is in trouble right now. So we cannot do it all.

This, I believe, is a better expenditure of money. When you look at the relative value, I think this is a better expenditure. That is my view. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has a different view. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has a different view. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) feels differently. So does the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE). God bless us. That is the way we are able to be in this House. We make judgments, and we make our best judgments. But I hate to have you all ascribe bad motives to us or trickery or fooling with the system. I really feel this is the best expenditure. That is why I offered the amendment. I reject anybody who says that there is any other motive. This is my best judgment based on the people that I represent and the needs that I see out in this country.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would just ask this of the gentleman from Washington. If it is true that his heart is so concerned about the plight of our Native Americans, then why did he not offer his amendment in committee when it would not be used as an effort to cut

off the effort of the gentlewoman? And why did he then vote for a bill which cut Indian health services by over \$500 million?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) greatly. He is a good person, but he does not need to do this with respect to impugning my motives. When we did not have \$22 million in this account when we were voting on it in the committee. And my friend knows it. There is \$22 million sitting here. I have made my best judgment as to how it can be spent. If we would have been sitting in the committee, I probably would have put it with diabetes research. That is one of my great things. Or defense spending. Or education spending.

Mr. OBEY. Why did you vote for the cut?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Again, I voted for a \$30 million increase from last year. I did not vote for a cut. The President's budget has been lower for years. He comes up higher this year, and you say it is a cut.

Mr. OBEY. You voted to cut the President's budget by \$500 million. You voted for that.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just reiterate something that I said this afternoon on the floor, and I have been, and I think some in this body know and certainly those that I have talked to in my State know that I have been a strong supporter of the arts for a number of years and I believe very passionately in it. And I believe that there is a Federal role.

I regret that we are finding ourselves in the position where we are pitting one priority against another. But the Federal budget is not limitless. There are limits. We must establish priorities. That is really what we are about doing here this evening. I believe that there will be additional dollars in the conference for the arts, but I believe that at this moment that it is not the appropriate time to do it because it will not help us pass this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a debate on this floor this evening that should make us all question why we are in this place and what we care about. I cannot help but ask myself, are we to take the gentleman from Washington seriously? This is the same man who supported term limits and has now reversed himself. We are asked to believe that this is about good public policy.

Well, it is not. This is about politics. This is not about an attempt to help the Indians. This is simply to provide political cover. This amendment adds a mere \$20 million to an account that the Republicans already cut by \$200 million. Native Americans are among the most impoverished people in the United States. Thirty percent of Native Americans are living below the poverty line.

□ 2145

Native Americans suffer disproportionately high rates of diabetes, cancer, heart disease, and substance abuse. Half of the roads and bridges on Indian reservations are in a serious state of disrepair. The unemployment rate among Native Americans is over 50 percent, and one-third of Native American children do not graduate from high school.

Despite the pressing needs of our Nation's first people, the funding in this bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs is \$320 million below the budget request submitted by the President. This bill cut funding for the housing improvement program by \$7 million below the fiscal year 2000 level and provided no funds whatsoever for new housing construction.

The bill also cut funding for school construction, \$13 million below the fiscal year 2000 level and \$180 million below the President's request. Funding for the Indian Health Service is an appalling \$200 million below the President's request.

The American economy is extraordinarily healthy today. However, the people who live on Indian reservations are some of the poorest people in our Nation. They desperately need funding for health care, education, school construction, housing and economic development.

This amendment that we are confronted with, in light of what has already taken place in H.R. 4478 the Interior Appropriations Act, is appalling. I do not believe that any Member of this House could comfortably support this amendment and comfortably even support this bill knowing how this can be viewed by our voting public.

The results of this can only be thought of as cynical. I would ask us all to oppose the amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is to inquire of the Chair whether the remarks of the previous speaker in ascribing motives to another Member are appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not rule on that specific instance in the context of a parliamentary inquiry.

The Chair would announce, however, and remind Members that by directing remarks in debate to the Chair, and not one another in the second person, Members may better avoid personal tensions during the debate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to talk about, I guess, the issue that has plugged up the House with a great deal of rhetoric; to give my perspective on the issue of the arts and the issue of health care for Native Americans and the issue that the gentlewoman from

New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) won earlier in the day; also to say that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is one of the finest Americans and Members of Congress I have ever met. And he will always have my undying respect, as do most Members on both sides of the aisle. We all represent the finest that America has to offer.

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) offered an amendment earlier today in anticipation of raising, putting aside \$22 million for the arts, for the humanities, for the museums, of which most of us agree with.

I have voted in favor of those kinds of amendments in the past. I am fundamentally in support of that type of culture, because I think it brings to the human being the kind of thought process, creativity, sensitivity, intellectual understanding that is necessary and can only come from the arts.

Now, I voted earlier today against the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), and I did not vote against the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) because I was against the arts. I voted against the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) because I also truly believe in certain environmental issues, and one of those is to understand the nature of coal or how we can improve the burning of coal through clean coal technology. That is the reason I voted against the Slaughter amendment, not because I am against the arts.

Now, we are in a democratic process where there are all kinds of things going on. We basically, though, fundamentally have an exchange of information on this House floor and somewhat a sense of tolerance for a different opinion by somebody else, and then we vote. And Oliver Wendell Holmes said about 100 years ago, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, that the Constitution was made for people with fundamentally differing views. And so that is what we have here.

Now, when this comes up for a vote, and if it does come up for a vote, I truly believe in the arts; I bring those kids here every year with their painting. And we have a marvelous time, and they are hung in the Capitol.

My daughter, and I am very proud, won the art purchase award for our home county, which is the highest award you can get. And she is going to college this year to major in art and music. And the joy she brings in our family and the other people in the county is marvelous.

But I also truly believe in my heart whenever there is an opportunity out there that I grab ahold of an opportunity and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) wants \$22 million in Indian health care that was not there before, I am going to vote for that, not because I am against the arts.

The arts are beautiful. Just listen to William Blake, to see a world in the

grain of sand, heaven in a wild flower, holding infinity in the palm of your hand and eternity in an hour. That was the theme for the arts caucus from the first congressional district of Maryland. And we gotten marvelous entries.

But there is desperate need in Indian health care; and so I am personally voting for that, because it just happens I have an opportunity to increase that money for health care.

There are many people on both sides of the aisle that are struggling with this vote, not for political advantage, but for a real heart-felt sincere understanding about what is best to do at any one given moment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I doubt seriously if there are very many people in this House who do not recognize the insincerity and the cynicism that underlies this amendment. If it had been true that there was a genuine concern—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the insinuation of this. What is the direction of the Chair in terms of words being appropriate? I am trying, Mr. Chairman, if you will indulge me, and the House will, I am trying not to go to have the gentleman's words taken down, but I would like my friend from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) maybe to rethink what he says.

Mr. Chairman, is it not true there have been three opportunities to have words struck down tonight, and is it true that if I was looking for an opportunity, this might be one; but is it not also true that the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) may want to rethink what he just said to avoid us from going there?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not rule on that. The Chair would ask the gentleman to proceed in order, and the time is now controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

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

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), who I served with on the committee and have great respect for, I would ask in terms of just a good relationship here tonight that you may rethink what you had just said, because I am not sure that you meant it the way we may have heard it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in a good relationship. Reclaiming my time, I am very interested in maintaining good relationships. I am very interested in maintaining comity. I am very interested in maintaining respect. I am also very interested in maintaining respect for the work of our Members of the House.

And I mean no personal attack in any way on the gentleman who offered the amendment. However, I believe that there is an insincere result that

comes about as a result of it. If there had been a sincere interest in addressing the obvious needs, health care needs of Native Americans, then that attempt could have been made during the full committee. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee. It could have been made during the subcommittee; it was not.

If there had been a sincere interest in addressing the needs of Native Americans in terms of their health care, that could have been done during the full committee by the gentleman who offered this amendment; it was not. If there had been a sincere concern for the legitimate health care needs of Native Americans, this amendment that we have now could have come before us in the context of this debate which has been going on for some time, and a great many others who have offered amendments have found offsets for those amendments.

In fact, every single amendment that came from this side of the House had an offset to it. It does not take a great deal of ingenuity to find offsets for your amendments if you sincerely wish to find them outside of attacking the work that others have done before you.

We had here earlier today an honest, sincere, heartfelt debate on an important issue. As a result of that debate, this House decided to provide 22 million additional dollars for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for Museums around the country.

I believe that the Members of this House did so sincerely because they recognized the value of NEA, NEH, and museums. They recognized their value particularly as educational vehicles and as the harbors of culture within our society.

And I believe the Members of this House, the majority of them wanted to do everything they could within the confines of a very restricted budget, artificially so, I might add, but, nevertheless, restricted budget, to do whatever they could to enhance the arts, the humanities, and museums.

That issue was debated sincerely, aggressively, intelligently, enthusiastically; and in the final result \$22 million went for the arts, humanities, and museums.

Now, at this late hour, we have an attempt to take that victory, not only from the Members of the House who voted for it, but from all the millions of Americans who will benefit as a result of that additional funding for these worthy subjects, and to do it in a way that I believe does dishonor to this House.

It is one thing to stand here and fight for the things that you believe in. We all do that. It is another thing to do it in a way that undercuts and undermines the success of others in the context of what goes on here in these debates, and I believe that is what we are witnessing.

Yes, I think that there is an element of cynicism that comes about as a re-

sult of this action that is proposed for us to take at this moment. I think that there is an element of insincerity that reeks in this House as a result of the effort that has been placed before us which we are being asked to embrace.

And I think it would be a serious mistake for the comity that we all seek, for the good judgment that we reach for, that the good relations that we hope to maintain, and the good results above all that we hope to achieve as a result of these debates. I would hope that the gentleman would recognize some of this and that he would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I seldom, rise on the floor. It bothers me tonight that I see on both sides that we are questioning the motive of our members and hear words that are being used about our Native Americans. Yes, I am from Oklahoma, basically meaning the home of the red man; Oklahoma, the State that has 22 percent of all Native Americans in this country.

□ 2200

I grew up with the Choctaw Indians in dirt-poor poverty. I was the only non-Indian on the baseball team. I was the minority but did not know it. All the rest of them were Native Americans. I gave eulogies at several of my Native American classmates' funerals, so please do not question the motive of people.

I have witnessed alcoholism among my Native Americans and their families. I was raised with them. Do not judge the motives of people.

Yes, this budget is probably short in total dollars. There could be a lot more done. But right now as we stand before you we must make a decision on this amendment. I was not in appropriations. The amendment before us basically is whether we use \$22 million for Indian health service. As my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) said, in Oklahoma we have the smallest percentage of Indian health service funds for our Native American families.

I cannot undo the things of the past, but as I stand in front of you, I have got an adopted Native American daughter. I have three Native American grandchildren whom I would rather have in my arms tonight than being here listening to this kind of debate.

Let us not question others' integrity or whether we are sincere or not sincere. We have an amendment before us. Let us address that amendment and move forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, for 36 years now as a lawmaker, 12 years in the Michigan legislature, 24 years here, and for 6 years in the Roman Catholic seminary where I worked with Indians, I have been working for all those years for justice for Indians.

My father, who was raised among Indians near Traverse City, Michigan, always told me that the Indians have been treated unfairly, and they were the people with the poorest health around Traverse City. Their land had been stolen from them, all their land. I was determined when I entered the State legislature in 1964 in Michigan to do something for the Indians, and I have worked very closely with people on both sides of the aisle to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked with people on both sides of the aisle to bring justice for Indians, and I have always hoped that before I shuffle off from this mortal coil to meet my judge, that I will have moved somewhere towards that justice, and I have taken some tough votes through the years to do that.

There are some people who would take money from the arts to give to the Indian Health Service, but some of those same people, and this is what troubles me, have voted for over \$200 billion worth of tax cuts. I voted against those tax cuts, and I got criticized back home for doing that, but I did it because I want to make sure we take care of the needs of those who are the most needy. I voted against those tax cuts, and I pay a political price for that. I voted for a tax raise in 1993, and almost lost my election because I voted for that tax raise, but I did because I felt there were needy people in this country.

I have made the real tough votes. Those are the tough votes. Those are the ones that you do not put in your campaign literature, "I voted for a tax increase and voted against a tax cut." Your opponent puts it in his or hers.

But those are the tough votes. That is really where you determine whether you are going to do something to help alleviate the immorality here in America, and the way we treat our Indians is immoral. If we really want to help them, we cannot be giving money to the wealthiest people and not give what is due to the neediest, the people whose land we have stolen, changed their way of life, destroyed their language in many instances. We want to give money to the super wealthy and withhold money from the poorest. That is the real moral issue here. That is the tough vote.

I voted those tough votes. When I voted in 1993, I thought I was looking at my political grave, but I was willing to do that. Those are the tough votes. These votes here really emanate from how we are willing to take care and balance the justice with the injustice in this country.

So it is really puzzling. When you find people who are giving to the super wealthy and take from the America's poorest, you find that at least puzzling. It is very puzzling to me.

I will always support justice for the Indians, in any instance and any chance I can, but I find tonight, in my 36 years in public office, one of the saddest days. When we came here in Janu-

ary, this was all part of a process. We raise so much money, we spend so much money. We find our priorities. We find our priorities in tax cuts; we find our priorities in expenditures.

This is a paradox. This is contradictory, what we are doing here tonight. If you can look into your heart and say, okay, I voted against the tax cut, therefore I can without contradiction go along cutting the President's budget for IHS by \$200 million as was done. And I don't blame the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is one of the most decent guys in this House, and when I go to his committee to testify, the gentleman, within the limitations he has, does a great job for the Indians.

But I find this really sad. We have to look at ourselves and say how do we balance how we raise the money, how do we balance how we spend the money? The two go together, and you cannot give a \$200 billion-plus tax cut to the very wealthy, the most wealthy, and deny what is needed, the basic needs, of America's poor.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, some people are having a difficult decision here, and, you know, we are often asked to establish priorities. Sometimes we are asked to decide whether we should fund an after-school program or special education. For some, that is a difficult decision. But tonight I do not think we are facing a difficult decision. We have \$22 million that we could add to Native American health care, or we could subsidize the arts, humanities and museums.

Now, this industry of the arts is a very wealthy industry. The gentleman from Michigan made a good point about how we are trying to make decisions between subsidizing the wealthy versus subsidizing a very needy cause. Well, Hollywood is full of millionaires; New York and Broadway are full of millionaires. Each year \$9 billion is spent on the arts; jobs in the arts community are growing 3.6 times faster than the regular economy; there are more Americans that attend an artistic event every year than attend sporting events; and yet we are willing to make a choice to subsidize wealthy producers, actors, artists and all of those who contribute to the arts another \$22 million.

Some do not care if we turn our backs on the Native Americans, because they want to subsidize and support some of these wealthy Americans through the arts. Somewhere, some day in America, some child may see an artistic expression if we just add another \$22 million to the industry, the \$9 billion industry, and we will do it at the expense of Native Americans' health care? For me this is not a tough decision.

For the downtrodden Native Americans, because I have seen their troubles, I have been to the reservations, I grew up with Native Americans, I played with them, I have worked with them. Four of my fraternity brothers

were Native Americans. I watched three of the four pass away because of some reason that I hope would be taken care of by additional health care. I do not know if that would meet the need, but it would be a long step towards a greater awareness in health care for the Indians.

So I think this is an easy decision tonight. I think we should support the Nethercutt amendment because it is a much higher priority than subsidizing a \$9 billion industry. Let us vote to add the \$22 million to Native American health care.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my opposition to the amendment that is before us. The real tragedy in the House is that a couple of months ago our Committee on the Budget gave us, and this House approved in a partisan manner, unrealistic, not carefully thought out, 302(b) allocations, which are the bottom line numbers that each of the budget bills must now work within. Those numbers were not fair 2 or 3 months ago, and they are not fair today as we debate this most important issue, Native American health care, arts and humanities for Americans who deserve it.

I think we do this House a disservice when we are not realistic. This country is doing better than it has done in a decade, in a generation. The budget projections that were made 2 months ago are now today further off than ever. When this fiscal year closes on September 30, our Treasury will have over \$100 billion more than we thought we would have this time last year.

Why then are we going through these tasks over the last couple of weeks now, debating legislation with good priorities for American citizens, and yet we are not able to fund them? I say to Members of the House, the reason is because the allocations initially approved in a bipartisan manner a few months ago were not realistic, they were not fair, and they leave a lot of money out that will be put in at the end of this process by 10 to 12 people in both Houses, cutting out over 500 people who have been elected by people across this country to represent them and to serve in this House and to make the kinds of decisions we are making tonight.

It is unfortunate that we cannot fund properly Native American health care. They deserve it. As a minority myself, I would love to have my tax dollars go to them. The President was not right, this House is certainly not right, and we can do better by health care for Native Americans. It is unfortunate that we are not able to do that.

If we are a body elected by the people in the freest country in the world, and we are, then we have a responsibility to do what is right, and the amendment before us does not do that. Yes, we should fund Native American health

care, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is a fine gentleman. The gentleman has offered amendments in the committee, and I have supported him a number of times.

This one is not the right thing to do. All great civilizations are known by their arts, their culture, their humanities, for hundreds of years after all of us leave. This country has not funded properly the arts and humanities in our country, so that our children can be beneficiaries of this great culture that we live in.

So do we now use a process to take away an amendment that was passed lawfully on this floor juxtapose it against an amendment we really do need, but not in this manner? I say to you, Mr. Chairman, it is the wrong way to do it and it is not proper; that as we go through the rest of the 5 or 6 months, or less than that, 3 or 4 months of this fiscal year, we will find that the budget receipts in our Treasury are larger than we thought they would be 3 months ago.

The country is doing well. Why should we have to choose between education and health care? Why should we have to choose between the arts and funding Native American health care? It is because the Republican Party wants to save hundreds of millions of dollars, nearly \$1 billion, I might add, for tax cuts that the American people have already said they do not want. They want you to fund education and housing and health care; they want you to fund the environment, roads and bridges and the like.

□ 2215

So Mr. Chairman, the amendment, though it means good, is not the right thing to do. Let us fund Native American health care. They deserve it, for all the reasons that have already been mentioned.

But at the same time, let us adequately fund the arts and humanities, so that our children and grandchildren can attest to the fact that this is a great country, and that 100 years from now they will look at this 106th Congress and say that we stood up for what was right for our country and for our children.

Vote against the Nethercutt amendment, and let us continue with the work of this Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we all are talking at each other, not with each other. I think we are about ready to vote on this issue.

Let me just say sincerely, I voted with the gentlewoman from New York, and it is not because the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is my cousin. I think we ought to remember, as we talk across the aisle, that we are all Americans, and sometimes we are even family.

I am ready to vote with her again, not because she is my cousin, but be-

cause it represents my district. I am representing my part of the world in this body as I swore to do under the Constitution.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is representing his district. I respect him for that. I respect him now as a representative under his constitutional powers. I have a little problem with the ridiculing and the attacking of us doing what we are supposed to do under our constitutional obligations.

I do not care who the gentleman from Washington defeated to get this seat. That is not the point. He does represent his district, and I expect him to do the best he can. He has found an opportunity to aggressively represent his district. The gentlewoman from New York has aggressively represented her district. We should not be attacking them for doing that. We should be celebrating the system working.

I just ask us to remember, this is what it is all about, representing our districts, and the cumulative impact of doing that. I would be remiss without bringing up one fact, we would all rather be somewhere tonight. I would have rather been at the graduation, of my children, Patrick and Briana, this week, but we are working on an education bill, we are working on an Interior bill. We are doing what we need to do.

I apologized to my children for not being there. I need that on the RECORD, and I apologize to the Members for sneaking this in. But I need to say sincerely, we have some opportunities to work together rather than sniping. Let us accept the fact that we do what we can, we represent our districts, and let us go together, out of the fact that all of us are doing what the public in our districts mandate and what the public wants us to do.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I believe basically that the will of the House is supreme, and what can be done by some of its committees certainly can be done by the whole body of the House.

We all know there is a rule that we cannot legislate on an appropriations bill. We get that through the Committee on Rules and it comes in here regularly when we vote the rule.

There are three traditional things we can do to get out of this situation. One is recommittal now. One is instruct the conferees. One is recommittal if the conference report comes back from the conference and does not satisfy anybody in here.

Again, I would suggest that by unanimous consent we add to the legislation, the Interior appropriations bill, that any amendment which has been adopted by a majority vote in the House will be funded in conference. I think that would solve it, because we know the

Senate is bringing in a much higher figure than we are.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. HORN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for that language to be added, Mr. Chairman, out of order, out of rules, and out of everything else, to get this thing solved.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from California suggesting an amendment to the Nethercutt amendment?

Mr. HORN. That is one way, and we could vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is the gentleman's desire, then the gentleman needs to have an amendment in writing to the Nethercutt amendment.

Mr. HORN. It is here if the Page is around.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the unanimous consent request is a modification to the Nethercutt amendment.

The Clerk will report the proposed modification to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mr. HORN:

At the end of the Nethercutt amendment add:

Any amendment which has been adopted by a majority vote in the House will be funded in conference.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted the Clerk to re-read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will reread the amendment.

The Clerk reread the amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) asking for unanimous consent, or is he amending the Nethercutt amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. At this point, the gentleman from California is asking unanimous consent.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the concern I have is that there has been an insinuation that there was some victory on the floor, and that victory has been snatched.

There was a victorious battle, but there was not a victorious war. We can win one battle in legislative bodies and then lose it in the next moment. I do not think there should be apologies or handwringing about that.

If the Nethercutt amendment passes, then that is not the end of the road. I am not a big NEA supporter, but I am going to vote for the bill and I am going to get to the resolution in committee, in conference. That is the way life is in the legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.