

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

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4578, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 603 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 603

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 603 is a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 4578, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001, and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

The Interior conference report appropriates \$18.8 billion in new fiscal year 2001 budget authority, which is \$3.9 billion more than the House passed and \$2.5 billion above the President's request. Approximately half of this funding, \$8.4 billion finances Interior Department programs to manage and study the Nation's animal, plant and mineral resources and to support Indian programs.

Among the Interior agencies receiving increases in this conference report are the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Minerals Management Service and the U.S. Geological Survey.

The balance of the measure's funds support other non-Interior agencies that carry out related functions. These include the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, conservation and fossil programs run by the Department of Energy as well as the Smithso-

nian Institution and similar cultural organizations.

Notably, the bill includes increased funding \$300 million above the President's request, for wildfire readiness, wildfire suppression and the rehabilitation of areas damaged by wildfires this summer.

Finally, I am particularly pleased that the bill appropriates \$5 million to be used solely for the reduction of the national debt. Mr. Speaker, although many Members, myself included, have concerns about certain sections of the bill, overall this is a responsible and balanced conference agreement. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the Interior conference report itself.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report has come after extensive negotiations to produce a bill that the President can sign. The underlying bill will provide \$18.8 billion for fiscal year 2001, \$3.9 billion more than the current fiscal year.

The measure will establish a new land legacy trust program which will provide \$12 billion over 6 years for land conservation, preservation and maintenance and provides \$1.8 billion for efforts to fight forest fires. Moreover, \$8 million is slated for the Northeast for the heating oil reserve, a program of critical importance to the Northeast.

I am especially pleased that the conferees provided \$105 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, a \$7 million increase over fiscal year 2000 and the first increase since fiscal year 1992. We still lack the funding levels that truly reflect the importance of arts to the American people. My colleagues may recall, Mr. Speaker, our earlier efforts to secure the funding increase. I was proud to lead the fight on the House floor and hope that this modest increase sparks a trend for increased funding in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the arts enhance so many facets of our lives from the educational development of our children to the economic growth of our towns and cities. We learn more every day about the ways in which the arts contribute to our children's learning. One recent study showed that children with 4 years of instruction in the arts scored 59 points higher on the verbal portion and 44 points higher on the math portion of the SATs than did students with no art classes.

New research in the area of human brain development shows a strong link between the arts and early childhood development. Obviously, arts education pays great dividends in a wide range of fields, and no other Federal program yields such great rewards on such a small investment.

The investment that we make contributes to a return of \$3.4 billion to

the Federal Treasury. The arts support 1.3 million jobs all over the country and has revitalized small cities such as Providence, Rhode Island; Rock Hill, South Carolina; and Peekskill, New York.

The conference report also funds the new Women's Progress Commemoration Commission, the provision that I strongly endorse. I sponsored the legislation, established a commission, and was recently elected commission chair. The funding will allow us to fulfill our mandate to identify national sites significant to women's history that we may be in danger of losing due to lack of privatization or other factors.

We will make recommendations to the Secretary of Interior for action to preserve endangered sites. The long-term goal is to further educate the public regarding significant contributions of women in America.

Mr. Speaker, there are still other things that are important in this bill, but I was disappointed to see that the conference report contains language that will undermine the passage of the CARA act, a measure I long supported. The CARA would provide more than \$3 billion each year for important conservation and recommend recreation projects. But the conference report contemplates less than half of the funding and at levels similar to recent years. Moreover, CARA would dedicate funds for specific programs each year while the conference report provides no such guarantees.

For more than 30 years, the Committee on Appropriations has failed to provide funds and live up to the promise of existing conservation and recreation programs. Unfortunately, this report provides more of the same.

With those reservations, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the conference committee for their hard work, particularly for their efforts in regards to the NEA.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), 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. Speaker, of course, I rise to oppose the rule, not because the rule is structured incorrectly, because it did not include CARA, as the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) mentioned. Most of my colleagues are aware that this House passed my Conservation Reinvestment Act 315 to 100 some odd votes. That is what the public wants, 5,285 organizations support that legislation.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Interior tried to have "CARA-lite" passed, but I again stressed the point that for those that are listening to this program and those on the floor understand this is not CARA. It is, in fact, a

system set forth that for each part of our CARA bill, historical preservation, urban parks, fish and wildlife restoration, native lands reclamation, land purchasing, all of it has to come back to the appropriating committee.

For those listening to this, this is not CARA. I will say this to the Committee on Appropriations, I think that my biggest concern is, my colleagues have asked us to authorize, and when we authorize, unfortunately, my colleagues have decided our authorization is not correct, and my colleagues are going to do the authorization. So the rule recognizes my colleagues' role to authorize legislation and that is inappropriate and I think it is against the House rules. That is one reason why I am voting against this rule.

And for the leadership of this House on my side of the aisle, I have never voted against a rule before that my colleagues asked me to vote for, and it is unfortunate my colleagues have not asked me to vote for this rule, in fact, my colleagues have not communicated with me on this issue.

This issue is not going to go away I say to the appropriating committee, I will be here long after my colleagues are gone. I will win this battle to preserve our wildlife, because my colleagues do not do it in this bill. My colleagues have given a great authority to fish and wildlife but do not say how it shall be spent. My colleagues do not recognize the importance of fish and wildlife; and for those sportsmen, I hope they understand what the appropriating committee has done.

This is a battle that is not over. We have a long ways to go, and I will win this battle for the people of America. My colleagues owe us \$13 billion dollars and have not spent it. We will not spend it in the future. My colleagues will spend it for land acquisition with no property rights. Oh, my colleagues will do that, but will not protect the people of this Nation and provide them for the spaces that they need, because my colleagues did not do it in the past and will not do it in the future.

My colleagues can say all they want about how great you have done in this bill, I say this out of friendship, my colleagues have actually put forth something that is hollow, something to appease the voters. When they do not read this bill, they will say what a great job. But when they find out, I will be back. I will be able to prevail.

I am going to make sure that the space is there for our young people, to have the hunting and fishing and recreation is required and the urban parts are put in place and the past is preserved for us. My colleagues do not do it in this bill. It is a hollow promise.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

□ 1200

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is very true, this is not CARA. This is not an entitlement.

In my view, we should add no new entitlements to the Federal budget until we first declare that every American has an entitlement to basic health care. That is the first new entitlement that I want to see added. After that happens, I will be happy to look at adding others, but not before.

But this bill is an amazing victory for those who care about preserving our precious natural resources, who care about preserving our outdoor resources, who care about setting aside crucial pieces of land for enjoyment by future generations.

This bill, for the programs included in it, takes what would otherwise be a \$4 billion appropriation level over the next 6 years and expands it to \$12 billion. That is a huge advance forward, and has been described so by a variety of environmental organizations, and by, for instance, the Council on Environmental Quality at the White House and others.

This bill essentially says that, for this year, we will set aside \$1.6 billion for these activities, and those funds will rise each year for the next 5 years until we hit \$2.4 billion. That money is fenced. It is not an entitlement, but if it is not spent on these programs, it cannot be spent on any others.

It is modeled precisely after the violent crime trust account which we established a number of years ago, the same duration, 6 years, and the same principle. That virtually guarantees, for anybody who wants to look at legislative reality, that these funds will go for the purposes that they are supposed to go for; namely, these conservation and environment programs.

I would say to our friends from coastal States who feel that they have not been given a big enough break in this bill, we take the appropriation for their States from a little over \$100 million a year to about \$400 million. That is not bad. That is not hay. That is taxpayers' dollars put to a good and worthy purpose. For people to make or to claim that that is a defeat requires a new definition of that word for Webster's dictionary.

I would also say to those conservation groups who are not happy that this is not CARA, there are lots of times in life when we have to settle for a little bit less than what we regard as perfect. But I am reminded of old Ben Reihle, the fellow who used to represent rural Marathon County, my home county, in the legislature.

He was talking to education groups one night who were unhappy because he had not voted for exactly the amount of money that they wanted in the State budget that year for education. He had voted for an increase, but it was not a big enough increase.

Old Ben looked at them and said, "Folks, I ask you to remember one thing. I may not have voted for every dime you ever asked for, but I voted for every dime you ever got."

If we think about it, there is a lesson in that for every single person inter-

ested in preserving wildlife, in preserving land, in preserving pristine coastal areas. This is a terrific bill for all of the purposes laid out in this legislation.

Members will hear from the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and others what the bill contains in more detail, but I want to congratulate him. I want to congratulate everyone who had anything to do with putting this package together. I certainly want to congratulate the White House for recognizing a good deal when they saw one. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the staff.

No, this is not CARA, but CARA was dead as a dodo bird in the Senate, and this bill resurrected the effort to put aside important pieces of land for future generations. It creates new State programs for their protection, and this rule should be supported, and so should the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the subcommittee chairman for the Committee on Appropriations.

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

This is a bipartisan bill. It is a good bill. It is fair. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said, it does not give everybody everything they want, but I think it does a remarkable job of balancing the challenges to those of us wanting to preserve the good things in our natural heritage, along with meeting the needs immediately of the American public.

I would urge all of the Members to vote for this rule. If they look at the facts, I am sure they will be convinced that this is a bill that meets the needs of the Nation in a good way. I think that is evident by the fact that every member of the conference, both parties, both Houses, every member, signed the conference report. This is the first time that I can remember that happening, and certainly since I have been chairman. I think it is evidence of the fact that there is strong bipartisan support for the bill.

The White House has indicated the President will sign the bill. I think all of America will be benefited by that set of circumstances.

I want to specifically address the wildlife conservation issue. There have been some facts bandied around about wildlife conservation which perhaps do not give the full picture. I just want to give Members the accurate facts on it.

This bill contains \$540 million for Federal and State programs under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This number represents an increase of \$93 million over fiscal year 2000, 21 percent. Keep in mind that the fiscal year 2000 bill had the Baca Ranch land acquisition in it, which increased that number considerably. Without that purchase, it would have been much greater in terms of an increase this year.

The conference report provides \$300 million for State and other conservation programs. That is an increase of \$232 million over the fiscal year 2000 bill. Particularly, it has a new \$50 million State wildlife grant program, \$50 million to the States. All of this is a 293 percent increase. That is not bad, 293 percent to the States for their programs.

We have heard from a few States that said, well, you may submit a plan. For shame. Submit a plan? We have a responsibility for accountability.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman saying, there have to be competitive bids for wildlife. Who makes the decision what it will be, the Federal government or the States?

Mr. REGULA. Is the gentleman saying as to the allocation between Federal and State?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The Federal government makes the decision, whether it is correct or not, is that correct?

Mr. REGULA. The people who administer the funds make the decision.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. So the States do not have the say-so? If the Federal Government does not agree, they do not get the money?

Mr. REGULA. That is not necessarily true. They have to submit a plan.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If they do not agree, they do not get the money?

Mr. REGULA. States have to be accountable.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If the States submit a plan for rehabilitation of wildlife in a certain area and if the Federal government does not want to do that, they do not get the money, under the gentleman's program?

Mr. REGULA. There has to be accountability.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. But the gentleman is letting the Federal government do it and not the States. That was the whole idea of CARA. CARA had an idea how to spend the money on the ground. The gentleman likes big government.

Mr. REGULA. This is not CARA. The gentleman makes his point very clearly. This is not CARA. It requires accountability on the part of the States.

I think if we are disbursing Federal dollars that we collect from the taxpayers throughout the Nation, then we have a right to ask for accountability for that money. That is what we have said.

Nevertheless, there is a 293 percent increase for the State Wildlife Grant programs, \$50 million for the new program, and an additional amount for the existing programs.

It provides \$66 million for urban parks and forests, an increase of \$33 million, a 100 percent increase over last year, recognizing that it is important in the urban areas to have the development of parks, because this is where

the compression of people exists, in our urban areas, and they need open spaces. For that reason we expand that program by 100 percent.

Of course, it has been pointed out that there will be 12 billion additional dollars over the next 6 years to be spent on land programs and the acquisition of open spaces in the jurisdictions under this Nation. Certainly, this I think is a remarkable step forward in providing all of these funds.

On the more practical side, we have \$2.9 billion to deal with fires. We all recognize what has happened in the west, so we have a large amount of money, a very substantial increase.

We have increased PILT by \$65 million. There is a lot of concern on the part of Westerners that there be additional money spent on PILT. We have increased that very substantially.

In the Northeast, we have doubled the funding for home heating oil from \$4 million to \$8 million. We have a substantial amount for backlogged maintenance. We have had testimony in our committee that there is over \$12 billion in backlogged maintenance. We are addressing that problem.

We have increased many of the other areas. In the energy field, we are providing for new technology, to recognize the need to meet our energy challenges: fuel cells, weatherization, the development of an 80-mile per gallon automobile. So again, these are important things to the people of America.

One that I think reflects the compassion of this bill is Indian health care. We have increased Indian health care \$214 million. I am pleased that the committee has supported this funding, because there is a great need. We had some testimony from the American Dental Association that only 25 percent of Native Americans have dental care. That should be 100 percent; if Members can imagine, going without dental care. So we put a large increase in the Indian health care.

Parks funding is up. We took care of the south Florida area. As it was mentioned earlier on coastal funding, we have put in \$400 million, an increase from \$100 million, to deal with the challenges of our coastal States. This will be managed by NOAA. Obviously, NOAA is a Federal agency, but these are Federal dollars. Therefore, we want to give this responsibility to an agency that has experience in dealing with coastal areas.

I just think on balance this is a very bipartisan bill. It is very well balanced in meeting all of the needs. I certainly urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I do so not because this is a

bad bill, I do so not because this bill has failed to dramatically increase the monies for the various environmental accounts. In many ways, this is the most environmentally friendly bill we have had out of this subcommittee in a number of years.

I do so because I have strongly believed there was another way to redeem the promise that was made to the American people about the use of offshore oil royalties. I believed that the method by which that should have been done was in CARA, H.R. 701.

It has been said several times that this appropriations bill is not CARA. Nobody is more aware of that than the gentleman from Alaska and myself. This approach is not CARA. This was devised within the Committee on Appropriations in responding to CARA and the grass roots support that was lobbying on behalf of CARA. They chose to do it in a Washington fashion.

CARA was the outgrowth of grass roots organizations, over 5,000 organizations from across the country, that looked at what the Congress had done over the last 20 years and decided there had to be another way. There had to be certainty for communities to be able to plan for the protection of their environmental assets, whether that was open space or whether that was trails or whether that was trying to solve endangered species problems.

There clearly had to be a way to help those States that have suffered the impacts of offshore oil.

Also, there had to be a commitment established so we could go out and try to secure private financing, fundraising from foundations, from corporations, and from individuals over the long term to help pay for land acquisitions. That is why the certainty of funding was a key feature of CARA occurs, so it is not a start-again, stop-again operation.

We believed that was important, and 315 Members of this House believed that was important, the biggest bipartisan vote I think we have had on any controversial legislation in this Congress.

We sent it to the Senate. Unfortunately, there it started to stall out. We ask our colleagues to oppose this rule so we can have a chance to pass CARA and not undermine it with the actions of the Committee on Appropriations. We hoped that the same kind of bipartisan support could be resurrected in the Senate to see this bill through to the desk of the President, who has promised to sign it.

□ 1215

I have to admit that I am a little disappointed in the signals from the Senate leadership about the improbability of scheduling the CARA legislation this year. But I believe the underlying proposition of CARA is the correct way for the Congress to deal with these issues, because local governments and park agencies and fish and wildlife agencies are struggling every day where the

people and the species and the open space and the lands and the assets meet on a daily basis.

What they need is a diversity of funding, and a certainty of funding; and they need a level of funding that will let them attack those problems in a manner that they understand best.

I believe that that is what the CARA legislation did. It is unfortunate, that we will not be able to complete action on that legislation in the Congress if the current indications from the Senate continue to hold true, because we believe that legislation, supported by a bipartisan coalition would have truly redeemed the promise that this Congress made to the American people about taking the monies from exploitation of nonrenewable resources and putting them into a permanent fund to protect renewable resources.

While it is very clear to anybody who reads this legislation that this is clearly the most dramatic increase in the environmental accounts that we have seen in 25 years, I would have hoped that we would have been able to include the CARA program that would have guaranteed to local communities the kind of certainty they need to support private and public partnerships at the local level for the protection of these assets.

It is for that reason that I will ask Members to vote against this rule.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would remind all Members it is inappropriate to cast reflections on the actions or inactions of the United States Senate, collectively or individually.

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

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me point out that, as I looked at this and finally got the inspired version of what was in it, I would have to say there are awfully good things in it. People have worked very hard on this bill. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and others who have worked on it. I know they had to probably tear their hair out a lot to come up with this.

Just last Friday or Thursday, I got a lecture from the appropriators saying there are certain things they could not put in the bill. Well, why cannot we put it in the bill? Well, it has not gone through the procedure of this House. We cannot do it that way, because on the House floor we do different things. We look at the rules, and the rules do not let us do that.

So I pick this up now; and as one of the authorizers with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) over here, I can count maybe 20 things in here that were never authorized. Now, how come

last Thursday I get a lecture and say we cannot do these things like San Rafael Swell and other areas, but we can put these 20 in it when we are behind closed doors somewhere? That kind of bothers me a little bit, Mr. Speaker. I thought if it was good for one deal, it was good for all of us.

So I know there is some good things in here. I compliment the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), two very, very fine legislators. However, in good conscience, I really feel, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, there are things in here, in this list and this list, that just blow my mind. I do not know where we can come up with these things.

There is \$12 billion over the next 6 years; \$12 billion is an awful lot of money. My little State of Utah, the entire budget is only \$6 billion. They are going to spend \$12 billion here.

There is no protection for property rights. Who is going to be the wise all-knowing guru who is going to say this is right and wrong with some of this stuff? I wish somebody would tell me this. So a blank check goes to somebody.

Even though there are some awfully good things in this bill, I very reluctantly have to vote against the bill and the rule. I say that feeling bad in a way because it has got the genesis of being a fine piece of legislation. But where we are now I think we are taking the American people down the primrose path.

I honestly urge my colleagues to vote against this and hope we can come up with something a little better and hope we can authorize from now on.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I rise in very strong support of this rule. I think it is a very good rule, a very fair rule. I want to compliment the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), who worked with me on the floor of the House and has been one of the advocates for increasing the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

We were able to add \$7 million in this bill for the endowment. Also a program that is very important to the gentlewoman from New York is the home heating oil provision, \$8 million, which will help every Northeasterner in this country.

I am here today to talk to my colleagues a little bit about this superior appropriations bill and the land conservation preservation and infrastructure improvement program. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I worked on this. We offered it in the conference. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), Mr. GORTON, and Mr. BYRD, they all agreed to this.

I think it is a day we should be here celebrating. I would say to my friends who worked so hard on CARA, and I realize 4 years of effort on CARA, but I want my colleagues to understand something. I believe that that work was translated into this legislation. This is a blend between the President's Land Legacy Program and CARA.

We have the most dramatic increase in conservation spending in the history of this country. Last year, we spent about \$782 million. This year, for the same programs, it goes up to \$1.6 billion. Then in increments of \$160 million a year, it goes up to \$2.4 billion in the year 2006. These are some of the most popular programs in our country for protecting precious lands in both the Federal and State categories, for urban parks, for historic preservation, for restoring our salmon runs. There is also \$400 million that goes through the State, Justice and Commerce appropriations for coastal programs, including the Pacific salmon recovery program. This is the most dramatic increase in conservation spending in the history of the country.

Let me just read to my colleagues a few quotations from people who have looked at this program. A good friend of mine, a fellow University of Washington graduate, Roger Schlickeisen, president of the nonprofit Defenders of Wildlife Society called it "probably the best conservation funding bill in our lifetime." Then George Frampton, chairman of the White House Council on Environmental Quality. "This represents a historic breakthrough in conservation funding," said Frampton. "It is a fantastic step forward."

Today, the New York Times in an editorial, lead editorial said "Congressional Dos and Don'ts. Land conservation. The White House and Congressional negotiators reached agreement last Friday on a plan to set aside some \$12 billion over 6 years for a range of Federal and State land conservation programs. It is the most important land conservation bill in many years and deserves prompt approval on the House and Senate floors. Budget purists are annoyed that the money will be fenced off in a special conservation account similar to the Highway Trust Fund. But open space has been shortchanged for years, and this is a way to make restitution."

Then finally, the White House, the President supports this bill. He also, in his statement of administration policy, it says, "By doubling our investment next year in land and water conservation, and guaranteeing even more funding in the years ahead, this agreement is a major step toward ensuring communities the resources they need to protect the most precious lands, from neighborhood parks to threatened farmland to pristine coastal areas."

Mr. Speaker, this is, as the Washington Post said, landmark legislation. This is legislation that this Congress can be proud of. I am proud of the fact that this amendment was adopted in a

bipartisan spirit. It will be the most important step forward in conservation spending probably in our lifetime.

I would urge my colleagues who support CARA to think about this. We have moved dramatically in the direction that they laid out in their legislation. No, it is not an entitlement. This money is in a special account. The money must be spent for the purpose, or it remains in the account.

If we look at the precedent of the Violent Crime trust fund, all of that money is spent because these are important programs to the American people.

As the ranking Democrat, I want to tell my colleagues that it is my intent that this money gets spent for all the people. I would say to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) this bill has so much money. This bill has so much for the great State of Alaska. This is one of the greatest funding bills in Alaska's history. I would hope that the gentleman, after he has his vote on the rule, would think about all of that money for all of those Alaskan programs and that he would be with me on final passage on the bill.

I would say to the gentleman from Alaska, I want to correct one thing that was in his letter. The money for the State games is not just for nongame. It is for game and nongame.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, that shows my colleagues how deeply I believe that CARA was the right way to go when I can take and sacrifice the great work that has been done for the State of Alaska that I worked on for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. DICKS. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is because the gentleman from Alaska knows that the chairman of the appropriations committee in the other body is going to make sure that the money remains in there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I appreciate his hard work and his guidance and his effort on this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that some of the environmental groups who think they are getting a bad deal remind me of what some of the senior citizen groups did when Social Security was passed in the 1930s. They opposed Social Security, which is a compromise with the Townsend plan. Some of those senior citizen groups opposed the creation of Social Security because they wanted the Townsend plan to pass, which was a straight \$100 a month check to seniors with no contributions or anything else. So they savaged Members who voted for the compromise.

This is a similar compromise. Five years from now they will be out to ring the neck of anybody who tries to cut this program.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read, by the way, the names of the

conservation groups that are supporting this rule and the bill: the American Oceans Campaign, Center for Marine Conservation, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense, Friends of the Earth, National Audubon Society, National Parks Conservation Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Natural Resource Defense Council, Scenic America, the Wilderness Society, and the Worldwide Fund. I mean, this is an amazing group of people supporting this. The President supports it.

I want my colleagues to know, I believe that this is one of the most important things on a bipartisan basis done in this Congress. So we should be celebrating today. We should be happy with this work product. Let us get on with it. Let us vote for the rule and pass this excellent conference report.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members it is not in order during debate to characterize the legislative positions of the Senate or individual Senators.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake about it, CARA is not in this bill. CARA is not in this bill. Everybody should know that.

I want to speak especially to the 102 Members of this body who voted against CARA. If my colleagues will examine their conscience, they will have to admit with me that most of them voted against CARA because they did not think there was enough property rights protection in a bill that was going to authorize an enormous amount of land acquisition in this country.

Some of my colleagues are from western States where the government already owns 60, 70, 80 percent of the property in their State. They were concerned about the government acquiring some more land without real strong private property protections.

Well, guess what we are going to vote on today when we vote on this Interior appropriations bill. We are going to vote on \$540 million of new land acquisitions in this country with no private property protections. CARA had 21 separate provisions in it protecting private property. That is not in this bill. There is no provision saying one can only buy from a willing seller.

In other words, under this bill, one can spend \$540 million of acquiring property from people who do not want to sell their land. That is called expropriation. When we vote for this bill

without CARA, that is what we will be getting. Keep in mind that CARA guaranteed for the first time a distribution of funds to the coastal States of America.

What kind of distribution was that all about? It was simply to try to give coastal States some contribution for the minerals produced offshore in some kind of way commensurate with the money that America automatically mandates is provided to interior States for minerals produced on Federal lands in interior States.

The law currently mandates 50 percent of all Federal royalties on interior States' federally owned property goes to the States. Committee on Appropriations does not spend it. No yielding of appropriations. It is a mandate to the interior States. This bill would have provided 27 percent to be shared among all coastal States. That is gone. There is no guarantee for coastal money. There is just a lot of Federal land acquisition with no private property rights. That is not the deal that CARA would have offered us.

□ 1230

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I express my thanks to the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I want to commend and compliment my good friends from the Committee on Appropriations. They have "done good." The problem is, they have not done good enough.

I want to express my respect and affection for the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). They are good Members, and I do not want them to take anything I say here today as being hostile to them. However, they have chosen to legislate without hearings; without opportunity to perfect.

What those of us who oppose the rule want the House to do is to allow us to vote the rule down so that we may come up with a better piece of legislation, one which was approved by the House by an overwhelming vote. I refer to CARA, H.R. 701. It passed the House by a very heavy margin, 315 to 102. It is interesting to note that this was one of the most bipartisan bills that I have ever seen, but also certainly the single most bipartisan piece of legislation that has passed this Congress.

Those of us who led that effort to pass CARA share a common passion, providing a meaningful and dedicated and continuing source of conservation funding for fish, for wildlife, for lands and waters, for recreation and open spaces, and to meet the concerns that confront so many of our States and our communities. Remember, we will not have many opportunities to pass a

piece of legislation like this. This is an opportunity that will probably come once in a lifetime. In all the years that I have served in this body, never once have I seen an opportunity of this magnitude to do good for Americans, for conservation, for fish and wildlife that matched this. And never once have I seen anything which did so much to realize the hopes and the ideals of those of us who love the out-of-doors.

Now, I have no doubt that the language contained in the Interior appropriation bill and this land conservation program was drafted with the best of intentions. It is again, I note, an effort by my good friends on the Committee on Appropriations to legislate well. And part of that legislating well is preserving the jurisdiction of that committee and part of it is in sidetracking CARA, something which that committee found to be highly offensive, as we had this legislation on the floor at an earlier time, because it did take away from the Committee on Appropriations the ability to function by whim and caprice, to deny new conservation money and, in effect, to supplant the efforts of the legislative committees around here which are strongly and deeply and sincerely conversed in this.

The premise of CARA was to take Federal resource revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf to reinvest them for conservation purposes. And it was originally intended, when the Congress passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the 1960s, that this would be done. Since that time, the Committee on Appropriations has had the opportunity to do the kinds of things we are talking about today. Without the pressure of CARA, they never would have done them.

So I say let us assist our good friends on the Committee on Appropriations. Let us help them. Let us see to it that we have an opportunity, if we are going to legislate, to legislate well. Vote the rule down. A new rule can be brought back, and we can have a full opportunity then to address all of the important questions that exist with regard to conservation, and with regard to spending proper levels of funds to save and protect open spaces and the conservation and environmental values that are so important to this country.

The language of the conference report is quite clear. It says the program is not mandatory and does not guarantee annual appropriations. If Members need a reason to vote against this rule so that they can vote for something which is of more lasting and permanent character, this is the reason right here. This is what the Committee on Appropriations is saying to us. This is not permanent. I am sure that they have the best of intentions at this time, but within a year there will be new pressures upon the Committee on Appropriations which will tell the Committee on Appropriations that they should perhaps cavil just a little bit on the commitment that they make

today and come forward with less money.

Now, they will tell us about the violent crime reduction trust fund. That expired the other day, and it was never fully funded. They have always told us what a great thing it was. And it was great, and I commend them for it. But it did not come through a legislative committee and it did not have the supervision and the care and the attention that goes to it. And it also was not as fully honored as it could have been and should have been. Certainly we are going to meet the same situation, where the Committee on Appropriations will shave conservation values just is a little here and just a little there, because it is easy to do when the pressures are on to expend monies for other purposes.

Again, I announce my respect for my good friends, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations; but they are not meeting the real challenges of greatness. They are passing aside an opportunity. They are urging this body to reject something which is perhaps the greatest piece of conservation legislation we can pass in this Congress or indeed in any other.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

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

Today, we have an opportunity to reward an agency which has completely turned itself around. For the first time in over 8 years, we have the chance to give the National Endowment for the Arts a small increase. It should be noted that this increase is dedicated to grants such as Challenge America.

Challenge America is an opportunity to serve smaller communities around the United States. Sixty percent of Challenge America grants will be distributed to communities under 200,000 in population in all 50 States. The intent of this program is to reach previously unserved communities in the same way that ArtsREACH programs work.

My colleagues may recall that in the first 2 years of ArtsREACH grants were made to the 123 mostly new communities, including places like Ft. Washakie, Wyoming; Deadwood, South Dakota; and Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

The remaining 40 percent of the Challenge America grants will be passed through the 56 State and Territorial arts agencies in keeping with the congressional practice of splitting NEA funds between State and national programs.

These new grant initiatives are part of a new NEA which supports projects in over 4,000 locations in the country. Today, NEA is doing more for communities in need than ever before, and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill

which gives NEA a minimal but monumental increase.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. With all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Washington, my friends on this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle, who have done a pretty good job putting a piece of legislation that is controversial year to year on the floor before us, we have heard other speakers before me say that this is not CARA and I can tell my colleagues that this is not CARA.

The energy behind the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, H.R. 701, is about one thing, it is about permanency. It is about making sure that they can plan for the future. Coastal programs, ball parks, conservation, wildlife management programs, they can all function if they know that they are going to have a revenue stream that is certain from year to year. That is the energy behind CARA and why 3,000 groups supported this piece of legislation and 300 Members of the House voted for it.

Let me remind my colleagues that it is not CARA, if I take just an excerpt of the conference report of the Interior bill that we are voting on today in the rule, and see where it says this program is not mandatory and does not guarantee annual appropriations. That is obviously what they have meant because they put it in black and white. Well, that undermines, I believe, and unravels the energy and the excitement behind a piece of legislation that is, I believe, one of the greatest pieces of legislation that we have had.

We have a wonderful opportunity here. The year is 2000. We have surpluses that we are dealing with. We have the greatest opportunity, I believe, in our lifetime to put in permanent funding for building ball parks, to save our coastline in Louisiana. We talk about an energy policy and the suspect of time that we are entering into with oil and gas prices. Well, Louisiana, which produces 80 percent of that, is eroding.

I firmly believe that we still have time for CARA. Let us not go forward with the rule that halfway gets us to where we need to go. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand in favor of this rule and stand in favor of this Interior Conference Report. As a member of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been proud to work with the Democrats and Republicans. Certainly my chairman, the gentleman

from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), has done a masterful job of being sensitive to all sides of these issues of conservation and reinvestment and fire protection and all the things that go into the Interior Appropriation Bill.

One thing is certain about this business: Nobody is ever satisfied. We cannot ever get perfection, but the conference committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, struggled over this bill to try to make it right, to get it the best we could for everybody concerned. People in my part of the State of Washington are very concerned about CARA and the mandatory spending requirement. Whether it is needed or not, it is mandatory.

I think our system of appropriations and discretionary spending in the years ahead is going to be better to have the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress as a whole making these judgments about conservation lands on an annual basis rather than forcing a mandatory spending program whether it is needed or not.

So I have great respect for the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). But I think he has to have great respect for the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), as well as myself and others who worked so hard to craft this compromise to make sure that it meets the White House's needs and the Republicans and the Democrats needs, and that is fair under the circumstances.

If we vote against this bill, we are voting against National Park Service operations; against fire remedies that occurred this summer in the West; we will be voting against Indian Health Service. That is critically important in my part of the country and across this Nation, as Indian populations have increased in their health needs. We will be voting against the weatherization grants if we vote against this bill.

The bottom line for me is this is a fair compromise. It puts the conservation decision-making right where it ought to be, on Congress, making its best judgments on an annual basis, and I hope the membership will approve it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule and, indeed, the underlying measure, the conference report on the fiscal year 2001 interior appropriation bill.

Contained in this legislation is up to \$94.5 million to bolster the financially ailing, congressionally mandated program that provides health care to certain retired coal miners and their dependents. If this funding is not forthcoming, some 60,000 beneficiaries, whose average age is 78 years old, will see their health care cut. So I ask that

my colleagues who represent coal field communities, whether they be in Appalachia, in the Midwest or the western States, not turn their backs on these retirees. They were made a promise, a promise endorsed by the Federal Government, of lifetime health care. This legislation keeps faith with that promise.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently dealing with a situation where what is known as the Combined Benefit Fund (CBF) is facing financial insolvency. In this regard, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD championed a provision in the pending legislation that would transfer up to \$94.5 million to the CBF to insure that health care benefits are not curtailed or halted in the immediate future. This provision is modeled after legislation I sponsored in the House, H.R. 4144, known as the CARE 21 bill.

By way of background, the CBF was created in the Coal Act of 1992 to provide health care benefits for retired United Mine Workers of America coal miners who were eligible to receive benefits as of July 20, 1992, under one of two prior multi-employer funds. Under the terms of the Coal Act, companies which signed past National Coal Wage Agreements with the union are responsible for paying premiums for retired miners assigned as being their responsibility. For those retirees where there is no responsible company can be identified, the Coal Act provides for an annual transfer to the CBF of a portion of the interest which accrues to the unspent balance of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund to pay premiums for these unassigned beneficiaries.

Today, however, the CBF is facing funding shortfalls primarily due to a rash of litigation brought by companies on a variety of fronts. First, under the Eastern case, the Supreme Court relieved what are called the "super reachback" companies from responsibility to their former employees thereby adding some 8,000 retirees to the unassigned beneficiary roles. These companies had at one time been signatories to the National Coal Wage Agreement, but were not parties to the 1978 Agreement which included what is known as the "evergreen clause" in which companies committed to a continuing payment obligation. Litigation has also been brought in what are called the Dixie Fuel cases where companies challenge the validity of assignments made to them. And a third round of major litigation is taking place challenging beneficiary premium rates under what is known as the Chater decision.

This litigation is chipping away at the financial solvency of the CBF and it should be noted these cases are being brought by companies that are both current signatories to the National Coal Wage Agreement as well as what are called "reachback" operators who were parties to the 1978 Agreement but not to the current agreement. In effect, and there is no way to get around this fact, these companies are seeking to reduce or walk away from their past collectively bargained obligations to provide lifetime health care coverage for their former employees. This creates a certain dilemma for the Congress as it is the Congress which created the CBF and I believe we have a moral obligation to these retirees despite the actions being taken by their former employers. However, at the same time, I do not believe it is prudent to use General Fund revenues for this purpose. Instead, the provision in the

pending legislation would tap additional amounts of interest in the reclamation fund to provide for the cash infusion into the CBF. This is an important consideration because it is the coal industry itself which pays a fee that finances the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund. It is, as such, the coal industry which is still paying for the health care benefits of these retirees under the provision contained in this legislation.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind involved with this issue that a long term solution must be devised. My CARE 21 legislation would have done just that. Unfortunately, it has not been brought to the House floor and its counterpart has not been considered in the other body. Indeed, there is still a level of greed among certain entities involved in this issue as reflected in the litigation they are bringing against the CBF that is stymieing legislative efforts in this matter. This is going to have to change because the current impasse on devising a long term solution has in my view no benefit. It certainly does not benefit the many thousands of elderly retired coal miners and their widows who are being held hostage to this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule, and I commend the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS); the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA); and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for their help in including this provision in the legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). (Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I certainly sympathize with the appropriators, and I sympathize with the authorizers as well.

□ 1245

We are always faced as to whether or not we are going to be able to come along with a rider, whether or not this time it is okay, or this time it is not okay. But in this particular case I think the House's will is not being taken into consideration.

When we passed the CARA legislation through the House with 315 votes, I think that is a pretty good expression of what this House of Representatives wants us to do. When the chairmen of the authorizing committees come to the chairmen of the appropriation committees and say we want you to put this rider on here, then we are faced with a different situation, Mr. Speaker. We are in a dilemma.

I am going to vote for the rule today, but I disagree with the fact that we are not given the opportunity to bring forth the will of the House somewhere during this process. If it were possible to recommit this to the Committee on Rules, then I would recommit it and ask the Committee on Rules to give us an opportunity to amend the rule so we

could bring forth an amendment which could be set back. Maybe there will be an opportunity of recommitment, maybe we will have a voice, but I think that those of us that are interested in CARA have been shortchanged.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues, this is an indication of where the money will go under the amendment that I and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offered. First of all there would be \$550 million for the Federal and State Land and Water Conservation Fund. State and other conservation programs would get \$300 million. Urban parks and historic preservation, \$150 million; \$150 million for the maintenance backlog; and \$50 million for PILT.

This is not guaranteed, but this money is prioritized in the budget allocation and Congress is going to spend this money as we have spent the money on the Violent Crimes trust fund. So it is not a guarantee, but it is about as close as we are going to get to one and still let the Congress have some oversight over these programs. This is a tremendous increase. The President supports it. Most of the outside conservation groups support it. It is a chance for us to triple the amount of funding spent on these programs.

Now, it is not CARA; but I actually think it is better than CARA because it is a blend between the President's land legacy and the CARA program.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said about George Frampton supporting it. That is probably the biggest reason to vote against the rule.

The second thing is that every governor in the country now has blasted this agreement. Every governor. The mayors, the legislative bodies have blasted this so-called Interior appropriations.

So do not give everybody how much they support it. In reality, the governors know right now we are back to square one. We have got to go back to the appropriators and grovel, hold our hand out and beg at the end of the session.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, this has happened to us now for 6 years, 8 years, 10 years. Wait until the last moment, the Senate does not do anything, they hold it; and then the appropriators get together in the back room, and the cardinals decide what legislation is going to pass and not pass. The natives are getting restless, buddy. I am going to suggest respectfully, that is not the way this Congress was set up. It is not good legislation; it is wrong and against the House rules, but we are ready to go home, so everybody wants to vote for this thing.

I am voting no and I am going to ask for a vote on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what we hear today is that there are four oil-producing coastal States who this year get \$100 million and who under CARA want to get \$1 billion, and they are unhappy because we only gave them \$400 million. That is the truth. We spread the money around more fairly among all the States, and we make no apology for it.

The fact is this is a historic bill. It is the best conservation funding bill that we have seen in a generation. This raises conservation funding from \$4 billion to \$12 billion over a 6-year period, and that money if it is not spent on these conservation programs cannot be spent on any other item. That is as close to a guarantee as we can get. It is a phenomenal victory for the environmental movement and a phenomenal victory for those who want to protect our outdoor resources.

The rule should be supported. The bill should be supported. This is something we can all go home and be proud of.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule so we can get on with this process.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 65, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—354

Aderholt	Bilbray	Campbell	Cubin	Kanjorski	Regula
Allen	Bilirakis	Canady	Cummings	Kaptur	Reyes
Archer	Bishop	Cannon	Cunningham	Kasich	Reynolds
Army	Bliley	Capps	Davis (FL)	Kelly	Rodriguez
Baca	Blumenauer	Capuano	Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Rogan
Bachus	Blunt	Castle	Davis (VA)	Kilpatrick	Rogers
Baird	Boehkert	Chabot	Deal	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Baker	Boehner	Chenoweth-Hage	DeLauro	Kleczka	Ros-Lehtinen
Baldwin	Bonilla	Clayton	DeLay	Knollenberg	Rothman
Ballenger	Bonior	Clement	DeMint	Kolbe	Roukema
Barr	Borski	Clyburn	Diaz-Balart	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Coble	Dickey	Kuykendall	Royce
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Coburn	Dicks	LaFalce	Rush
Bartlett	Boyd	Collins	Dixon	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Barton	Brady (PA)	Combest	Doggett	Lampson	Ryun (KS)
Bass	Brady (TX)	Condit	Dooley	Lantos	Sabo
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Cook	Doolittle	Largent	Salmon
Bentsen	Bryant	Cooksey	Doyle	Larson	Sanford
Bereuter	Burr	Costello	Dreier	Latham	Sawyer
Berkley	Burton	Cox	Duncan	LaTourette	Scarborough
Berman	Buyer	Coyne	Edwards	Leach	Schaffer
Berry	Calvert	Cramer	Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Schakowsky
Biggert	Camp	Crowley	Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Scott
			Emerson	Linder	Sensenbrenner
			Engel	Lipinski	Serrano
			English	LoBiondo	Sessions
			Etheridge	Lofgren	Shadegg
			Evans	Lowe	Shaw
			Everett	Lucas (KY)	Shays
			Ewing	Lucas (OK)	Sherman
			Farr	Maloney (CT)	Sherwood
			Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Shimkus
			Filner	Manzullo	Shows
			Fletcher	Markey	Simpson
			Foley	Martinez	Siskisky
			Forbes	Mascara	Skeen
			Ford	Matsui	Skelton
			Fossella	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
			Fowler	McCrery	Smith (MI)
			Frank (MA)	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
			Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Smith (TX)
			Frost	McInnis	Smith (WA)
			Galleghy	McIntyre	Snyder
			Ganske	McKeon	Spence
			Gejdenson	McNulty	Spratt
			Gekas	Meehan	Stabenow
			Gephardt	Meek (FL)	Stearns
			Gibbons	Menendez	Stenholm
			Gillmor	Metcalf	Strickland
			Gilman	Mica	Stump
			Goode	Millender-McDonald	Sununu
			Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Sweeney
			Goodling	Miller, Gary	Talent
			Gordon	Minge	Tancredo
			Goss	Moakley	Tanner
			Graham	Mollohan	Tauzin
			Granger	Moran (KS)	Taylor (MS)
			Green (TX)	Moran (VA)	Taylor (NC)
			Green (WI)	Morella	Terry
			Greenwood	Murtha	Thomas
			Gutierrez	Myrick	Thompson (MS)
			Gutknecht	Nadler	Thornberry
			Hall (OH)	Neal	Thune
			Hall (TX)	Nethercutt	Thurman
			Hastert	Ney	Tiahrt
			Hastings (WA)	Northup	Tierney
			Hayes	Nussle	Toomey
			Hayworth	Obey	Towns
			Herger	Olver	Trafficant
			Hill (MT)	Ose	Turner
			Hilleary	Owens	Udall (CO)
			Hinchey	Oxley	Udall (NM)
			Hinojosa	Packard	Upton
			Hobson	Pallone	Velazquez
			Hoefel	Pascrell	Visclosky
			Hoekstra	Pastor	Vitter
			Holden	Payne	Walden
			Hooley	Pease	Walsh
			Horn	Pelosi	Wamp
			Hostettler	Peterson (PA)	Waters
			Houghton	Petri	Watkins
			Hoyer	Pickering	Watts (OK)
			Hulshof	Pickett	Weiner
			Hunter	Pitts	Weldon (FL)
			Hutchinson	Pombo	Weldon (PA)
			Hyde	Pomeroy	Weller
			Inslie	Porter	Weygand
			Istook	Portman	Whitfield
			Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)	Wicker
			Jackson-Lee	Pryce (OH)	Wilson
			(TX)	Quinn	Wise
			Jenkins	Radanovich	Wolf
			Johnson (CT)	Rahall	Wu
			Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad	Wynn
			Johnson, Sam	Rangel	Young (FL)
			Jones (OH)		

NAYS—65

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Norwood
Ackerman	Hansen	Oberstar
Andrews	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Baldacci	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Barcia	Holt	Phelps
Blagojevich	Isakson	Rivers
Bono	Jefferson	Roemer
Brown (OH)	John	Sanchez
Callahan	Jones (NC)	Sanders
Cardin	Kildee	Sandlin
Carson	Kind (WI)	Saxton
Chambliss	Lee	Shuster
Clay	Levin	Souder
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Crane	Luther	Stupak
Danner	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
DeFazio	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McKinney	Watt (NC)
Delahunt	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Deutsch	Miller, George	Woolsey
Dingell	Mink	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Moore	

NOT VOTING—15

Dunn	King (NY)	Napolitano
Eshoo	Klink	Paul
Franks (NJ)	Lazio	Riley
Hastings (FL)	McCollum	Vento
Hefley	McIntosh	Wexler

□ 1310

Mr. VITTER and Mr. HINOJOSA changed their 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:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 506, the Rule for Interior Appropriations Conference Report, I was unavoidably detained in a business meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4578.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4578, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 603, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 603, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 29, 2000, at page H8472.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

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

□ 1315

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank those that supported the rule; and to all Members, I believe that this bill today is something we can point to with pride in supporting it.

I know there are differences on how we approached it, but this bill provides for the future of this Nation in terms of our assets, our land and our unique ecology; and I hope that all of my colleagues will look carefully at all the things that are in this bill, to realize what it means, not only to your district, but to the Nation.

As my term as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations nears an end with this conference agreement, I would especially like to take the opportunity to thank the Members of the subcommittee. I might say that this conference was unique. For the first time in my 6 years on this subcommittee, the conference report was signed by every member of the conference committee from both parties in both Houses, and it will be supported by the administration.

I thank the Members for their support as we did work together to produce this agreement. Especially I extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their hard work during our conference and throughout the year.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation to the excellent staff on the subcommittee who have dedicated hours, numerous hours on this bill. And I wanted to also make a comment here, and that is that this bill is in the true tradition of Sid Yates, who was the previous chairman of this subcommittee. I think Sid would be very proud of what is in this bill. In his many years as chairing the subcommittee, much of what we have done are things that he cherished and worked for. And I say to you, Sid, if you are watching, that we thank you for all of your good service. This bill today perhaps is an accumulation of some of the things that you were pushing for for years and years as you chaired the committee.

This is a good bill, I say to my colleagues, one that all of us should support. It provides \$18.8 billion in the funding for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. It includes wildfire funding, a recognition that the fires are a problem on our 200 million acres of forest land. It has \$2.9 billion and of that amount, \$1.6 billion is emergency funding. And for those of my colleagues who noticed the size of this bill, keep in mind that we had to address not only fire emergencies, but

we also had to address other emergencies that were overlooked in the supplemental appropriations bill.

While it is a large number, it does represent a number of dollars that were meant to address the interests of many Members in the House. The conference report includes a new land conservation, preservation and infrastructure improvement title which makes available \$12 billion over the next 6 years for programs such as Federal and State land acquisition, urban parks, State and wildlife conservation, PILT and backlog maintenance. State and other conservation programs receive \$300 million, \$300 million to the States, including a new \$50 million State wildlife grant program.

We do ask for accountability, and I think that is our responsibility to the taxpayers to say to the States we want you to be accountable in the expenditures of these monies.

Also in this report, there is \$200 million for PILT, that is \$65 million more than what was in the bill that passed the House. And again I think it is a recognition that we have to support these local governments, the schools and local government agencies with some type of substitute for the losses that they have because of the Federal lands, and so I am pleased that we have a very substantial amount in PILT.

We have initiated several new funding provisions to prepare for wildfires, wildfires that have swept across the West. There is \$128 billion for State and rural fire and economic assistance. We recognize, and I know many of my colleagues watched the shows that the people were coming even from offshore to help fight the wildfires, and, of course, the States and local communities were very instrumental in this effort.

We have \$377 million to increase wildfire readiness, \$422 million for additional wildfire suppression and \$277 million for hazardous fuel reduction work. To address the impact of the current fire season, we have also provided \$227 million to rehabilitate areas damaged by fires and \$351 million to reimburse firefighting costs already incurred.

And I say one of the good features is that we try to clean up forests through the readiness programs and through the suppression programs, so that when we get lightning strikes, they do not burn with such intensity, because as you have fuel buildup by failure to thin and so on, you obviously add to the intensity of any blazes.

I am especially pleased that we have addressed the numerous operational and maintenance shortfalls. We have \$1.4 billion for the operation of the national parks, \$25 million more than last year. We have \$1.6 billion for the BLM which includes a \$66 million increase overall, and \$18 million for revision of the Bureau's land management plans, and \$356 million for national wildlife refuges.

Funding has been included within these operational accounts to address