

Doolittle Istook
Doyle Jackson (IL)
Dreier Jackson-Lee
Duncan (TX)
Dunn Jenkins
Edwards John
Ehlers Johnson (CT)
Ehrlich Johnson (IL)
Emerson Johnson, E. B.
Engel Johnson, Sam
Eshoo Jones (NC)
Etheridge Jones (OH)
Evans Kanjorski
Everett Kaptur
Farr Keller
Fattah Kelly
Ferguson Kennedy (RI)
Flake Kerns
Foley Kildee
Forbes Kilpatrick
Ford Kind (WI)
Fossella King (NY)
Frank Kingston
Frelinghuysen Kirk
Frost Kleczka
Gallegly Knollenberg
Gekas Kolbe
Gephardt LaHood
Gibbons Lampson
Gilchrest Langevin
Gilman Lantos
Gonzalez Larson (CT)
Goode Latham
Goodlatte LaTourette
Gordon Leach
Goss Lee
Graham Levin
Granger Lewis (CA)
Graves Lewis (GA)
Green (WI) Lewis (KY)
Greenwood Linder
Grucci Lipinski
Gutierrez Lofgren
Hall (OH) Lowey
Hall (TX) Lucas (KY)
Hansen Lucas (OK)
Harman Luther
Hastings (WA) Lynch
Hayes Maloney (CT)
Hayworth Maloney (NY)
Herger Markey
Hill Matheson
Hinchey Matsui
Hinojosa McCarthy (MO)
Hobson McCarthy (NY)
Hoeffel McCollum
Hoekstra McCrery
Holden McHugh
Holt McInnis
Honda McIntyre
Hooley McKeon
Horn McKinney
Hostettler Meehan
Houghton Meeks (NY)
Hoyer Menendez
Hunter Mica
Inslee Millender
Isakson McDonald
Israel Miller, Dan
Issa Miller, Gary

Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Simpson
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shinkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns

Aderholt
Baird
Borski
Brady (PA)
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Fletcher
Ganske
Gillmor
Green (TX)
Gutknecht
Hart
Hefley
Hilliard
Hulshof

Stenholm
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez

NAYS—50

Kennedy (MN)
Kucinich
LaFalce
Larsen (WA)
LoBiondo
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Peterson (MN)
Ramstad

Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Roemer
Sabo
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Wicker
Wu

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—22

Blagojevich
Bonior
Capuano
Clay
Clayton
Culberson
Cunningham
Filner

Hastings (FL)
Hilleary
Hyde
Jefferson
Manzullo
Mascara
Meek (FL)
Nadler

Platts
Rangel
Solis
Stark
Stump
Traficant

□ 1050

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

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 309, I missed this vote due to a medical appointment. Had I been present, I would have voted, “Nay.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. 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. 5093, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 483 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. 5093.

□ 1052

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. 5093) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 16, 2002, the amendment by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) had been disposed of and the bill was open from page 4, line 1 through page 74, line 23.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a table detailing the various accounts in this bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The tabular material is as follows:

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources.....	746,632	772,962	782,904	+36,272	+9,942
Conservation.....	29,000	40,028	44,028	+15,028	+4,000
Subtotal.....	775,632	812,990	826,932	+51,300	+13,942
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness.....	280,807	277,213	278,639	-2,168	+1,426
Fire suppression operations.....	127,424	160,351	160,351	+32,927	---
Other operations.....	216,190	216,190	216,342	+152	+152
Suppression (contingent emergency appropriations). Fiscal year 2002 supplemental.....	34,000 ---	---	---	-34,000	---
Other operations (contingent emergency appropriations).....	20,000	---	---	+200,000	+200,000
Subtotal.....	678,421	653,754	855,332	+176,911	+201,578
Central hazardous materials fund.....	9,978	9,978	9,978	---	---
Construction.....	13,076	10,976	10,976	-2,100	---
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	160,000	150,000	160,000	---	+10,000
Conservation.....	50,000	15,000	70,000	+20,000	+55,000
Subtotal.....	210,000	165,000	230,000	+20,000	+65,000
Land acquisition (conservation).....	49,920	44,686	49,286	-634	+4,600
Oregon and California grant lands.....	105,165	105,633	105,633	+468	---
Range improvements (indefinite).....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite). Offsetting fee collections.....	8,000 ---	7,900 -7,900	7,900 -7,900	-100 -7,900	---
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite).....	12,405	12,405	12,405	---	---
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	1,872,597	1,825,422	2,110,542	+237,945	+285,120
Appropriations.....	(1,689,677)	(1,725,708)	(1,747,228)	(+57,551)	(+21,520)
Conservation.....	(128,920)	(99,714)	(163,314)	(+34,394)	(+63,600)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(54,000)	---	(200,000)	(+146,000)	(+200,000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management.....	819,597	825,598	847,353	+27,756	+21,755
Conservation.....	31,000	78,006	71,006	+40,006	-7,000
Subtotal.....	850,597	903,604	918,359	+67,762	+14,755
Construction.....	55,543	35,402	51,308	-4,235	+15,906
Land acquisition (conservation).....	99,135	70,384	82,250	-16,885	+11,866
Landowner incentive program (conservation).....	40,000	50,000	40,000	---	-10,000
Private stewardship grants program (conservation).....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund (conservation).....	96,235	91,000	121,400	+25,165	+30,400
National wildlife refuge fund.....	14,414	14,414	14,414	---	---
Conservation.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Subtotal.....	14,414	14,414	19,414	+5,000	+5,000
North American wetlands conservation fund					
(conservation).....	43,500	43,560	43,560	+60	---
Neotropical migratory birds conservation fund					
(conservation).....	3,000	---	5,000	+2,000	+5,000
Multinational species conservation fund.....	4,000	5,000	---	-4,000	-5,000
Conservation.....	---	---	4,800	+4,800	+4,800
State wildlife grants (conservation).....					
Rescission.....	85,000	60,000	100,000	+15,000	+40,000
	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
Subtotal.....	60,000	60,000	100,000	+40,000	+40,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service..					
Appropriations.....	1,276,424	1,283,364	1,396,091	+119,667	+112,727
Conservation.....	(893,554)	(880,414)	(913,075)	(+19,521)	(+32,661)
	(407,870)	(402,950)	(483,016)	(+75,146)	(+80,066)
Rescission.....	(-25,000)	---	---	(+25,000)	---

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Park Service					
Operation of the national park system.....	1,474,977	1,560,565	1,596,593	+121,616	+36,028
Conservation.....	2,000	24,000	9,000	+7,000	-15,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	10,098	---	---	-10,098	---
Subtotal.....	1,487,075	1,584,565	1,605,593	+118,518	+21,028
United States Park Police.....	65,260	78,431	78,431	+13,171	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	25,295	---	---	-25,295	---
Subtotal.....	90,555	78,431	78,431	-12,124	---
National recreation and preservation.....	66,159	46,824	56,330	-9,829	+9,506
Urban park and recreation fund (conservation).....	30,000	300	30,000	---	+29,700
Historic preservation fund (conservation).....	74,500	67,000	76,500	+2,000	+9,500
Construction.....	299,193	240,182	271,450	-27,743	+31,268
Conservation.....	66,851	82,202	53,736	-13,115	-28,466
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	21,624	---	---	-21,624	---
Total, Construction.....	387,668	322,384	325,186	-62,482	+2,802
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority).....	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---	---
Land acquisition and state assistance (conservation).....	274,117	286,057	253,099	-21,018	-32,958
Total, National Park Service (net).....	2,380,074	2,355,561	2,395,139	+15,065	+39,578
Appropriations.....	(1,905,589)	(1,926,002)	(2,002,804)	(+97,215)	(+76,802)
Conservation.....	(447,468)	(459,559)	(422,335)	(-25,133)	(-37,224)
Emergency appropriations.....	(57,017)	---	---	(-57,017)	---
Rescission.....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	---	---

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	889,002	853,760	903,405	+14,403	+49,645
Conservation.....	25,000	13,578	25,000	---	+11,422
Total, United States Geological Survey.....	914,002	867,338	928,405	+14,403	+61,067
Minerals Management Service					
Royalty and offshore minerals management.....	253,397	264,452	264,951	+11,554	+499
Use of receipts.....	-102,730	-100,230	-100,230	+2,500	---
Oil spill research.....	6,105	6,105	6,105	---	---
Total, Minerals Management Service.....	156,772	170,327	170,826	+14,054	+499
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement					
Regulation and technology.....	102,800	105,092	105,092	+2,292	---
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite).....	275	275	275	---	---
Subtotal.....	103,075	105,367	105,367	+2,292	---
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	203,455	174,035	184,745	-18,710	+10,710
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.....	306,530	279,402	290,112	-16,418	+10,710
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs.....	1,799,809	1,837,110	1,859,064	+59,255	+21,954
Construction.....	357,132	345,252	345,252	-11,880	---
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians.....	60,949	57,949	60,949	---	+3,000
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	4,986	5,493	5,493	+507	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(75,000)	(72,424)	(72,424)	(-2,576)	---
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	2,222,876	2,245,804	2,270,758	+47,882	+24,954

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in Thousands)**

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Departmental Offices					
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories.....	51,230	42,497	45,497	-5,733	+3,000
Northern Marianas.....	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Subtotal.....	78,950	70,217	73,217	-5,733	+3,000
Compact of Free Association.....	8,745	8,745	9,045	+300	+300
Mandatory payments.....	14,500	12,000	12,000	-2,500	---
Subtotal.....	23,245	20,745	21,045	-2,200	+300
Total, Insular Affairs.....	102,195	90,962	94,262	-7,933	+3,300
Departmental management.....	67,741	78,596	72,533	+4,792	-6,063
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	2,205	---	---	-2,205	---
Subtotal.....	69,946	78,596	72,533	+2,587	-6,063
Office of the Solicitor.....	45,000	47,773	47,473	+2,473	-300
Office of Inspector General.....	34,302	36,659	36,239	+1,937	-420
National Indian Gaming Commission.....	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000	---
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians					
Federal trust programs.....	99,224	151,027	141,277	+42,053	-9,750
Indian land consolidation.....	10,980	7,980	7,980	-3,000	---
Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....	110,204	159,007	149,257	+39,053	-9,750

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Natural resource damage assessment fund.....	5,497	5,538	5,538	+41	---
Federal priority land acquisitions and exchanges.....	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000
Total, Departmental Offices.....	367,144	423,535	407,302	+40,158	-16,233
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)...					
Appropriations.....	9,496,419	9,450,753	9,969,175	+472,756	+518,422
Conservation.....	(8,428,939)	(8,501,952)	(8,705,510)	(+276,571)	(+203,558)
Emergency appropriations.....	(1,009,258)	(978,801)	(1,093,665)	(+84,407)	(+114,864)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(59,222)	---	---	(-59,222)	---
Rescissions.....	(54,000)	---	(200,000)	(+146,000)	(+200,000)
Rescissions.....	(-55,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(+25,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(75,000)	(72,424)	(72,424)	(-2,576)	---

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest and rangeland research.....	241,304	242,798	252,000	+10,696	+9,202
State and private forestry.....	190,221	121,805	146,695	-43,526	+24,890
Conservation.....	101,000	155,558	133,133	+32,133	-22,425
Subtotal.....	291,221	277,363	279,828	-11,393	+2,465
National forest system.....	1,331,439	1,366,475	1,370,567	+39,128	+4,092
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness.....	622,618	600,703	640,000	+17,382	+39,297
Fire suppression operations.....	255,321	420,699	420,699	+165,378	---
Other operations.....	336,410	347,736	452,750	+116,340	+105,014
Suppression (contingent emergency appropriations). Fiscal year 2002 supplemental.....	266,000	---	---	-266,000	---
Other operations (contingent emergency appropriations).....	---	---	500,000	+500,000	+500,000
Subtotal.....	80,000	---	---	-80,000	---
Capital improvement and maintenance.....	1,560,349	1,369,138	2,013,449	+453,100	+644,311
Conservation.....	485,188	501,222	507,865	+22,677	+6,643
	61,000	50,866	64,866	+3,866	+14,000
Subtotal.....	546,188	552,088	572,731	+26,543	+20,643
Land acquisition (conservation).....	149,742	130,510	146,336	-3,406	+15,826
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.....	1,069	1,069	1,069	---	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	234	234	234	---	---
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	3,290	3,402	3,402	+112	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	92	92	92	---	---

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses.....	5,488	5,542	5,542	54
Reduction for non-conservation funding.....	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
Conservation (Youth Conservation Corps).....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---
Total, Forest Service.....	4,130,416	3,948,711	4,645,250	+514,834
Appropriations.....	(3,470,674)	(3,609,777)	(3,798,915)	(+328,241)
Conservation.....	(313,742)	(338,934)	(346,335)	(+32,593)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(346,000)	---	(500,000)	(+154,000)
Total, Forest Service.....				+696,539
Appropriations.....				(+189,138)
Conservation.....				(+7,401)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....				(+500,000)
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY				
Clean coal technology:				
Deferral.....	-40,000	---	-50,000	-10,000
(Transfer out).....	(-33,700)	(-40,000)	---	(+33,700)
Fossil energy research and development.....	582,790	489,305	664,205	+81,415
Clean coal technology (by transfer).....	(33,700)	(40,000)	---	(-33,700)
Alternative fuels production (rescission).....	-2,000	---	---	+2,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.....	17,371	20,831	20,831	+3,460
Elk Hills School lands fund.....	---	36,000	---	---
Advance appropriations, FY 2003.....	36,000	---	---	-36,000
Energy conservation.....	912,805	901,651	984,653	+71,848
Economic regulation.....	1,996	1,487	1,487	-509
Strategic petroleum reserve.....	179,009	168,856	175,856	-3,153
SPR petroleum account.....	---	11,000	7,000	+7,000
Northeast home heating oil reserve.....	---	8,000	8,000	-4,000
Energy Information Administration.....	78,499	80,111	80,611	500
Total, Department of Energy:				
New budget (obligational) authority (net)...	1,766,470	1,717,241	1,892,643	+175,402
Appropriations.....	(1,772,470)	(1,717,241)	(1,942,643)	(+225,402)
Advance appropriations.....	(36,000)	---	---	---
Rescissions.....	(-2,000)	---	---	---
Deferral.....	(-40,000)	---	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-33,700)	(-40,000)	(-50,000)	(-50,000)
(By transfer).....	(33,700)	(40,000)	(-33,700)	(+40,000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill Enacted	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services.....	2,389,614	2,453,835	2,508,756	+119,142	+54,921
Indian health facilities.....	369,487	362,571	391,865	+22,378	+29,294
Total, Indian Health Service.....	2,759,101	2,816,406	2,900,621	+141,520	+84,215
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses.....	15,148	14,491	14,491	-657	---
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute.....	4,490	5,130	5,130	+640	---
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses.....	399,253	448,760	450,760	+51,507	+2,000
Rescission.....	---	-14,100	-14,100	-14,100	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	21,707	---	---	-21,707	---
Subtotal.....	420,960	434,660	436,660	+15,700	+2,000
Repair, restoration and alteration of facilities.....	67,900	81,300	81,300	+13,400	---
Construction.....	30,000	12,000	10,000	-20,000	-2,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	518,860	527,960	527,960	+9,100	---

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Gallery of Art				
Salaries and expenses.....	68,967	78,219	78,219	+9,252
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	2,148	---	---	-2,148
Subtotal.....	71,115	78,219	78,219	+7,104
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	14,220	16,230	16,230	+2,010
Total, National Gallery of Art.....	85,335	94,449	94,449	+9,114
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts				
Operations and maintenance.....	15,000	16,310	16,310	+1,310
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	4,310	---	---	-4,310
Subtotal.....	19,310	16,310	16,310	-3,000
Construction.....	19,000	17,600	17,600	-1,400
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	38,310	33,910	33,910	-4,400
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars				
Salaries and expenses.....	7,796	8,488	8,488	+692
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities				
National Endowment for the Arts				
Grants and administration.....	98,234	99,489	99,489	+1,255
National Endowment for the Humanities				
Grants and administration.....	108,382	109,632	109,932	+1,550
Matching grants.....	16,122	16,122	16,122	---
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities....	124,504	125,754	126,054	+1,550
				+300

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Institute of Museum and Library Services/ Office of Museum Services				
Grants and administration 1/.....	26,899	---	---	-26,899
Challenge America Arts Fund				
Challenge America grants.....	17,000	17,000	17,000	---
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	266,637	242,243	242,543	-24,094
Commission of Fine Arts				
Salaries and expenses.....	1,224	1,224	1,255	+31
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs				
Grants.....	7,000	7,000	7,000	---
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation				
Salaries and expenses.....	3,400	3,667	3,667	+267
National Capital Planning Commission				
Salaries and expenses.....	7,253	7,253	7,553	+300
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117).....	758	---	---	-758
Total, National Capital Planning Commission.....	8,011	7,253	7,553	-458
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum				
Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	36,028	38,663	38,663	+2,635
1/ Funded in the Labor HHS bill for FY 2003.				---

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2002
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003**
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Presidio Trust					
Presidio trust fund.....	23,125	21,327	21,327	-1,798	---
Total, title II, related agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)....	9,671,351	9,488,163	10,444,950	+773,599	+956,787
Appropriations.....	(8,988,686)	(9,163,329)	(9,662,715)	(+674,029)	(+499,386)
Conservation.....	(313,742)	(338,934)	(346,335)	(+32,593)	(+7,401)
Advance appropriations.....	(36,000)	---	---	(-36,000)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(28,923)	---	---	(-28,923)	---
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(346,000)	---	(500,000)	(+154,000)	(+500,000)
Rescissions.....	(-2,000)	(-14,100)	(-14,100)	(-12,100)	---
Deferral.....	(-40,000)	---	(-50,000)	(-10,000)	(-50,000)
(Transfer out).....	(-33,700)	(-40,000)	---	(+33,700)	(+40,000)
(By transfer).....	(33,700)	(40,000)	---	(-33,700)	(-40,000)
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)....	19,167,770	18,938,916	20,414,125	+1,246,355	+1,475,209
Fiscal year 2002 (contingent emergency).....	---	---	(700,000)	(+700,000)	(+700,000)
Fiscal year 2003 (net).....	(19,167,770)	(18,938,916)	(19,714,125)	(+546,355)	(+775,209)
Appropriations.....	(17,417,625)	(17,665,281)	(18,368,225)	(+950,600)	(+702,944)
Conservation.....	(1,323,000)	(1,317,735)	(1,440,000)	(+117,000)	(+122,265)
Advance appropriations.....	(36,000)	---	---	(-36,000)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(88,145)	---	---	(-88,145)	---
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(400,000)	---	---	(-400,000)	---
Rescissions.....	(-57,000)	(-44,100)	(-44,100)	(+12,900)	---
Deferral.....	(-40,000)	---	(-50,000)	(-10,000)	(-50,000)
(Transfer out).....	(-33,700)	(-40,000)	---	(+33,700)	(+40,000)
(By transfer).....	(33,700)	(40,000)	---	(-33,700)	(-40,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(75,000)	(72,424)	(72,424)	(-2,576)	---

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAHALL:

Page 50, beginning on line 19, strike "expended" and all that follows through "Congress: *Provided further*," on line 6, page 51, and insert "expended: *Provided*,".

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I begin by commending the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior. He has brought a very sound bill to the floor. I commend the gentleman for his leadership and salute him upon his retirement from this body. I salute, as well, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), who I understand may oppose this amendment, but has been very courteous to me in allowing this amendment to proceed.

I offer this amendment with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE). It is my understanding the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) on the majority side has a keen interest in this matter and may want to speak as well.

Mr. Chairman, I did vote against the rule governing debate on this measure because it waived all points of order against the bill on matters which constitute an authorization on an appropriation measure with the exception of an issue relating to the Everglades.

In this regard, I am particularly concerned with one authorizing provision in particular that is so unfair, so callous in my view that since it was protected from a point of order under the rule, it has prompted me to offer this amendment.

This provision is nothing more and nothing less than a gag order on thousands of American Indians who are seeking a proper accounting from the Federal Government of royalties that are owed to them. It is a most repressive provision.

Simply stated, this provision in the bill prohibits the government from accounting for amounts owed to more than 300,000 Indians prior to 1985. It is unfortunate, but true, that through both Democrat and Republican administrations, the Department of the Interior has acted like the Enron of Federal agencies when it comes to managing Indian trust assets.

Over the years, countless investigative reports by the Congress, the GAO, the Inspector General, and others have been issued on the failure of the Department of the Interior to properly account for and manage Indian trust funds. This matter is in litigation and the contention is that the Department of the Interior has squandered more than \$10 billion in royalties owed to these individuals. Compared to this scandal, the Teapot Dome scandal was chump change.

But rather than allowing the litigation to go forward, rather than allowing for a full and proper accounting of these trust fund accounts, H.R. 5093

places an arbitrary cutoff date of 1985. That would be like telling Americans who have placed money in a savings account all of their adult lives and have proper records that we will have the bank tell the investor what is in their account regardless of what the investor's records show. If the investor's records show an investment of \$100,000 in the bank, but the bank says they have only \$50,000, then the bank figure would stand, and there is no recourse.

That is what this provision in H.R. 5093 says to these American citizens. They are our first Americans. They have died in our wars. They have invested and contributed to our society. And today they are being treated with the most callous disregard, no better than the heads of Enron and WorldCom treated their investors.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for adoption of this amendment. I ask that my colleagues in support be recognized as well.

REQUEST TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes to be equally divided and controlled.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have a number of requests on this side of the aisle for time.

Mr. SKEEN. Would the gentleman agree to an hour?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, continuing under my reservation, at this time I would like to reserve the option to see how many more speakers may come to the floor.

Mr. TOOMEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman's amendment. Since fiscal year 1996, the Subcommittee on the Interior has taken the steps necessary to have the Department of the Interior and the Indian community clean up decades of trust fund mismanagement. After appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for this purpose, it has become clear that a number of "good government" legislative changes were necessary to ensure that trust fund reform can go forward. If trust reform is to succeed, these provisions must be enacted into law.

□ 1100

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Let us begin by acknowledging that this is not a partisan issue. We have had Interior secretaries under Democrat administrations and under Republican administrations that have struggled with this that have been subject to court orders and contempt of court and employees in both administrations. This has been an extraordinarily difficult issue.

Let us put a little perspective on this. Let us understand what is in-

volved with this. It was 1996 when five plaintiffs filed a class action suit against the Department of Treasury and Interior on behalf of themselves and 300,000 individual Indian money accountholders. It is called the Cobell v. Norton lawsuit for breach of trust in handling Indian funds.

Now, it is not as though the subcommittee and the House of Representatives and the Congress have not recognized the problem. Over the years, we have appropriated \$45 million for the trust fund accounting system, \$43 million for the trust asset accounting management system, \$22 million for data cleanup, and \$20 million for a transaction-by-transaction historical accounting of the named plaintiffs and their predecessors to serve as a benchmark to determine future funding requirements for this type of activity. This amount, about \$130 million, is in addition to all of the other things that we are doing on a day-to-day basis in the operations of the trust account.

Meanwhile, we have had the courts making and the plaintiffs making life very difficult for employees. They have had contempt of court motions filed against them. They are being advised to purchase their own personal liability insurance. As a result, many of them have recused themselves and they were not able to get employees to work on this accounting system. It is becoming an almost impossible situation for everybody within the department. We need to get this thing resolved.

Now, the reason we have this limitation, this historical accounting limitation, is because it would do all accounts that were opened as of December 31, 2000, going back as far as January 1985. That is virtually the vast majority of them. We are talking about going back to infinity in time to the very beginning of time, and we are talking about something that is almost impossible to do, and it is estimated that it would cost about \$2.4 billion, \$2.4 billion to do the accounting. It is extraordinarily expensive, but it is not going to yield the desired results because of the missing data that we have. So what we are talking about is trying to narrow this down to something that is reasonable that we can actually accomplish.

If we were required to undertake an extensive historical accounting, we would have to divert funds from other high priority Indian programs and it is going to have a disastrous effect on Native Americans.

We are likely to spend, even with this limited amount, we are likely to spend \$200 million over the next several years.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, what we are trying to do is the responsible thing, to act in a responsible way to make sure that we can get this historical accounting done for the vast majority of the Native Americans who deserve to have this done. One of the things we need to make sure that we do is to release the Ernst & Young report

that has been held up by the Court; the Court has denied its being released. It has been denied by the Court. We need to do that so we could see what we would have in the way of historical accounting for the numbers of people that would be affected. We need to give some compensation to employees for their litigation expenses. We need to have new members of the Special Trustee Advisory Board and, I think, ultimately, we need to limit this historical accounting to the 300,000 individual accounts.

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

Mr. KOBLE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and, certainly, as I said in my opening comments, this is something that has gone on through a Republican and Democrat administration. I would agree with the gentleman that it is very hard to get an historical accounting, a true accounting of these monies that are owed, and the Interior Department said that in our Committee on Resources during our hearings on this issue. They said that on numerous occasions.

But I think what we must recognize is that this issue is in litigation at the current time, as the gentleman has noted, and as we are all very much aware. That litigation should be allowed to proceed. I would fear, by the language in the pending bill, that we are prejudging the outcome of that litigation, and that is my concern.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, since I think my time is limited at this point, I would just say that it is in litigation, but it is not exactly the first time that the Congress of the United States has stepped in when there has been litigation to try to resolve something. This is litigation that has absolutely no end in sight; none. There is no prospect of this litigation ever coming to a resolution; there is no prospect of ever resolving this issue. We are trying to put some parameters around it so that we can get an historical accounting for the people who really need it. I urge this amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, as cochair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, I strongly urge the House to support the amendment to strike the provision in the Interior appropriations that would limit government accountability to Indians by restricting an historical accounting of Indian trust funds.

This provision would limit the legal claims against the Federal Government for mismanaging Indian trust funds by limiting the accounting from 1985 forward.

Further, the provisions would presume the balances as of 1985 are correct, even though the government admits the money has been mismanaged for decades.

It would also overturn a central provision of the American Indian Trust Management Reform Act, legislation enacted in 1994 after many hearings and deliberations on this issue. That act requires that the Secretary of the Interior provide a full accounting for "all funds held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Indian tribes or individual Indians."

The Federal courts have also mandated that the government provide Indians with an historical accounting based on trust principles that apply to all Americans. The D.C. Federal District Court and a unanimous D.C. Circuit have already ruled that the government owes Indians an historical accounting of all funds from the date the funds were deposited into Federal accounts for Indians.

To overturn the earlier mandate of the Congress and the Federal courts for this important act of government accountability fails the poorest Americans: Indians, who rely on money from their lands to whom the Federal Government owes a trust responsibility.

This provision also raises new claims that this proposed congressional action constitutes an unconstitutional taking of Indians' property: their money.

Mr. Chairman, this is the Indians' money, not the government's. It is not from a Federal program or entitlement, but from the leases of Indian lands. Money comes directly into the Interior Department in trust from Indians from payments for use of Indian lands for grazing, timber, and mineral royalties. The United States has admitted that it mismanaged and lost the money.

This amendment would absolve the government for accounting for that mismanagement while opening up the government to new legal claims based upon unconstitutional taking of property.

In effect, this provision we seek to strike legalizes years of malfeasance, misfeasance, and nonfeasance. In some instances, it legalizes actual theft of Indian property.

Right now, a Tribal Task Force on Trust Reform is currently working with the Department of Interior on a trust fund proposal that, upon completion, will be submitted to the committees of jurisdiction for review. Let us let them finish their work, and we are working with them. I have been in contact with them, this Indian task force and the Department of the Interior. They are seeking a solution to this themselves.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to strike these provisions from the Interior funding bill.

Mr. Chairman, we spend \$16 billion a year on foreign aid. Should we not at least be willing to render justice to our Native Americans at a much less cost when it is their own money?

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with great interest to the debate, and I

want to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), for bringing this to the floor to discuss. I also happen to agree with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL). This issue has been with us since 1906, and if anybody has a responsibility, it is this body, the Congress. Because it is our estimate, and when I say ours, the different accounting firms and not Andersen, but different accounting firms, there is about \$12 billion unaccounted for that belonged to the American Indians. In my State alone since 1971, we cannot account for the BIA \$800,000, and that is a short period of time.

But I will say that what the committee is trying to do here, and I hope that as we go through this process, what I am worried about, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) mentioned, this is the Indians' money, and he is absolutely right, but what is happening is it is going to be the lawyers' money. It is going to be the lawyers' money. What the committee has tried to do, and whether they are right or wrong, and why they picked 1985 I do not know, is try to, in fact, pick the date that has the modern communications system for accounting, the computer system that is in place so that they can account for that period of time.

I do not believe, and if I could ask, although I do not see the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) here, but somebody, perhaps the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) or the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), is there somebody who can tell me, this does not preclude or close off other investigations prior to 1985. Can anybody address that? Does anybody know? Is anybody listening?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the gentleman from Alaska, and I believe that the gentleman is actually giving a very good description of the situation we are in, and I am going to double-check that, if the gentleman will give me 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will get back to the gentleman.

What I am suggesting here is I do not want to see this happen, this to go on and on and on, and never be settled. If we can get the money from 1985 and not preclude the money beyond that and the earlier years, then I think we have achieved a goal. But right now, we know who is making the money out of this, and that is the lawyers who are presenting the cases and it is the lawyers for the government who are defending against government inaction, a malfeasance. So I am just saying, let us try to bring a conclusion to this, and let us really work on making sure from now on that the system works.

Now, I will say when Ms. NORTON became Secretary, the first thing I did was call her up and said get rid of the BIA and that accounting firm for the trust fund because it is not working. Mr. Babbitt was cited for contempt. But that is not the only person, the person before him, all the way to 1906, the government has not acted as I think they should, and I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), that is absolutely wrong. But right now we have to try to get this thing started so from now on we do not have the misuse of these funds and, in fact, the loss of these funds.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Even if we were to adopt this arbitrary cutoff date of 1985, from 1985 on, we cannot even get a proper accounting. Mr. Tommy Thompson, one of the special trustees before our committee, testified as such when he said that we cannot get a grasp of the short-term leases that have been recorded post-1985. So we still have an accounting nightmare out there in which we cannot track everything.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that means that we have to address that issue. We have to address that issue, maybe not in this legislation; I will be honest with the gentleman on that, I am not sure this will do it. But I am saying somewhere along the line we have to solve this problem. Create a grand master, make an accounting firm that will handle that and get out of the BIA, because as long as the BIA is where it is, we will never have a good system of accounting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has expired.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, first of all, it is going to cost about \$900 million just to do the accounting back to 1985. The department does not have all of these records, or they would have done it. We have to have a settlement. At some point this Congress is going to have to impose a settlement on this issue. I have done one before, the Puyallup Indian land claim settlement, a very comprehensive settlement which Congress supported. We are going to have to craft a settlement.

Now, if these gentlemen who have come here to the floor today to help us, if their committees would get busy and develop a compromise and do a settlement on this issue, it could be coming from the Congress. Somehow we have to resolve this, because we do not have enough money.

I think there is a lot of wishful thinking that suggests that this is all going to come out of the Justice Department. It may not come out of the Justice Department. If there is malfeasance, Mitch Daniels is going to say, Interior, you repay this \$2.5 billion, 5 billion, whatever the number is. So that is a possibility.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman. What I am suggesting to the people and those of us who support the American Indians, as I do, I think it is the responsibility of Congress. Because if we look at the trust, if we look at the trust, if we look at what is said about the American Indians, the trust belongs to the Congress.

□ 1115

We have been neglectful in not pursuing and making sure that this issue had been solved in previous years.

So I am asking us to sit down, as the gentleman mentioned before, and say, let us solve this problem, because they owe their money to themselves. We have spent that money somewhere. It is our responsibility.

Like the gentleman says, they will say, we will not appropriate, we do not have the money. But somewhere along we have to step up to the plate and say listen, we have spent that money, we owe it to them, and we ought to take it and get it to them as soon as possible and shut the doors.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this is why they cannot get this done, they do not have all the records. There is no possible way to do this. Someone is going to make an estimate of what is there, and it can either be done by the court, which is not helping us, by the way, or by the Congress.

If we do not do it there, between the parties, then it has to be done by the Congress. Congress has to step in, the authorizing committee has to step in, and come up with a legislative settlement of this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for my colleagues who have been speaking so far this morning.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for one minute, this is something unrelated that I think the gentleman will support dispensing with.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) have 1 additional minute to answer the question.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), who objected to that time limit on this amendment.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) will not object to other amendments in title I as long as title I is not closed up, which would reserve the gentleman's right to offer amendments to title I at a later time.

So when we consider other amendments under title I, such as the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), we can agree to a time limit without the gentleman's objection.

Is that the gentleman's position?

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me.

I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee, we do have a number of additional amendments which we would certainly reserve the right to introduce. However, we recognize many Members have important amendments, and in the interest of cooperation here and in giving everybody their opportunity, we would agree to not object to any agreements on time limits on the amendments that the gentleman would like to offer in title I, provided that when the gentleman finishes with his amendment, the committee rises without closing out title I.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, again I want to say that I have a great deal of respect for those who have spoken so far. I know that they are well intentioned, but I am very disturbed by some of the comments and the procedure that we are following this morning.

Let me say that I understand perfectly what the gentleman from Alaska said, but this is a debate that really does not belong here. I know we are dealing with money and trust reform, and one could argue that somehow it is appropriations related, but I think the very fact that there is such a debate, and so many questions about what we should be doing with the trust funds means that it should not be done on an appropriations bill.

There should be a hearing, or perhaps a series of hearings that are being held in the Committee on Resources, in the authorizing committee, not here on the floor, when we are dealing with this larger bill.

I think it is a huge mistake. The very nature of the debate shows it is a mistake, and why we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Beyond that, I was very disturbed by some of the comments the gentleman

from Arizona made. He talked about how we have spent a million here or a million there in order to try to deal with this trust issue. But we are talking about a scandal, I use the term "scandal" because that is what it is, that affects about \$10 billion in funds that may or may not be owed, depending on the amount, to American Indians.

We have had problems over the last few weeks and the last few months with the corporate scandals and the accountants that we have had in Enron and WorldCom and everything else, and everybody on a bipartisan basis has been on this floor saying that we have to take responsibility and the CEOs have to take responsibility and do the right thing to make sure that the accounting is proper.

Why is that any different for the Federal Government? Why is it any different for this Congress? This Congress has the same responsibility. I am not interested in whether the employees at the Interior Department are going to be harmed in some way, or whether or not they are going to have to go out and get a lawyer in some way because of something they may have done wrong.

We are talking about people who historically have been harmed by this Congress. We have a special burden here. There are 100 or 200 years of harm to American Indians, and they do not trust us. I understand why they do not trust us, because of the things that have happened historically with this Congress and with the Federal Government.

There is a special burden here, a special burden that goes beyond the Enrons and the WorldComs, so they do not think that everything that they do and everything that Congress does is going to harm them and be discriminatory against them.

I know it is very easy for us to say here that we have to worry about this money and we have to worry about that money, but I think for us to suggest here today that we are going to have some sort of cutoff pre-1985, or we are going to have some sort of cutoff after the year 2000, and say that we are going to limit the accounting or what the liability should be without having consultation with American Indian tribes is a huge mistake.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) mentioned that there is now a task force within the tribes in the American Indian community that is sitting down with the Interior Department, with Members of Congress, with our Committee on Resources, and talking about a process that we should go about, in consultation with them, to decide how to deal with this essentially accounting issue.

We need the time for that task force to sit down, to come back to the authorizing committee, the Committee on Resources, and discuss what should be done so that American Indians do not continue to be harmed.

It is not fair for us in this little debate today, even though my friends are well-intentioned, and I am not suggesting they are not, it is not fair for us in this half hour or hour of debate to make cutoffs and arbitrarily decide what we want to do, even if it is for monetary reasons, because there is too much money involved, there is too much of a history of discrimination involved. And given what we have seen with the corporate sector over the last few weeks and the last few months, I think we have a particular responsibility as elected officials and as representatives of the Federal Government to not do the same things in trying to protect the CEOs or, in this case, the government officials who have the responsibility to deal with this issue.

It is wrong to have that discussion here. This amendment should be passed, if for no other reason than this is not the forum and this is not the time to be taking this action.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the House is in the Committee of the Whole House to consider this, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, acknowledging what I believe to be good-faith efforts of the appropriators for what is a very difficult problem. Indeed, simply to call this a very difficult problem may be the understatement of this new century, and maybe the understatement, quite candidly, Mr. Chairman, of almost 3 centuries.

I was honored, upon first arriving in this House, to join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, in a bipartisan fashion co-chairing a task force dealing with this very problem. In 1994, this Congress required the Secretary of the Interior to provide an accounting of all funds held in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or individual Indians.

There is a body of law, ratified treaties, the long-standing tribal trust relationship, the sacred trust, that this government must exercise. And there are larger questions, not only from an institutional perspective, where, despite the good faith of our friends, the appropriators, they are actually stepping in to what the authorizing committee, my colleagues and I who serve on the Committee on Resources, should be working out.

We have taken steps, and I appreciate my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan. We have held some hearings. My friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, quite correctly pointed out that the tribes themselves, working with the Department of the Interior, and let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the current Secretary of the Interior takes this seriously. She has worked on this every day. The contempt citation offered by Judge Lambert is something that she takes seriously.

Good people can disagree; but it seems to me if we are involved in fo-

rensic accounting, the point has been made in a variety of news analyses that when we look at the hocus-pocus of either maladroitness or unethical accounting, whatever the corporate world has done cannot eclipse, for whatever reason, what has gone on for a long time in the halls of government.

So, Mr. Chairman, let it begin here. Our first genuine efforts at accounting reform, let it begin with the first Americans, the first Americans, who have taken steps in good faith with the Secretary of the Interior, who has taken steps in good faith with an authorizing committee that wants to work together in good faith to address this problem.

It is a challenge, to say the least. But the remedy offered, however well-intentioned, by the Committee on Appropriations today is something we should thank them for, but ultimately reject. That is why I support this bipartisan amendment. We will work this in good order and move to accept this amendment. I thank my friends who have spoken on behalf of it.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Arizona or the subcommittee aware of any formal requests from the administration for this provision?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am not aware of any formal requests for this particular provision. I think it offers another compelling reason why we thank the appropriators, given the magnitude of the task, but reassert the role of the authorizing committee, and recognize the good but challenging work that has been done thus far to try and deal with this problem.

So again, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment. This amendment strikes a provision that would limit a historical accounting of Indian trusts. The accounting would only cover the period from 1985 to 2000. How can we limit the accounting to such a short period when the accounting practices in question date back over 300 years?

At a time when we are trying to increase accounting responsibility in the corporate world, can we really say that these standards apply only to them, and I say, only apply to them, Native American Indians? Can we really be that unfair to Native American brothers and sisters, once again, to our Native American Indians being unfair?

The President and Congress has made it clear that the proper accounting goes hand in hand with high moral standards. Should we not expect the same standards to be applied to the Federal Government accounting Indian

trust funds? Morality and ethics should be applied to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, this provision undermines a Federal law that this House passed requiring a full accounting of all trust funds. It also undermines a Federal court decision requiring an accounting of all funds, regardless of dates deposited.

Most importantly, it undermines our moral and ethical values. We cannot argue for fairness in corporate accounting and act in such a way which is unfair today, as we are to Native Americans who have made a contribution, who are the first Native Americans of this country, who have contributed so much to our society. We have a trust responsibility and a moral responsibility to provide full and fair accounting of all Indian trust funds. I urge Members to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to do is kind of go through some of the questions that have been brought up here. One of the questions was, Does the administration know about this? Does the administration support it?

The administration does know about this language and the administration does support this bill. Certainly, the Department of the Interior has fly-specked it as carefully as they can. As we all know, Democrats and Republicans and the administration are quick to point out what they like or dislike on anything we are doing here on the Hill.

The second issue I wanted to touch base on was one that the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) raised about precluding any dispute prior to 1985. It is the intention of this committee to not permanently preclude any accounting for other accounts for other periods. Why is the 1985 date the one we are starting with? We are starting with that because that was the beginning of the electronic era, when it became a little easier to track this.

Why are we in this situation to begin with? We go back, and this actually does span hundreds of years, the dates might not be exactly accurate, but say 1820-ish. At that time, there were Indian reservations. In 1833, there was an act of Congress that busted them up, and it was called the Land Allotment Act, 1833 and 1834.

□ 1130

And at that time much of this previous reservation land was returned into the hands of Native Americans. And then through a number of unscrupulous moves they lost a lot of this land. The Federal Government came back and said this is not fair. We have got to get the land back to the people who own it, and so they started a system of leasing land.

Now, let us say you were a Native American in 1840 and you owned 240 acres of land, easy, clear to understand. But fast forward down the road

100 years, and you have got a thousand people, a thousand heirs who are claiming that 240 acres, and in many cases smaller tracts of lands and more heirs are claiming it. So it is very difficult to administer this thing.

To give you an idea what we are talking about, some of these leaseholders are getting paid 3 and 4 cents, Mr. Chairman, and it costs \$30 or \$40 a lease to administer the payment to them.

So what the committee is trying to do in this confusion is bracket the problem off and say, tell you what, the year is 2002, let us go back to 1985 where we had hard core electronic records of the land. Let us start with that. Let us try to figure this out in this bracket. Now we are not saying we will not go back, but we are saying from this point on let us clean up the mess that we have because this portion is more manageable.

It is not, again, the intent of the committee to preclude any accounting problems prior to 1985. But one thing I want to say, if we do not put a bracket on it, we are looking at \$2.4 billion in accounting. And a lot of money, this money, as the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has pointed out, is going to wind up in the hands of lawyers, not in the hands of the Native American landowners. So the committee is trying to find some reasonable balance and it is bipartisan.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I think the thing we want to emphasize here is that we are trying to get this thing resolved without spending what has been estimated. If we go the route we are going, it could cost from \$500 to \$700 million out of the Interior Department budget to do this historical accounting. What we have proposed is let us take the period from the year 2000 going back to 1985, let us do that first, that is going to cost approximately \$900 million. That is still going to come out of the Interior Department budget. Then, if the Congress, if the authorizers who we see here today, want to, we could then have a subsequent congressional act that would, go back 100 years and try to reach some kind of an accounting, estimate, or settlement on what would be fair considering the facts that we do not have the accounts.

What we are faced with is we have got a broken main here. And money is gushing out because of this lawsuit. It could be up to a billion dollars, \$500 to \$700 million up to a billion. On 5 individuals they spent \$20 million. And that is the finding that the judge will not release to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) has expired.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a very tough problem and there are some who may not realize that this is already hurting all of the other tribes because this money comes out of the Interior budget and is not available for other programs.

Now, Babbitt tried as hard as he could. I believe that Norton is trying as hard as she can. But you have litigants who are going after the people in the agency who are trying to do the work, forcing them to be recused and threatening them with civil liabilities. This is an outrageous act of legal activity aimed at trying to destroy the Department of Interior and its ability to function. In fact, people are being held personally liable under lawsuits because of their work in this particular matter.

I just think that this is broken. We have got to fix it here. It is a possible way to move forward with a reasonable amount of money. We could spend a billion dollars and still not get the information because it is not there, the information pre-1985 is not there in any definable way. You cannot do this job. And if you just keep throwing money at it and say, do it, and they cannot do it, then we cannot get anything done.

I am a very practical guy. At some point if it is broke, let us fix it. Let us come up with a settlement. Let us get the authorizers to do something and create a settlement here and pass it through the Congress that is fair and equitable. Listen to all the witnesses. Listen to the best information you can get, the best estimates you can. Do a settlement, not this litigation which is broken.

We have a judge that is out of control who is saying the Department cannot use the Internet. To me it is one of the most outrageous things that I have witnessed in my career. We have to stop it. If the Democrats are worried about saving some money, this is a place to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) has expired.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I want to make the point, this is not an arbitrary move by the Committee on Appropriations. There were budget hearings on this, oversight hearings and annual appropriations committees. All we are trying to do, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has said, is just start with some certainty from 1985, from here on, that point on, we are going to clean it up. And that cost is going to be about \$900 million. If we do not have that 1985 bracketed, we are looking at two things: A cost of about 2.4 billion according to the Department of Interior's Office of Historical Trust Accounting. And what is worse than that, we will not be able to resolve it.

Mr. DICKS. There is \$143 million this year in this budget for this activity.

This is broken. We need somehow to get our hands around this and try to come up with a settlement. Congress is going to have to do it or we are going to spend billions on something that we cannot do.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, this helps a lot of people in that 1985 to 2000 and on bracket. There are lots who are not going to be benefitted either way but these people will be helped tremendously.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am impressed with the sincerity, I think, that is being offered by our various points of view in different perspectives on the floor here. However, the longer I serve in Congress, this is an area where I do not just feel worse, I feel guilty as an American about the treatment of our Native American citizens. And it seems to me the efforts here to establish an arbitrary date, which is arbitrary, which is not going to stop litigation, which is not going to solve confusion, is not going to help make the process work. By all means, treat it as the crisis that it is.

I identify with the comments from my friend from New Jersey who talked about how people are pulling all sorts of rabbits out of the hat around here dealing with corporate responsibility, including putting bills on this floor that have never been to committee, that we never had a chance to analyze, that have had significant ramifications because there is a scent of scandal in the air.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, this is a scandal of monumental proportions. And I would hopefully, respectfully suggest that instead of trying to jimmie it, to cut the ground out from underneath it, to try and take a small portion of it, that we move forward, give it the treatment that it accords. Work with the authorizing committee. Work with others here who have the sincere effort to move it forward. Put serious money behind it. It is going to cost a huge amount of money, but it seems to me that it is not going to move us forward by trying to arbitrarily bracket it here in the appropriations bill.

I strongly support the amendment from the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL). I hope that we can use this as a way to start forward, taking the good will that has been expressed on a bipartisan basis, the acknowledgment of the financial contribution that is going to have to be made, approve the amendment, but move forward with a comprehensive approach.

I know that there are Members of this Congress who would like to do some serious legislating. This is an area where I think people would step up to the plate for Congress to finally accept its responsibility. I would not like this to be perceived by our friends in the Native American community as

another chapter in this long, sad history.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I think when we come to this floor and we find ourselves in a time like this, I am excited. I see a ray of light that can finally maybe work for this problem. I agree with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). This issue is so complicated it should not be on this bill. We need to support the Rahall amendment, and we need to fix it this issue. And the positive side of this, we see Members from both sides of the aisle recognize that, A, that this problem is difficult, that it has been festering for too long and that it is wrong of what our government has done to Native Americans.

How many of us, when we walked out of Dances With Wolves, felt sad? Probably sad that in what we have done to the Native Americans. What about Wounded Knee? What about Code Talkers? I do not have a reservation in my district. There is one in San Diego.

I want to tell you what these Native Americans are trying to do. They are trying to stand on their own two feet, and every time they stand and they may just get one leg up, this government takes and whacks them and knocks them down.

This is a chance for us to come together as Members of Congress, both in the House and in the other body, and really do some good. I want to thank my colleague, and I think that it is time that we act. Members will find that I think most of us on this side of the aisle are very, very supportive.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the request that the limit be 30 minutes equally divided between the opponents of the amendment and the proponent, myself? Fifteen minutes each side, is that the request?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the gentleman's request.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, it is the intent to do 30 minutes total, but if the gentleman would want to substitute to another number, I think that would be appropriate.

Mr. RAHALL. I have no problem with 30 minutes. I just wanted to make sure I understood the division of time therein.

Mr. KINGSTON. Fifteen minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request is to limit debate to 30 minutes, 15 minutes divided and controlled by the gentleman on this amendment and

on all amendments thereto, equally divided between the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and a Member opposed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to address in colloquy with the chairman. Would the gentleman be opposed to making that 40 minutes, primarily the next amendment? We have many, many speakers.

The CHAIRMAN. It is just this amendment and any amendments to this amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the unanimous consent request is granted.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) controls 15 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I think it has become clear that the language in the appropriations bill has become unacceptable. I think somebody said earlier on the Republican side of the aisle, we should thank them for the language but we should reject it because I think it does not deal with this in a proper fashion.

We have all understood and many of us have been struggling for many years on a bipartisan basis on many committees to get around the mismanagement of these funds, to get an accounting and get the money to the people who deserve it. It is a massive mismanagement of the funds by the Federal government and people have been hurt and damaged by this and we must resolve it.

I think the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has made some good points. I think the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and others have made some points that we are at a point here where to some extent the Department of Interior does not want to admit that they cannot reconcile the accounts, and we keep giving them money to do a job that maybe they cannot do.

Other people are not interested in a settlement at this point, but my concern here with bracketing this to 1985 is we really have not discussed what we do with the others. I appreciate people said our intent is not to close it off, but maybe we ought to reject this language; and hopefully between now and the conference committee be discussing with the parties that this is a staged operation. What happens to the people before 1985 or the accounts in 1985. Is there a parallel negotiations that can be entered into, because everybody has pointed out those records will not be full and complete.

□ 1145

I am afraid that this alone leaves us with kind of a large unanswered question, what happens pre-1985, and I know the Members of the committee have expressed, well, this really, we can come along and authorize that later, but that puts a lot of people at a disadvantage.

So I think we ought to reject this language, but we ought to do it in the spirit of what people have said both on the Committee on Appropriations and on the authorizing committee about, I do not know that we can direct in legislative language a settlement, but we have got to direct the parties that we cannot keep funding this sort of Alice in Wonderland attempt at accounting when it will not resolve the issue in the end, and it is taking money away from vital programs.

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 completely concur with the gentleman. I think the gentleman laid this out correctly. That is what needs to happen in terms of having some mechanism created to deal with pre-1985 so that we get some expert estimate, and negotiate that.

Our hope was to take to the present, forward where we believe the records are sufficient, and get that done as quickly as possible. I do not know how we are going to have to that structured, but that is what we need to do. I would love to work with the gentleman on this to try to see if we cannot move something like that forward.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the concern here is that some people are affected 1985 to 2000 and other people are affected 1785 to 1985. I think that we have got to make sure that we can assure both parties that their rights will be protected, but we also have to get them to understand that no matter what we do, no matter what the accounting is, even 1985 to 2000, it is going to be disputed. So we are going to end up at some point in settlement, and those settlements must go forward.

I am afraid that the Department keeps asking for money to do the accounting. Part of that is trying to insulate themselves from liability, that they are working on the issue, but they are digging a hole.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, they are directed by the judge to do this.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Exactly.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, then the litigants go after the people doing the work, saying they are not acting in good faith, and then they have to be recused, subject to litigation, personal

liability, I might add, which we have tried to take care of in this bill.

This thing is broken; and somehow all the people that are here today expressing their wonderful concern, there is going to be a tomorrow, and we will see if anybody really wants to stand up with the majority side obviously having to be involved and work on this. This has to be done. We have got to get something done here.

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

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I perfectly agree with the statements that have been said. We want to settle this. We want a settlement. Let us allow the current litigation to go forward or get a settlement.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what efforts have been made by the Committee on Resources to foster a settlement?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think, with all due respect, it is very clear, I am sorry to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and others, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), when he came here with his special commission.

Part of this was about getting the administration, the past administration and others to recognize that they had real liability for these funds. Let us not forget that we were being pushed back by the Department of the Interior for many, many years to somehow this problem did not really exist. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), to his credit, is the one who really broke it open.

Now they recognize that they cannot escape that liability. They had had preliminary discussions about settlement. We have got to encourage that to go forward, but we cannot make this decision about 1985 here and now without the consultation of the other parties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) wish to control time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, yes, I would like to control the time; and I reserve the balance of the time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), a valuable member of our Committee on Resources.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and let me just first thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for his leadership on this bill. The chairman is from my home State of New Mexico. He has always served New Mexico very well, many years of distinguished service, and so I just want to say to him, I know this is going to be the last bill he manages on the floor, that we are all going to miss him very much, and he has been somebody I think that has always been there for New Mexico. So I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

I want to rise in support of this amendment, the Kildee-Hayworth amendment. This is a bipartisan amendment; and I think the important thing, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) said, is that Native American issues should not be partisan issues. This Congress should address these issues in a bipartisan way, and that is what we are trying to do on the Committee on Resources.

We have two senior Members that have offered this amendment. It is a good, solid amendment, and basically what it does is take out these provisions that hurt Native Americans. What specifically it does is when we talk about a court case, we are talking about the current court case of Cobell v. Norton. That court case is a case which arose from major officials violating their trust responsibilities to Native Americans.

The court has said in the strongest of terms and condemned the actions of Federal officials and how they have dealt with these accounts. So there is absolutely no doubt that there has been a violation by the Federal Government, and the provisions in this bill cut off Native American rights. There are very specific deadlines in there, and all of those need to be taken out; and the important thing here is this bill language comes at a time when the Nation is focused on accounting responsibility.

The President and the Congress have made it clear that accounting must be marked by transparency and high moral standards. We expect the same standards to be applied to the Federal Government accounting for Indian trust funds and not to allow the Federal Government to absolve itself of accounting responsibility.

So these provisions would throw the Native Americans out of court, and I do not think that is the way we want to go.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) raises, I think, a very good point when he says we need to move this case toward settlement. I do not think there is any doubt that we need to move this case toward settlement. We should be working on the settlement issue, and we should let all of the attorneys know we want to move towards settlement.

The key issue here, the committee that should be working on this is the Committee on Resources. We have had hearings on this issue. We have had Secretary Norton in the Committee on Resources as recently as February 6, 2002; and unfortunately, she will not admit that she does not have the records. Very pointedly, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, specifically asked her, Do you have the records? Can you do this accounting? She would not admit that she could not do the accounting.

So part of the responsibility for prolonging this comes from the Department, which is not willing to admit

that they do not have the records. They should step forward, say they cannot do this, and that would lead to some kind of settlement.

The last issue I want to raise is this issue of attorneys' fees, and the issue has come up that attorneys are getting rich on this. The lead plaintiffs in this case are the Native American Rights Fund. It is a nonprofit. It is a law firm that is dedicated to protecting Native American rights. They are only allowed to get their attorneys' fees. No attorneys are getting rich in the Native American Rights Fund, and so I would just say that that attorneys' fee issue, we ought to move that to the side, and as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) says, in terms of the committee, let us get on with settlement and move in that direction.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I think we made some progress here today. I want to make sure there is clear understanding that the committee, this committee has been one of the strongest advocates for Native Americans. We have increased every year that I have been on this committee; we have had added money for Native Americans.

This is not an effort by the committee to do something to harm the tribes that are affected here. What we are trying to do is to get them money in a reasonable period of time without decimating the interior appropriations bill every single year. I want that \$143 million to be used for other programs that will help Native Americans. I do not want to waste \$1 billion in going out and trying to do accounting that is not going to give us the information pre-1985.

I have talked to the chairman and the staff. We are prepared to work with the authorizers on language that would deal with the pre-1985 period between now and the conference committee and maybe we can put together a package as the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has laid out previously, which I think makes some sense, so that we can move expeditiously on the period between 2000 and 1985; and then we craft an approach for a settlement of some sort pre-1985 so that we move the game forward, get this thing moving in the right direction so that the tribes will get some money.

To do just historical accounting every single year and let this litigation fester is not accomplishing anything to help the tribes. They are not going to get the money. It is going to be years and years and years before this will be resolved. It will go through litigation. It will go to the circuit court of appeals. It will go to the United States Supreme Court. We need to work out a settlement; and this amendment was offered in the spirit of trying to break this logjam, trying to move this thing forward.

I would like to see the authorizers agree with us today that we should

work together collectively to try to come up with some pre-1985 language. The chairman and his people are willing to work with us on this, and I think we could make some very significant progress and move this thing forward.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, we strike the pre-1985 accounts and then give them some vague promise that we may restore that, and I have been working in Indian matters now as a legislator for 38 years, and many promises have been made.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman wants to make his speech, make it on the gentleman from West Virginia's (Mr. RAHALL) time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, may I make my next point then?

Mr. DICKS. Yes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I think what we do with this language that we have in the bill is just invite new litigation with more cost to the government, because as soon as this becomes law, new litigation will break out because we are taking property unconstitutionally.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we are not doing very well the way we are going, and again, the prospects are we are going to spend between 500 and \$700 million on the historical accounting. It could go to \$1 billion if we go the way we are going; and if we try this approach, we may be able to limit the amount of money spent to \$100 million on the 1985 to the current accounting, then work out an approach pre-1985. It has got to be a settlement because they do not have the records. It has got to be a settlement, and we ought to work on the language.

I resent the intonation that it is some vague promise. The gentleman from Washington has never ever made a commitment that I have not kept in my years in this Congress. When I say we are willing to sit down and work on something, that is not a vague promise.

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

I say to my good friend from Washington, and fellow classmate, that I do not believe I was referring to any vague promises.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, it was not you. It was the previous speaker.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the comments he made as far as his word and ability to work with everybody.

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about settling today, and I certainly agree with that. I think we all want to settle this very complicated and very unjust provision that does affect our Native Americans. I happen to believe, and the reason I offered this amendment, was that the provision in the

pending legislation happens to hamper us in that effort and perhaps even prejudices the outcome of current litigation.

My good friend from Washington has suggested that we perhaps work on this between the floor and the conference. And with all due respect, and I know he realizes, there are perhaps some scoping problems if that were to be done. I would suggest as an alternative using the framework of the gentleman from California, using the framework of the gentleman from Washington, whoever else's framework wants to resolve this in a fair manner, that we start with a clean slate. And in order to do that, we have to delete the current provision of the pending legislation.

I would note as well that the Department of Interior, as I have already noted in this debate, will never be able to conduct a full historical accounting of these trust fund accounts, and the Department has admitted that to us during hearings before our Committee on Resources. In my opinion, the Department should be sitting down with the plaintiffs in the current Cobell litigation and settle this matter and move on.

Something that has been referred to earlier is the lawyers' fees; that this is making the lawyers rich. I would note that the lawyers are working for fees only, no percentages, and I do not believe they could be described as getting rich on this issue. But, instead, I think some in the Department, and again this is not a partisan comment, but it has been occurring over time, have engaged in sleights of hand. They have thought to shuffle the deck chairs and intended to dilute their responsibility, and that is just truly unfair.

I would suggest that we delete this provision and allow litigation to come to a proper and fair resolution. And I would note as well that any settlement of this litigation would not be paid for by this appropriation bill; rather, any settlement of this litigation would come out of the Claims and Judgment Fund at the Justice Department, which is set up when the United States loses any legal case, not just in this matter but any others. That is where the settlement would come from.

It is not the intention of this gentleman to see this matter drag on any longer than it has. However, I cannot stand idly by while the rights of thousands of citizens are trampled upon by the limitation that is contained in the pending legislation. I think it is a dangerous precedent. It is one we should not be establishing, and especially in these times of widespread accounting scandals in the corporate world.

So, in conclusion, we all agree we must settle this, but I fear that the provision in the current legislation would harm our bipartisan efforts to settle this important matter for our Native Americans in a fair manner, and I would urge adoption of the pending amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for his comments. I want to make a few closing points that I think are very important.

Number one, on the question of 1985, it has been called an arbitrary date. It is not an arbitrary date. That is the date of the electronic records. If my colleagues do not like the 1985 date, what date do they want? 1980, 1975, 1979? And then with that gap, what records will you have? If you have the records for the period prior to 1985 to any other date certain, please come up with it.

Number two, this does not preclude claims that happened before 1985. It simply gets us started.

Number three, we are looking at now making real progress, getting the job done, or at least taking the first very significant step at a cost of about \$900 million versus a cost of \$2.4 billion. Earlier, on this bill, last night, we had lots of debate and heartaches about the money this bill was spending. It seems odd to me that now people would say, well, let us just spend \$1.5 billion.

And that money, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) has pointed out, may never get to the people who we all want to get the money to eventually. It has been said that the lawyers are not making money. Well, lawyers do tend to do things for a profit. The court monitors in 2001, for example, were paid about \$342,000. The court monitor was paid \$342,000 and the special master was paid \$354,000. That is compensation well over \$400,000 a year. So I think what was asserted earlier, that the lawyers are making money on this thing, I think is important to say.

This committee has long stood up for Native Americans. This is the committee that funds the Native American programs. This is the committee that advocates for Native Americans, and it is in that regard that we are saying let us get this job started with the 1985 date, do a good job on those that we know are certain, and then go back.

I want to point out that this bill has \$2.9 billion for Indian health services, new hospitals, critical health care services, research on diabetes and treatment. It has \$1.8 billion for the Bureau of Indian Affairs' operation of Indian programs. That, Mr. Chairman, means education programs, money for new computers, money for new teachers, money for new transportation so school kids can get to schools. And, also, this bill, at the advocacy of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and many, many others, puts \$22 million in Indian program increases, which will help build six new schools and continues critical hospital and clinic construction.

This bill does a lot of things because this committee, on a bipartisan basis, does everything it can for our Native Americans.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the one thing I want to correct, and I know the gentleman from West Virginia did not intend it, but there is an assumption being made by the proponents of this amendment that any claim in this issue will be paid for out of the Justice Department funds. We have had just recently a Ramah settlement, \$80 million, that came out of the claims fund, and OMB directed the Department of the Interior to take money from their accounts and put it back into the Justice Department.

So this is not a clear-cut case. And there could be an effort to make the Department of the Interior pay this.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Just on that point, Mr. Chairman, it would be a travesty of justice if the Indian programs ended up getting punished because of the mismanagement by the Federal Government of Indian trust funds.

I appreciate OMB may direct them to do that, but I cannot believe the Congress is going to go along with that directive.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it would not be just the Indian programs. All the programs of the Department of the Interior would have to be taxed for the \$80 million to pay back to the claims.

The point I am making is the gentleman from West Virginia stood up here and said that it is an automatic deal for the Justice Department to have to take care of this settlement. That is not an automatic deal. I want the House and the Members to understand that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 5093 offered by Mr. NICK RAHALL of West Virginia that would strike provisions in the Interior Appropriations bill that rob the legal rights of Native Americans. The provision in question limits the Federal Government's accountability to Native Americans by restricting an historical accounting of Indian Trust Funds.

Mr. Chairman, these trust funds have been entrusted to the care of the Federal Government for over a century and for nearly as long the trust has experienced rampant mismanagement of funds, destruction of records, and blatant dissembling by those charged with management. And the provision of the Interior Appropriations bill would seek to limit billions of dollars in claims against the Federal Government, claims that are legal and just, by mandating accurate accounting of the trust funds only from 1985 forward. The trust has been in existence since 1887—that is the date from which accurate accounting should be given.

Mr. Chairman, this provision is not only unjust, it's downright illegal, overturning a central provision of the American Indian Trust Management Reform Act that requires the Secretary of the Interior to provide a full accounting of "all funds held in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or individual Indians." If a Congressional act were not enough, the federal courts have also demanded a full accurate accounting from the date the funds were deposited into Federal accounts.

Mr. Chairman, these trust funds are not entitlements, they are monies that come directly from the sale or lease of Native American owned property and is held in trust by the Department of the Interior. This is Native American money. And the Federal Government has admitted the funds' mismanagement and an inexplicable "loss" of its money.

Mr. Chairman, the sort of mismanagement of accounts and destruction of records the Department of the Interior has performed makes the scandals of Enron seem like stealing from a piggy bank. If the House of Representatives truly wants to make a statement about fair accounting and accountability, it will start here by supporting the Rahall Amendment.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rahall Amendment and urge its adoption by the House. Included in the Interior bill are several provisions relating to trust reform efforts and the Cobell v. Norton litigation. These legislative provisions will limit an historical accounting of trust funds from the period of 1985 to 2000, which will assume all records before 1985 are correct. There is also language included in the bill that would not provide an accounting for funds held in an account closed as of December 31, 2000.

I believe these provisions undermine existing Federal law requiring a full accounting of all trust funds and a Federal court decision requiring an accounting of all funds regardless of the date deposited.

As a former Chairman of the Native American and Insular Affairs Committee of the House Resources Committee, I have heard countless times the concerns of Native Americans who say they just want an historical accounting done by the government entrusted with managing their assets. They have waited long enough.

I would strongly encourage the House to vote for the Rahall Amendment.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that the federal government has failed its responsibility in handling American Indian trust funds. But parties, Republicans and Democrats, agree that the governments has mismanaged these trust funds and there is definite need for reform.

Previously, trust reform legislation has passed Congress twice. In addition, a Task Force is currently working with Members of Congress, the Administration and the tribal communities on how to best reform how Indian Trust Funds are managed.

Unfortunately, current provisions in this bill would limit true fund reform. By accepting the provisions in the Interior bill, Congress must assume that the records and accounting are correct prior to 1985. This is hard to believe, due to the fact that the trust funds have been mismanaged for decades. The Federal Government is responsible for these funds, and to simply suggest that everything is perfect prior to 1985 is a slap in the face to our Native

Americans. Through legislation, Congress has asked for historical accounting of these trust funds and a Federal Court has ordered it as well. The provisions in the bill would overturn legislation already passed and could possibly open up the government to even more lawsuits. It is imperative for historical accounting to take place, which includes the years and decades prior to 1985.

The issue of Trust Fund reform is extremely important to me and the Tribes I represent in the state of South Dakota. Their voice needs to be heard whenever decisions are being made regarding Indian Trust Funds. I have heard from them, and they are adamantly opposed to these provisions of the bill.

We must remember that the funds we are talking about are not federal programs or entitlements, but money that Native Americans have earned from the lease of their lands for mining, grazing and timber. This is their money, and the Federal Government has failed to honor its responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment to strike the provisions of this bill, and the continuation of true Indian Trust Fund reform.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HAYWORTH

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. HAYWORTH:
Strike section 141.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 60 minutes to be equally divided.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the chairman if this is on the Hayworth amendment?

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Yes, this is on the Hayworth amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, is it his amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. And we would split it 30-30, or would it be 15?

Mr. SKEEN. Thirty-thirty.

Mr. DICKS. And then it would be split, the time in opposition?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes.

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

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. A further point of clarification. Again, this would be time divided between opponents and proponents, instead of along party lines?

Mr. DICKS. As I understand it, the gentleman from Arizona would have 30 minutes and the chairman and I would split the other 30 minutes, 15 minutes each in opposition.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friends for the clarification on a bipartisan basis. Appreciate where we are headed.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 30 minutes on his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for a simple reason: The current language in title I provides for yet another study of Native American gaming. Mr. Chairman, I am holding here in my hand a recitation of recent studies, most of them in the 1990s, a couple from the 1980s, but 73 studies in total dealing with Indian Country health, infrastructure, economic development, education and housing; and, more specifically, Mr. Chairman, to the question of the influence of organized crime on Indian gaming, no fewer than three studies already conducted by our Federal Government.

So 73 studies total, six of them directly linked to my good friend from Virginia. Let me say in defense of the work he does, I understand his intent and his sincerity, but I come to this floor to say that we must strike section 141 because it offers yet another study of something we have studied before and we have studied time and again.

The money involved here, I realize by Washington standards, does not even qualify as something to come out of Uncle Sam's change scoop. But, Mr. Chairman, a couple hundred thousand dollars would go a long way in Bylas, Arizona. A couple hundred thousand dollars would help my Native American constituents, who are dealing with fire and the aftermath of what went on in the White Mountains. This is real money. And to take this from programs of the BIA and apply it to yet another study, no matter how well intentioned, is exactly the wrong policy at the wrong time for what might be sincere reasons.

Not only is it ill-advised policy, Mr. Chairman, but once again we are getting into a situation where this House

could find itself in violation of rule XXI. No matter what mores or customs of the House have been observed here, the fact is, in the final analysis, by allowing this language to stay in the bill, this is a legislative rider on appropriations legislation. This takes from the purview of the authorizing committee the public policy that the authorizing committee should continue to control.

The exact language of this proposal is already found in H.R. 2244, a bill that is pending before the Committee on Resources. So not only, in my opinion, do we have an ill-advised study, number 74 on the list, and not only is it spending money that could be better utilized, but again it is a usurpation of the prerogatives of the authorizing committee.

For those reasons, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment and join in striking section 141 of this title I.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) controls 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) controls 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

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

Let me just say that what the gentleman said, the scope of this is totally new. Totally. There has never been a study of these issues with regard to the tribal relationship regarding the surrounding communities.

I worked at the Department of Interior for 5 years under Secretary Morton. I am sure for those who have ever gone on any reservation they have seen the utter despair that is on those reservations. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will hurt Native Americans.

Eighty percent of the Native Americans in this country, 80 percent, have never received one penny from gambling.

□ 1215

The Hopi, the Navajos, most of the tribes do not want gambling; but in many respects this has given an opportunity and allowed the country and allowed the government and the Congress to neglect Native Americans. Indians and Native Americans have suffered more and have not been treated well by this Congress and not been treated well by this administration or previous administrations.

The poverty level that afflicts Native Americans, they are in the 36 percent category. The gentleman says there have been other studies, but they have

not worked; and we all know and anyone who has been on an Indian reservation knows that what has been tried has not worked. Why do Members oppose something that is going to study something to see if we can do something to help Native Americans?

With regard to stroke, they have one of the highest rates in the country, so that is not working; and the study over there is not working. Lung cancer, the highest; breast cancer, the highest; suicide, the highest. So the policies of the Congress and the policies of both Republican and Democrat administrations have not worked. Why do Members oppose something that will bring members all together to come up with a study to help them?

The death rate among Native Americans is higher in seven major categories. Alcoholism, the death rate is 627 percent higher than other categories. TB, 533 percent higher than other categories. Diabetes, 249 percent higher than other categories. Accidents, 204 percent higher than other categories. Homicide, it is dangerous, 63 percent higher than other categories. Housing, and those Members who have been on Indian reservations know that housing is miserable; it is absolutely miserable. We all like to live in a good house and our constituents like to live in a good house. Why can they not have the same opportunity?

Crime is twice the national average on the reservation. Education is miserable. This is a commission, and what the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) does is strike this. It says we are going to put our head in the sand and say we do not know how bad alcoholism and education is. We are not going to look at it.

We have seen the movies, and the gentleman from San Diego has talked about the movie "Wounded Knee" and other things, we have seen the movies; but we are not going to look at it and see if we can come up with something different. Maybe an economic development administration, maybe an EDA like what has been used in Appalachia, maybe something constructive, something new that we can do to help. We must not be afraid to at least look at it.

The 13-member commission will include representatives of State Governors. That should not frighten us. Attorneys generals, members of the Departments of Treasury, Interior and Commerce, and the National Indian Gaming Commission, they are going to be participating. A local or municipal government official, a small businessperson from areas near the reservation, two representatives from nongambling Indian tribes, and they should be heard from. We should not just hear from those who have gambling and also two representatives from tribes that are operating gambling casinos. And thanks to the gentleman

from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), we will work with others who represent Indian interests.

So what will this commission do? It will take a thorough look at the living standards on Indian country, including health care, infrastructure, economic development, and education and housing. Now that is not a bad thing. That is not a bad thing to look at.

If Members lived on some of these reservations, Members would not object to us looking to see if we could come up with some constructive ideas to see if we could improve the situation. The commission will look at the effectiveness of current Federal programs designed to improve standards in these designated areas. That is not a bad thing. That is not a bad thing to look at. That will not hurt. That will not hurt.

Go on an Indian reservation and ask them whether they object to us seeing if we can improve housing and education and health care. Whether they have gambling or not, they will not object to this.

Crime control on Indian reservations, we all like to live in a safe community. Would it hurt for Congress to look at crime on Indian reservations? What would be wrong with that? What would be wrong with looking at crime on Indian reservations? We would also look at the influence of non-Native American private investors on the Indian Federal recognition process. We know there have been Inspector General reports that the process is becoming corrupt. We know it. The Wall Street Journal knows it; the Boston Globe knows it. The London Day in Connecticut knows it. Papers know there are problems here.

They know in the previous administration, one person came in the day after the administration left and signed the recognition thing. And non-Indians are exploiting those in certain cases and taking advantage of them. So what would be wrong with looking at that, the economic, the environmental, the social impact? So after an 18-month review, the commission will submit to Congress a report containing legislative recommendations as to the welfare of Native Americans, including health care and infrastructure and housing and education.

I, frankly, think we in the government have failed Native Americans. I think we have used the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 to provide gambling as a staple of Native American policies. Since that act, our investment in Federal programs intended to improve the health and welfare of tribes has declined significantly.

Mr. Chairman, gambling has been an excuse to reduce the commitment of the Federal Government to the Nation's first citizens. A bad excuse. The overall portrait of America's most impoverished group continues to be dominated by disease, by unemployment, by infant mortality, and by school dropout rates that are among the highest in

the Nation. We can do something today to make a difference in the lives of the Nation's first citizens. We can quit hiding behind gambling as a panacea for Native Americans and take action to improve their health, their lives, and their welfare. I do not believe that those Members supporting the amendment believe any differently. I think we should do this. I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, from 1989 until now, there have been no fewer than one dozen studies dealing with the spectre of crime on Indian reservations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the co-chairman of the Native American Caucus.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, as co-chair of the Native American Caucus, I would like to express my strong opposition to provisions included in the fiscal year 2003 interior appropriations bill relating to establishing a commission on Native American policy. I support the bipartisan amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), whose knowledge and concern of Indian matters is of the highest order, and his credentials among Indians are held in the highest regard.

The commission proposed in this bill would address several areas including Indian gaming examined recently by the National Gambling Impact Study Commission. In 1996, Congress authorized \$5 million to fund this study. In fact, since 1980, more than 70 federally funded reports have been published that address the same areas that the commission would study.

Provisions similar to the amendment are included in H.R. 2244, a bill pending in the Committee on Resources, the committee of jurisdiction. These provisions will take Federal funds from badly needed Indian programs.

The funding for the commission would come from the Bureau of Indian Affairs operation of Indian programs line item, which pays for welfare assistance payments, housing improvements, roads, education, tribal courts, law enforcement, and other programs that improve the quality of life and the economic potential of those on Indian reservations.

Congress does not need another study to tell us that these programs require more funding, not less, to assist tribes and their members. Millions of Federal dollars have already been spent studying the same areas that the proposed commission would study. Congress should not waste taxpayers' dollars by duplicating studies on the same subject matter.

Congress should not take Federal dollars from Federal programs designed to assist tribal governments that continue to suffer from high unemployment rates, inadequate educational systems, poor road conditions,

and insufficient health care systems. I urge my colleagues to support the Hayworth amendment to strike these provisions.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the proposal for a commission in this bill by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

I fail to understand why we do not need this kind of study. In 14 years since the 1988 bill, we have seen enormous problems of poverty, school dropout, disease, infant mortality and unemployment. Since 1994, because we passed a more enlightened policy for the rest of America, we have reduced poverty among children in American 3 consecutive years. We have never done that. And the deepest reductions in poverty were among black kids. Why is it that we just ignore the fact that poverty among Indian children is terrible? Why do we not notice or study the impact on families of the level of substance abuse on the reservations. We have known it is there. Why do we keep appropriating dollars when we know they are not changing lives?

I see no reason to fear this commission, and I see every reason to look at what is Federal policy in regard to our reservations, and how does it compare to Federal policy in regard to the rest of Americans. Why is it Federal policy has reduced poverty in America but not for reservations? Why is it we are making progress on some of the child-abuse issues in the States and our Federal level, and we are not strengthening families on the reservations? Why is it that the school dropout rate is so extraordinary? What are the policy comparisons? What are the policies that we as Federal lawmakers are supporting in these different areas?

As one who is increasingly affected and frankly more aware of and knowledgeable about Federal policy toward tribes, I would have to say it is distressing to watch outsiders come in, finance big-stakes casinos, and watch the people in the surrounding towns pay for the hospitals that everybody has to use. I do not see the little guys getting the same benefit as the big guys.

It is time to look at this. I do not see that it is a danger, and I do not see that it is duplicative. Recognizing that on Indian issues I am not one of the more knowledgeable Members, but seeing Indians from my perspective in a community where they have benefited from all these resources, and we do not have the poverty, but seeing the big money going to some and not others, we need this study. It is disgraceful not to do it.

□ 1230

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chairman emeritus, in fact, vice 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 rise in strong support of this amendment.

I think most of you heard me yesterday on the floor. This provision should not be in this bill. This legislation was introduced in the Committee on Resources and it never had a hearing because we did not want one. We do not believe it is necessary. It has been repeated before. There have been many studies. The studies show, in fact, that the native groups are doing quite well in the gaming industry.

Let us not kid ourselves, this is what this is all about. But also let us answer the question. I listened to my good friend, and I do respect him a great deal, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and his opposition to this amendment. He is really trying to target the gaming. Let us be knowledgeable about that and recognize that, and he has that right to do so. But he talks about the suicides and the poverty and the poor housing and the education level and the sewer problems, all those things that every Native American has faced over these years. Let us not kid ourselves. This is nothing new.

But you ask why that occurs. I will tell you why it occurs. One of the basic reasons why is they are tired of having people study them and tell them how to solve their problems, of having the people come in with their briefcases, the Governors and this person and that person and say, "We're going to study you," and they have to respond to the study. It happens every day.

I live with them. I am close to them. My wife is native, my kids are Native American Indians, and I am proud of it. I think I have a little bit of knowledge about this. If you really want to help the Native Americans, let them help themselves, provide the money, but let them make the decisions, and not some commission. We know the problems. They know the problems. Let them solve those problems with their knowledge and their will and they will do it. We do not need another government study to explain this to everybody and spend that money out of needed funds. That is where these moneys are coming from. Let us give them credit. Intelligent, smart, persevering, if they have an opportunity and not the government to tell them how to do it and what they cannot do.

Let us say you can do it and we will help you. You know the old saying, a hand down will help everybody up. Let us not put our hand on their head again with another study. My God, if you go back to the history of this Congress, how many studies have we had and spent that money to take and identify the problem? In my case I will tell you. My 12 regional corporations know the

problem. They are addressing the problem. They know what can be done and they want to do it themselves and the money that is being spent on this commission ought to go to solving those problems and letting them do it themselves. That is what we ought to be doing today. It should not be in this bill. I told the leadership it should not be in this bill. We should not attempt to try to do it again and again and again. It solves nothing.

There are those who will say this is about gambling. I guess maybe those that oppose this, taking it out, is about gambling. I happened to be the author of that original gambling bill with Mr. UDALL. Some of you object to gambling and I understand that. I do not gamble myself, other than being elected once in a while. That is a gamble. But I will tell you one thing. I have visited most of these gambling establishments and seen what the people say about what it has done for their tribes. And, yes, there is outside involvement. You would not expect them not to have that. They hire the best. They do the job. If there is something illegally happening, then let us address that and we do that under the gambling commission and under the Justice Department. Both of those say there is nothing happening there that is illegal.

If you want to be against gambling, and I am all for that, let us eliminate all gambling. Let us not have racetracks in Virginia. They do not have racetracks, but lotto, pull tabs. What else? Racetracks in every other State. Gambling in some States. Let us look at that. But let us not have a so-called quasi-study to take and identify the problems when we know what the problems are. I urge this Congress to think about that a moment.

Let us let them help them lift themselves up. Let us not have a commission dictating to them what is wrong with their great race of people. That is all I ask you. Vote for this amendment. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is right on. I believe the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) is right on.

For you appropriators again, it is not your fault. I say this. I do blame the Committee on Rules and the leadership for not making this issue for a point of order. It should never have been protected. We would not have had this debate if we had gone through the legislative process.

Vote for the Hayworth amendment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of this bipartisan amendment, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the authorizing committee, the Committee on Resources.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding time. I commend him on his effort here today and his leadership, as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment to strike the provision

which authorizes the establishment of the Commission on Native American Policy to study Indian Country. This provision sets up a fiscally irresponsible study which is underfunded, far-reaching and duplicative of numerous other Federal studies.

As the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Resources, I do oppose the way this commission is being forced down the throats of Indian Country. Clearly, authorizing a study of this magnitude and the value of such a study is the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources. Yet we have not had the opportunity to study or hold hearings on this matter at all.

This language has not been publicly vetted and Indian tribes have not been permitted to participate in crafting this provision. So we should not be surprised that the commission and its study is set up to fail. It is simply wrong to set this up without allowing for open consultation with Indian tribes.

Funding for this commission is set so low that it would virtually guarantee a flawed study being conducted. In addition, these moneys would be taken from Federal Indian programs where they are badly needed for housing, transportation, welfare assistance, tribal courts and law enforcement.

As we have heard, Mr. Chairman, since 1980 more than 70 federally funded reports have been released addressing the same areas that this commission would study. Most of those reports were well thought out, narrow in scope and appropriately funded to assure accurate and comprehensive findings. Sadly, that is not the case with this commission.

It is clear, and nobody is being misled here, that the Committee on Appropriations can establish this commission and with the support of the Committee on Rules and the leadership of this House, we are at a severe disadvantage in trying to delete the provision, make no mistake about it. But just because the appropriators can do it to Indian Country does not mean that the appropriators should do it to Indian Country.

If you want to spend money and set up a flawed study, do not do it out of the paltry Indian program budget. I urge my colleagues to support the Hayworth amendment to strike the Commission on Native American Policy from this bill and once again to be fair to our Native American Indians.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment by the gentlemen from Arizona and Michigan, both fine and excellent Members of this body, but like many Americans, I am concerned that gambling is a panacea for the real problems of poverty on Indian reservations. As gambling

has become more and more a part of Native American policy, investment in Federal programs intended to improve the health and welfare of tribes has declined.

While the intent of the 1988 Indian Gaming Regulatory Act was to allow Native Americans to lift themselves out of poverty through self-reliance, today nearly 80 percent of Native Americans do not receive anything from gambling revenues. The reality is that most tribes, which are located in areas not economically viable for a casino, live in poverty.

The National Indian Gaming Commission, which is now in the bill, would be struck by this amendment. This would be unfortunate because the Indian Gaming Commission would undertake a study of a number of problems which impact the Native American community, including the welfare of Native Americans, including health, infrastructure, housing, economic development and educational opportunities; the relationship between tribal entities and nontribal communities; and regulations that govern tribal gaming to produce potential for abuse or exploitation by organized crime and the gaming industry.

This commission, I believe, provides a much-needed review of Federal policy on Native Americans. Given the current state of affairs, I urge my colleagues to preserve the National Indian Gaming Commission and to oppose the Hayworth-Kildee amendment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a genuine American hero.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Virginia said that 80 percent of the Native Americans never receive funds. That is not factual. It is absolutely untrue. The study that he himself proposed cost \$5 million. He said this would only cost \$200,000. Well, this 13-board commission also receives full per diem, airline tickets for 18 months. This is going to cost another million bucks. And study after study after study generated by the gentleman from Virginia. He can be opposed to gaming, that is fine. But do not try and do it with study after study, because the studies that he proposed found out many of the same things he is asking in this study. The only problem is he did not get the answers that he wants, so you do another study until you get the answers that you want. It is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior appropriations bill before the House does include these provisions, and it is wrong. No hearings. In the dead of night—actually it was the daytime—all of a sudden the gentleman from Virginia inserts an amendment on an appropriations bill, not authorized, not studied but in the appropriations bill. I was told by staff that if I did not object in the committee, this would be killed. And here I find it is okayed by the rules. Why? The gentleman is a car-

dinal and leadership recognized that. But it does not make it right. It should be eliminated.

The chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), is going to vote for this amendment because it is bad policy, terrible policy. There have been studies from the Department of Justice, memos from the Department of Justice to the anticrime, all recognizing the issues that the gentleman from Virginia is talking about. And you want to talk about Indian health care and education and those things. Absolutely. But visit some of these tribes. I do not have it in my district, but they are in San Diego and I visit them because they used to come down to my ranch to swim, the kids. I want to tell you, they did not have an education center. They do now. They did not have a health care center. They do now. As a matter of fact, that center studies alcoholism, which is a primary problem with Native Americans, and tied to that is diabetes. These people have pulled themselves up by their bootstraps. Just because you are against gambling, do not try to hamstring them and tie them down from doing the things that help them the most. It is just wrong.

We all want to do what is right and promised, but how many times have we looked at Native Americans and tied them down in every type of endeavor? Oil on their land. We took it. Their hunting rights. We stopped them. Water rights. They have to fight tooth, hook and nail even for water rights on their own land. We took it.

□ 1245

And here, for the first time, they found something that is viable. The study that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) commissioned found that there is no other viable, long-term, across-the-board resource that can help as much as this issue. They are doing everything that we ask. They spend millions of dollars to fund the gaming commission. They spend millions of dollars internally to fund it, and they are doing it right; and because someone is opposed to gaming, they want to stop it. That is wrong. Support the Hayworth amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute just to respond.

The study does show, as the Boston Globe piece demonstrates, which we are bringing over, that 80 percent of the Indians have never received anything. Fifty percent of all of the revenues have gone to 2 percent. It is actually an area of location, where you are is what you do, and Indians on the tribes and the reservations in most parts of the country have received absolutely nothing.

Secondly, it did not say what the gentleman said in that report.

Lastly, what the report that we are asking for talks about is looking at the welfare of native Americans, including health, which everyone will acknowledge, and I stipulate the goodness of

the gentleman on the other side; the health infrastructure, housing, and economic development, and educational, educational opportunities. They are all things that we all want for our families and for our constituents and others.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. My State of Connecticut is home to two of the world's, the world's largest casinos. In fact, both of these casinos are about a 15-minute drive from my home; both are Indian casinos, and both were built within the last decade.

When gaming came to Connecticut in the early 1990s, it was a fortuitous event. The Cold War had ended, defense cutbacks had affected our defense industry, our economy was in decline. Unemployment was high, and there was actually a net loss of population from the region. Indian casinos created thousands of jobs. They increased the State's revenues, and spared the region from an economic recession.

The casinos purchase goods and services and pay upwards of \$300 million a year to the State of Connecticut. Tribal members have been personally generous with their new wealth and support numerous community projects and charities.

But with all of these benefits come some very real problems. Indian casinos place a substantial burden on small, local municipalities who have no right to tax, to zone, or to plan for these facilities. Small State and local roads are overburdened, again, with no offsetting tax revenues. Volunteer fire and ambulance services are overwhelmed to the point that some have shut down their operations altogether. Land taken into trust is removed from the tax rolls. Gambling addiction creates problems at home, in the schools, and in the workplaces.

While Indian casino gambling in Connecticut has made two tribes very wealthy and has motivated other groups in Connecticut to seek Federal recognition, the fundamental question remains: To what extent has casino gambling improved the health and the wealth of Indian country as a whole, and what are the costs involved?

I have read that 365 of the 561 Indian tribes do not have casinos. I am told that up to 80 percent of American Indians do not receive any benefit from gambling revenues, and we know that many continue to live in terrible poverty. That is why I support the provision of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). A commission would examine how we can do a better job to help Indian tribes for whom gambling is not an option, either because of their geographic location or for other reasons; and it would also help examine how gambling affects the welfare of Indian tribes.

Earlier amendments have focused on substantial increases in funding within

this bill overall; tens, actually hundreds of millions of dollars. But this recommendation to establish a commission costs merely \$200,000. It is a small price to pay. It is an insignificant price to pay.

Recently, my hometown newspaper, The New London Day, editorialized in favor of the Wolf provision and they said, "His amendment will ruffle some feathers, but Representative WOLF is asking questions worth answering."

I concur with the editor, and I cannot understand why current information on an important issue is a problem. It would seem to me that current information on an important issue would be a plus, not a minus.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, continuing with the bipartisan support of this amendment, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), a fellow member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I listened to what the gentleman from Connecticut said and the gentleman from Virginia said and, again, just as on the previous amendment that we discussed today, there are a lot of important issues here, but it does not belong on an appropriations bill. The Wolf amendment is before the Committee on Resources. We should have a hearing. We should have an opportunity for all sides to be heard, not bring it up today in this debate in the context of the appropriations bill.

I just want to remind those who are opposed to this amendment that the law is clear that Indian nations are sovereign. They make a decision, just like a State makes a decision, about whether they want to have gambling or what kind of gambling they want to have; and as long as States are allowed to have it, they should be allowed to make those decisions as well. A lot of sovereign Indian nations have decided they do not want gambling, but a lot of them have decided that they do want it because they know that it is a way for them to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

Now, I do not hear any proposal here to say to, for example, a State or even my own State, well, why do you not have a Federal body that is going to look into gambling and see whether it is a good thing or not? This is only being imposed on tribes. That is not fair. There is no indication, as the gentleman from Virginia said, that somehow Indian gambling is corrupt versus gambling in other aspects. In fact, we have had many, many studies that have shown, in fact, that that is not the case; that it is well regulated; that it is not in any way a victim of corruption. In fact, there may be corruption in other types of gambling, but where is the indication that it is strongly or in any way significantly influences Indian gambling? There is not any.

I know that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is well intentioned. I

have seen him stand up for press people, and I know that he is not influenced by any special interests. But let me tell my colleagues, not him, but a lot of the people that are making the allegations about corruption in Indian gambling is because they resent the competition from Indian gambling. These media interests that are being cited here that are criticizing Indian gaming, they are not operating with clean hands. They represent special interests. So do not impose this on Indian nations and not talk about it in terms of other States or other groups that do the gambling. If someone is opposed to gambling, then look at it in general, but do not pick on Indian tribes, once again.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hayworth and the Kildee amendment to strike the Wolf language from this appropriations bill.

Like my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), I stand in strong support of the first Americans; and I believe they need to be given every opportunity as we work to ensure that they are full Americans. Our Constitution, as I have learned over the years, gives full sovereignty to our Native American tribes; and I think we all respect their efforts to be self-determined and self-sufficient.

The question is, Why do we need one more commission? Now, a lot of times when we talk to the tribes and they wonder, because they have already had 70 of these kinds of commissions, and what good is one more group of guys in suits carrying brief cases saying, we are here from Washington and we are here to help and we are going to study you and we need you to fill out these forms. We are going to take you away from all of your other activities, so, hopefully, we can get some results that we want for whatever our agenda is.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Virginia. I have admired his perseverance. He is a leading opponent of commercial gaming in America, and I have admired his perseverance about that, and that is what this is all about. What this study is being proposed for is to eliminate Indian gaming. That is the agenda here. Whether we support Indian gaming or not, the tribes have the right, under our national laws, to be able to engage in commercial gaming activities. If it is going to be discussed whether or not to take it away, it should be fully and thoroughly discussed in the Committee on Resources, which has jurisdiction over this language. It is the authorizing committee of this language. I would note that the Committee on Resources has not held a hearing on this bill and has not moved this legislation, probably because they recognize there have already been 70 other studies.

Now, if one opposes gaming, I would note that the National Gaming Impact Study Commission and National Indian

Gaming Commission have already thoroughly discussed these issues. Please vote for the Hayworth-Kildee amendment. It is the right thing to do. Let us not harass the tribes any more.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. What the gentleman said is not accurate. My good friend from Illinois said it is to eliminate, and that is not true. There is nothing in the bill that says that, and it is not fair to go down to the well of the House and say something that is not in the bill. That is not fair. I would urge the gentleman from Illinois, my friend, to read what it says. It does not say that.

I have a Boston Globe piece right here, Mr. Chairman. It said the plight of the native Americans is the unemployment rate, which is 43 percent. We argue in this body over is it going to go to 4 to 5 to 6 percent for non-Native Americans. Forty-three percent, says the Boston Globe. Employed, but living below poverty, 33 percent. I stand corrected; I just said it was 26 percent. It is 33 percent. Suicide rate for ages 15 to 24, the flower of the youth, 37.15 percent. We have to look at that. We have to look at that.

So what the gentleman says, and he is a good friend, it is not to eliminate; it is to look at other ways in addition. We do not say that.

Lastly, with regard to diabetes, my figure was too low; it is 9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kildee-Hayworth amendment and in support of establishing a commission to examine the Federal Government's policy towards Native Americans.

Our Nation has a responsibility to Native Americans. This commission would go a long way in finding out if the Federal Government is meeting this responsibility.

It is important for us to establish conditions so that we can examine what we are doing right, what we are doing wrong and what more needs to be done for the Native American community. Studies suggest the overall portrait of the community is failing in the areas of poverty, health care, housing, crime, education, and economic development.

Finally, I fail to see any harm in establishing a commission which would make recommendations on how we can improve the performance of Federal assistance programs. I see only a positive.

A commission will examine what the true effect of the Federal Government's reliance on gaming to the societal ills on reservations and answer the long-standing question of what it means for the Native American community at large.

□ 1300

I would also suggest that whatever we are doing today for Native Americans is simply not succeeding. I have

wondered for a long time why we failed to have any real, meaningful dialogue in the committee on why conditions are so bad for Native Americans.

I happen to believe that, sadly, gaming has helped in some communities simply because the Federal Government has failed to do its job. Gaming cannot be a substitute for what we need to be doing as the Federal Government to help our Native Americans.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), continuing with the bipartisan support for this amendment.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kildee-Hayworth amendment. This amendment strikes a provision that would create a Commission on Native American Policy to conduct more studies related to Native American communities.

This provision violates House rules that prohibit legislation on an appropriation bill.

We talked earlier about needing a study. The problem with this bill is it does not appropriate additional dollars. It does not appropriate additional dollars.

The studies have already been done. We know that. What we need to do is provide more funding. What we are doing right now is we are taking Federal funding away from Indian bureaus when we should be providing the additional funding for education, for housing, for law enforcement.

Yes, that is what we should be doing right now, but we are not doing it. All we are asking for is an additional study with no appropriation monies. We all have the information in front of us. What we should be doing is providing the funding.

Yes, I have been to Indian reservations. I have visited the schools. When schools are going on, we see a child who does not have a computer, does not have the technology; and when we look at people who do not have the clothing, we need to make sure that we provide the funding.

This study does not do anything for us. Let us make sure that we provide the assistance and support for the Kildee-Hayworth amendment right now that strikes this provision.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

It does not take it away from housing. It does not. It takes it away from the administration. It takes it away from the administration. We cannot come down and say things that are not accurate on the bill. It takes it away from administration; it does not take it away from housing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I personally find this a very difficult issue. On one hand, I think it should be abundantly

clear that gambling is corroding the fundamental moral fabric of our Nation, as hard work is being disconnected from financial success. We see more and more Americans thinking that somewhere it is in the lottery or by manipulation through the stock market or manipulating the bank statements of different companies; that there is an easy way out.

The more we see the advertising for the lotteries, the ads for the casinos, it is undermining the moral fabric. We are also seeing families deprived of the income that they need. As adult members of their family blow their savings, thinking they are going to see some pot of gold at the bottom of the rainbow, it is hitting their potential to actually care for the health care or the education needs of their children because of the gambling epidemic we have in our country.

That said, this is still a complicated issue, because I believe that some seem to argue that the only people who should not be allowed to have gaming are the tribal nations of America; that it is okay for all the politicians to run lotteries; it is okay for them to have the casinos, and not the Indian nations.

I think it is indisputable that there have been some financial gains to the Indian nations from this, and it has caused some transformation of the different nations. I have also seen in the State of Indiana where the Potawatomie Indians are being deprived their tribal status because competing gaming interests, as well as those of us who oppose gambling, do not want to see them own a casino.

The Miami Indians of Indiana have been deprived tribal status, even though they unanimously voted not to have a casino. Because of the fear that they might do a casino, they cannot get their tribal status recognized because of the opposition to gambling. Plus, those people have a vested interest in the gambling people.

That said, we still have a fundamental question that needs to be looked at. Yes, we have had studies. We have studies on child abuse all the time. We have studies on juvenile delinquency all the time. We have studies on drug abuse all the time because conditions change, variables change, and also the different studies change.

This government would not be spending hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars in studies, if the criteria for a study was, oh, we researched that before. We research all the time looking for new angles and information.

There are a couple of questions that clearly need to be looked at. While, superficially, additional dollars are being brought in to the Indian nations, but net, what is being actually transformed in those communities, and is it reaching the communities?

Or, secondarily, are there damages being done that are going to be very

difficult to undermine? Are there dependency things, and are we substituting quick financial success for the real things that we need to do: how to develop an infrastructure and an independence for these communities?

Secondly, when I was just in New Mexico, we could see every pueblo had been turned into a big casino operation; and the historic structures and things that historically were the way people viewed the Pueblan people were not the way they do them currently. Most of those cars at those casinos were not, there are not enough Indians to fill those casinos.

It is also having an impact on the communities around them. We need to be looking at the broader impact, in addition to the Indian nations.

I hope we will go ahead with this study. I am not hostile in particular to whether Native Americans should have casinos and the government should be allowed to do this, but I do believe we need to look at the impact on the peoples themselves and whether we have reached the limit, whether it is a corrupting influence on the families there and outside, and what the balances are.

I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is important. Where we get the money should not be the fundamental question; it is that we need this information to do a wise job managing funds.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a fellow member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

I rise in support of the Hayworth amendment in this bipartisan effort to remove the Wolf language creating a Commission on Native American Policy from the interior appropriations bill.

I have great personal respect for the gentleman from Virginia, and we agree on most things; but the Wolf provision is unnecessarily duplicative, and it violates rule XXI by legislating on an appropriations bill.

What is particularly troubling to me is that there was no process, no hearings, no authorization, no consultation. The Wolf language would direct available funds from the very tight budget of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to create a commission.

Others have said the proposed commission would duplicate existing reports to Congress. I will not go through all of that, but each of these questions has been answered a number of times, at great cost to the American taxpayer, millions of dollars.

If there has been any thread tying together centuries of failed United States Government policy toward the First Americans, it is the lack of consultation. In the name of trying to help Native Americans, there has been untold heartache and much loss of life. At a minimum, Native Americans should be part of any process and have the same respect and opportunity to be heard as

any other group who is being considered to have legislation in the United States Congress.

Let us let the committee of jurisdiction deal with this issue. Let us have hearings. The United States Constitution recognizes the sovereignty of the First Americans. I would hope this House would do so, as well, and support the Hayworth amendment.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), former chairman of the committee, continuing with the support for the bipartisan amendment we offer.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Chairman, and for offering this amendment.

Let us just begin that by understanding for \$200,000 we are not going to get a quality study covering this range of issues. It is just simply impossible, and to assemble the expertise for the time and effort to do that. That is why we spent \$5 million just on gaming in that commission.

Let us all understand that to say that 80 percent of the Native Americans do not participate in gaming does not tell us anything. Many States do not allow gaming. Many do not allow gaming at all. Many reservations cannot participate because it is not economically viable. Many have chosen voluntarily not to do that.

That does not tell us anything about the benefits of Indian gaming. What we ought to do is spend more time on reservations and see the kind of economic development, the kind of economic diversity, the kind of opportunity that is being presented now that did not exist.

I sat on the Committee on Resources and watched this Committee on Appropriations appropriate millions and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars in economic development that went nowhere, that went nowhere, just disasters across Indian country. Now we have an opportunity to have some success. They may not like that it is based in gaming, but the fact is that it is successful and it is providing that economic opportunity.

I have listened to this ruse argument about organized crime from the day we wrote the first statute to the Supreme Court, and nobody has been able to prove it; nobody has been able to show it. These people operate their casinos under more restrictions than any other operators in the country. This is just disingenuous. Disingenuous is what this is about.

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

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) said is not accurate with regard to more regulations than any other. In Atlantic City there are 12 casinos, and there are roughly 800 people, totally, who regulate them, 100 every day. In

Indian casinos, there are roughly 200 casinos and there are a few dozen, probably about 36. So what the gentleman said, again, is really not accurate.

Again, the fact deserves a cap on how much we are regulating. But that is not what we are talking about today. We are talking about health care and those other issues.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hayworth-Kildee amendment.

I understand the concerns people have about gambling in America. They are very real concerns, and there is much that we can do as a Congress and much we can do as a country to deal with some of the tragedy that occurs from gambling around the country.

But this has nothing to do with that. It has nothing to do with it. This is a study on Indian gaming when studies have already occurred. It is focusing only on Indian gaming. It is a mistake.

If the issue really is, and I acknowledge and I support and I have been involved in efforts to deal with some ancillary problems, and they are very real and serious problems about gaming in America, then let us address them. Let us have the Congress do oversight investigations. Let us do hearings on those issues.

Really, there is much we can do. There is absolutely much we can do in terms of research in terms of addictive gambling and things like that. But through this process, this is just a mistake; and the amendment should be supported and the study not go on.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself in support of the Kildee-Hayworth amendment. I do have the utmost respect for my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, and his efforts, never questioning his integrity nor his sincerity about the proposed amendment.

But Mr. Chairman, I submit, the Pacific Island cultures and the First Americans have been studied to death. We have had enough studies already: 11 Federal studies on health and economic needs of Native Americans; four Federal studies on economic development; nine Federal studies on educational needs of the First Americans; nine Federal studies of housing for First Americans; four Federal studies on infrastructure development; nine Federal studies on the effectiveness of the current programs that we are giving to the First Americans; 12 Federal studies on crime control in Indian reservations; six Federal studies on influence

on non-Native American private investors dealing with Indian gaming; three Federal studies on influence of organized crime, supposedly.

I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, the Indian gaming industry is controlled by the Federal Government under the auspices of the Congress. That is not the case with State gaming operations, and that makes a distinction here. There is no organized crime involvement in this effort. I submit, Mr. Chairman, we do not need this proposed amendment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as vice-chairman of the Native American Caucus to express my support for the Kildee-Hayworth amendment, and encourage my colleagues to strike this measure from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that since I was first elected to Congress, I have strongly supported efforts that would seek to expose the long history and failure of this country to recognize the deep poverty within Native American country.

I applaud the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for continuing to expose that. But the answer is not to take away the one vehicle that so many tribes have used to even take themselves out of poverty. The answer is, we need to put more money into Indian health services, more money into education, more money into Indian law enforcement. These are the answers.

Until we have those answers, we do not pull the leg out of the stool that is the one thing that many Native American tribes are standing on. That happens to be gaming.

□ 1315

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman on the other side.

To read from the Boston Globe, here is what it said: "Congress in the Reagan administration embraced Indian gambling as a vehicle to foster tribal self-sufficiency in 1988, after a decade of steadily cutting per capita spending on six major programs for Native Americans from 6,000 to 3,000 measured in 1997 dollars, a time when spending on social services aimed at the rest of America was on the rise." It goes on to say, "The result is untold riches for a few smaller tribes. Annual revenues are 100 million or more for a couple of dozen of additional tribes near major urban centers and continued poverty for the vast majority of Indians spread across rural America."

We are talking, Mr. Chairman, as I said, 43 percent unemployment. If we had 43 percent unemployment in our district, we would be upset. We would say let us study it. We would be saying let's storm the Bastille doors to do something. But today we are complaining about a study to see. Thirty-three percent live below poverty. Why

would not we want to find out today? You have different computers in your offices than you had 5 years ago. Did you say we do not want to study new computers? We do not want to change? So a study was done 5 years ago. We do it again today. But would it not be worth it to spend \$200,000 to do it?

The suicide rate is 37.5 percent. The national average is 13 percent of those ages 15 to 24.

I urge defeat of the Hayworth-Kildee amendment and urge that we can move on and study these issues so we can truly come together. And let me say there are Indian tribes who have gambling and who do not have gambling who were on this commission, good people. And I spoke to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), saying we can come together, if I happen to be successful, come together and try to find out the very best minds that are around in the country to see if we can come up with some new ideas to really make life better for these people who have suffered so much.

I thank the gentleman on the other side for the debate.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, last Sunday I was driving up on the Tulalip reservation in northwest Washington. I was going to a memorial service for a good friend of mine, and I noticed a really nice white building on the Tulalip reservation in Tulalip, Washington. It was a beautiful place on the water. And when I got to the service I asked my friend what that new building was, and he said that was the Tulalip Boys and Girls Club, and that was the first Boys and Girls Club on an Indian reservation in America ever.

It has been supremely successful. And the reason it has been supremely successful, in part, is because this group of folks have developed an industry to make this possible.

Now, I know many people have very sincere concerns about gaming, but I just hope that when we vote on this, we will think of the faces of those young boys and girls of Tulalip people who are learning respect for elders, discipline, team work in that building that has been allowed because this industry has been allowed to blossom.

I hope we reject this amendment, sincere as it is, for that reason, so these people can continue those American values of the first American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes studies of the obvious are important. But it is ob-

vious that across the width and breadth of the country we have the first Americans, quite candidly, oftentimes dealing with Third World conditions. Economic opportunity should know no bounds. If there are those who dispute some endeavors, God bless them. They have that right. But to again study, to add now to the grand total study number 74 of what we know to be problematic, I think is wrong. Support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be one of the supporters of this amendment to strike language in the Fiscal Year 2003 Interior Appropriations bill that would create yet another commission to study the benefits of gaming to the Native American community.

The Commission on Native American Policy created by the Interior bill would report to Congress on whether Indian gaming benefits Indian communities, whether Tribal government gaming is regulated and whether Tribal government gaming is influenced by organized crime. I oppose this language because it would be legislating on an appropriations bill. This provision has not been subject to any hearings or debate in the Resources Committee, which has jurisdiction over Native American issues. In addition, because these issues have been thoroughly studied before, I believe this language wastes valuable taxpayer resources.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is more important for Congress to continue to focus funding towards providing the educational, healthcare and economic needs of the Native American community. I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Again, I thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:

Under the heading "DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT—SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in title I, insert after the dollar amount on page 49, line 16, the following: "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Under the heading "NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION" in title II, insert after the dollar amount on page 114, line 18, the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Under the heading "CHALLENGE AMERICA ARTS FUND—CHALLENGE AMERICA GRANTS" in title II, insert after the dollar amount on page 115, line 14, the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 60 minutes to be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) will control 30 minutes and a Member opposed will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is our annual rite of passage on the Interior bill. I remember that one of my colleagues recently said in the last debate that it just is not right to come down here and lie.

Well, we are accustomed to that. It seems that every year something comes up that people view with great alarm by the National Endowment for the Arts. This year is a very interesting one. This one comes from Eagle Forum and they say something like 167, I believe, which is an odd number, but 167 naked go-go dancers put on a performance sponsored by the NEA. Not so, Mr. Chairman.

The group called Broadway Cares, which was in Equity, fights AIDS, was given a \$10,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts for a single performance to be held in September of this year. It has not been held. They are master classes conducted by some of the most prestigious companies in modern dance, including the Alvin Ailey Dance Theater, the Merce Cunningham Dance Company, and the Tricia Brown Company. The festival will include performances by notable dancers including current and former dancers of the New York City Ballet, Ballet Hispanico, Sean Curr and Company, Alpha Omega, and that is the only project of Broadway Cares sponsored by the NEA. So that one bites the dust.

Today comes a new Dear Colleague saying that NEA has lined up with Planned Parenthood for a dance group, \$10,000 again, they do not have many grants, for young people to stop teen pregnancy. And I say hooray for that. But I am proud of my colleagues who every year have seen through this verbiage and understand that the NEA is a very important part.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as I do every year to offer an amendment to try to offer a very modest increase in the National Endowment for the Arts and also for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

We can and we should appropriate an additional \$10 million to the NEA and an additional \$5 million to the NEH because these agencies both remain well below the funding level from a decade ago.

A recent economic impact study clearly shows that investing in the arts has a profound economic impact on our

States and local communities. The Arts and Economic Prosperity Study which was conducted by the Americans for the Arts just recently, and mostly in rural America and smaller cities, reveals that the nonprofit arts industry, this is so important, I do not want anybody to miss this. The nonprofit arts industry generates \$134 billion annually in economic activity.

Now, over \$80 billion of this stems from related spending by the arts audiences. At the parking lots where they park their cars, the restaurants where they eat before or after performances, at the gift shops where they buy souvenirs, at the hotels where they spend the night, and on and on.

I have this chart here to give you some idea of what we get. The \$134 billion that comes back into the Federal Treasury, it creates 4.58 million full time equivalent jobs. The resident household income of the people who work in arts is 89.4 billion. The local government revenue is 6.6 billion. State government revenue, 7.3 billion. Federal income tax revenue, 10.5 billion. I challenge anybody to tell me of any other program which we give a very modest amount to, \$116 million in this case, that comes back with this kind of return, and this is just the economic return.

There are many others. The things that it does for young children; their developing minds; as we have mentioned a while ago, cutting down on teenage pregnancy.

Let me go on with some of these figures that I think are very important. The patrons spend an average of \$22.87 per person over the price of admission which is being spent in our local communities, supporting the businesses and sustaining the local jobs. As you can see, this is a very important investment that we make here and we get a great deal back for the modest amount we put in.

Now the 232 million the Federal Government invested in NEA and NEH last year, as I said, has returned \$134 billion and I think that is a good investment. The study also shows that the kids who are exposed to art, their SAT scores in high school go up 57 points. It improves their critical skills in math, reading, language development and writing. That, again, is cheap at the price to get that kind of return for money for arts in schools. For example, the study shows that learning dance and drama help to develop skills that improve creative writing.

Probably what they are worried about this morning with Planned Parenthood will teach young women that they have a better hope in life other than being a teenage mother.

Skills learned in music increases a student's understanding of concepts in math. That is so important to us.

More broadly, the study concludes student attendance and retention is better for those involved in the arts. Additionally, student learning experiences in drama, music, dance and other

art activities assist in conflict resolution and lead to improved self-confidence and social tolerance.

I think as I go through these things you can say these are things we devoutly wish for the children of the United States.

These results demonstrate the importance of incorporating arts into our schools. So it is time for us to give them a portion of the financial support they deserve.

This amendment goes just to support the NEA's Challenge America program which is targeted specifically for communities that have been underrepresented among the NEA direct grants.

Challenge America has successfully supported arts education and community arts development in many communities nationwide. The program facilitates State and local arts partnerships and regional touring arts programs. We need to extend this great program and the amendment will provide part of the funds to be able to do that.

State and local and regional arts associations receive vital support from the NEA, bringing arts close to home. The NEA also supports the after-school programs and activities in underserved communities that allow our youth to understand the benefits of arts learning.

The NEH. NEH is a wonderful program, bringing into our communities the humanities; subjects such as history and literature or foreign languages and philosophy and geography. For example, they support a summer teacher training program that prepares and encourages teachers to bring humanities alive in the classroom. They teach us well who we were, what we hope to be, and what we can become.

The NEH actively supports historic preservations of books, newspapers, official documents and material culture collections that are so important for us to understand our history. These efforts are vital to preserving America's historical and cultural heritage.

I commend the President for recognizing the critical role the arts play in our schools and communities. Now it is time to show us the money. The administration's budget request includes a very slight increase, actually not any increase at all, just inflation. But if we want to leave no child behind, if we really want to encourage growth in this economy, we need to increase the funding for these two agencies because they are proven, proven like no other to do exactly that: Encourage growth in the economy and leaving no child behind.

So we request \$10 million more for the NEA, \$5 million for the NEH by making minor correspondent reductions in the administrative budget in the Department of the Interior.

The account, which is appropriated an increase in the underlying bill, would be increased by less than half of 1 percent. This offset ought to be acceptable to all of my colleagues.

Less than 1 percent of our entire budget is committed to arts. In other

words, it costs each year less than 40 cents a year to support art. Yet, our small Federal investment in the arts reaps rewards, as we have said here, many, many times over. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment co-sponsored by my good friend and co-chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), and by the ranking member on this committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) who fights valiantly every year for this program in committee, and for whom we are very grateful, to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Please support this modest increase in the NEA and NEH. It is the least we can do to invest in cultural and economic well-being of our Nation. And once again, I ask my colleagues to reject the fearmongering that comes out every year. To tell the truth, I almost wait with some anticipation to see what they will dig up year after year.

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

□ 1330

The CHAIRMAN. Who claims time in opposition?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I do; and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for yielding me the time, and last night, many of us commended all the good things he has done and I want to say it again. He helped parks and he has cared about the students in rural America. I grew up on a farm, and I am talking about the National Endowment for the Arts, which includes not just urban America but also rural America. That is when I first saw a symphony and that was in the WPA. He will remember that and I will, in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, the WPA, and that was the wonderful job they did to have young children that never would have to do it any other way than in that.

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) was highlighting the enormous benefits of the arts to our economy and to our local communities. A recent economic impact study from Georgia Institute of Technology, which she used, and I want to put this again, nonprofit arts industries in America generate \$134 billion for our Nation's economy. That is an outstanding return on taxpayers' investment, and that is about \$10.5 billion for the Internal Revenue Service; and the children also benefit from the arts and the educational curriculum, as the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) noted. And we obviously want arts education, and it has happened in math, reading, language development, and writing.

This is a new NEA in the sense that they have a lot of common sense now in that group, and I would hope that all of us could vote for that and see the arts that percolate through our sec-

ondary schools, our community colleges, our research centers, our State humanities council; and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this amendment to increase funding for the national endowment for the arts and the national endowment for the humanities.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for her leadership on these issues over the years. She has been tireless, and with those Members that are supporting this Member, I rise in support of this amendment.

Just to give my colleagues a little bit of a picture of what happens in a rural State like Maine and the importance of the arts and humanities, there are many areas of America, particularly rural America and rural Maine, that cannot afford some of the luxuries of major urban areas; and it is important to have organizations like the NEA and NEH provide resources to rural communities so that they can have an opportunity to participate and be exposed to the arts programs.

In my home State, the Maine Humanities Council has developed several programs that have greatly served our State. Current programs run by the council promote literacy for all ages, provide teacher enrichment. They have seminars in preserving cultural heritage. In addition, they have grant programs that provide the support to Maine libraries and museums, historical societies and schools.

One of their programs, literature and medicine, has become so successful that the national council has just received a significant grant application and awarded Maine a national endowment grant for the humanities to expand this program to eight other States.

Clearly, we must continue the support of these programs. Even on top of all of that, the economic opportunity that was highlighted earlier generated over \$134 billion in economic opportunity. This gives rural States like Maine a real opportunity to focus on this creative cluster of development opportunities in our region; so that in a lot of rural areas we are manufacturing textiles and the agriculture have seen some declines, that there is an opportunity to create new economic growth in opportunities in terms of our art galleries, art exhibits and the promotion of the arts.

So we are very much in support of this effort, very much asking my colleagues to support this increase. It does a great job. It does a great job in Maine, and it does a great job in the Nation.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time; and Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the arts, but I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The President's budget provides a budget request of \$116,489,000. Last year, fiscal year 2002, the enacted budget appropriation was \$115,234,000. So we are over a \$1 million increase already in the President's budget, essentially flat-funding it, but increasing it slightly.

The request today is for \$116,489,000 for the National Endowment for the Arts; and the committee, in a bipartisan way, supported that. They supported it because it believed it is an adequate amount to pay for the Federal share of contribution to the arts, and I believe that, too. I think \$116,489,000 is a fair amount. It is a fair number.

I point out to my colleagues that this was an increase last year of over \$10 million a year ago for the National Endowment for the Arts. It was \$104 million, went up to \$115 million. So we have already added over \$10 million a year ago and now to come back and add another \$10 million this year, in addition to the \$1 million that the President has already requested and the committee, in a bipartisan way, has already approved, I think is wrong.

When is enough enough? I have serious questions about the \$134 billion that is generated, allegedly generated, by nonprofit arts groups; and I know they do a great job. They do it in my State, and I support them very strongly. However, that is like saying if we buy little league uniforms for the teams in America, we are going to generate all the money that goes to little league or high school or sports. It is a big universe, in other words; and I will give credit to some amount of money that is generated by the \$115 million that we put in last year and that we are going to put in \$116 million this year. I think that is a fair expenditure. For some it is too much; for some it is too little. But I think it is just right.

I would just urge my colleagues, when is enough enough? I will say to the sponsors of the amendment, this is money that is going to be cut out of the Interior Department operations accounts. We have held these operations accounts in the bill down. We have not even fully funded their inflationary request; and so if we are going to further cut into the Interior Department operations accounts, I think it is going to have an impact on the national parks operations. It is going to have an impact on public lands administration, on refuges that a lot of people go to see and enjoy the wildlife refuges in this country, and other programs that are part of the interior appropriations process.

The interior bill has a lot of responsibilities. We have a documented backlog in repairs for public facilities of over \$12 billion. Ten million can make a big difference in that \$12 billion

backlog maintenance problem. We are trying to make prudent investment in our land management agencies, in Indian health programs, in energy research. They can use \$10 million, too, if we really want to look at the cumulative effect of having dollars invested and benefits to the public.

I am not going to say the arts are not valuable, they are; but \$116 million is enough, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, finding that \$116 million is adequate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my colleague from Washington State that just applauding the arts is not enough, and I yield 2 minutes to the other gentleman from Washington State (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thought that the study was very professionally done, and I think the arts generate probably more than \$134 billion in economic activity. The most important number was the Federal revenues, \$10.5 billion for a \$116 million investment. I do not think we are going to do any better than that on return in investment.

The other thing I would point out, when the House of Representatives was under the control of the Democratic Party in 1994, we provided \$162 million for the National Endowment for the Arts on a very bipartisan basis. I see many Members here on the floor supported that level of funding; and then, of course, in 1995 that was reduced to less than \$100 million, we had this dramatic Draconian cut in funding.

We have come back, and last year we had a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives for an increase of \$15 million: \$10 million for the endowment for the arts, because it was cut more severely than the endowment for the humanities, \$3 million for humanities, \$2 million for museums and library services. We do not have museum services anymore in this bill, so it is \$10 million for the arts, \$5 million for the humanities this year.

We can go to every part of this country now and we can see the consequences, the impact of these efforts, the Challenge America program. These moneys are going all over the country. We made sure that all the arts are not in the big cities. They are now everywhere; and that is why they are creating all this economic activity, creating these jobs and giving audiences all over the country a chance to enjoy the arts and the humanities.

This is a good, positive thing to do. Let us support it. Let us get back to where we used to be back in the good old days in 1994.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, let me just talk about the good old days. The good old days, for my dear friend from Washington State, were days when there was deep criticism of the National Endowment for the Arts for putting pornographic material in

grants that they offered. I mean, that is what resulted in the cut. The representatives in the House of Representatives and the Senate and the country were disgusted with the way that the National Endowment for the Arts was distributing grants. They were wasting taxpayers' money. So just as a matter of historical reference, that is why they were cut back was because they were granting sort of disgusting material for grants with taxpayer money.

So what we did not see before 1994 was a limitation on the amount of money that went to big museums and big cities and people with all the money and the resources in the world. Thanks to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and others, we put in these reforms after 1995 and 1996, which said put a cap on the amount of funds that one State can receive, that State grant programs and State set-asides increased to 40 percent of the total grants. That is what we did in the post-1994 period.

Anti-obscenity requirement for grants supported by a Supreme Court decision in 1998. Put six Members of Congress on the National Council of the Arts to monitor what went through the system. We reduced the Presidentially appointed council members to 14 instead of 26. We prohibited grants to individuals except for literature fellowships and National Heritage fellowships or American Jazz Masters fellowships. Prohibited self-granting or full seasonal support grants. Allowed the NEA and the NEH to solicit vest private funds to support the agencies.

That is a beef that I have had for quite a while is that we give grants to people. With all due respect for the good work they do, they go out and make a tremendously good commercial success, but they do not give back; and my argument has been commercially successful people ought to be able to come back and give back to the big pot to help everybody, the fledgling artists and others who are out there trying to get some help instead of reaping the commercial benefit at taxpayers' expense.

□ 1345

We have provided granting priority for projects to underserved populations. That is very important, as I come from a relatively rural area. We have provided priority for education, understanding and appreciation of the arts, and emphasis for grants to community music programs. These were all post-1994 reforms.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Well, then, we have a bipartisan consensus that we made these changes. Then let us give them back the money they so desperately need to fund the program all over the country. They need this money.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if \$116 million is not enough.

Mr. DICKS. No. No.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thought the gentleman would say that. Back in the 1970s, when this program first came out, it had zero. So now we have grown it to \$116 million. One hundred sixteen million is enough. Let us give it a one-year hiatus. We have a war going on, we are trying to provide for people in New York, we have a defense bill, and homeland security. Let us give it a rest. Let us economize.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

What we have heard on this floor for years on this subject is that we should not fund amendments like this simply because at some time in the past the arts program was not perfect. Well, I grant that. But for how we ought to view them today, I once again consult my sociological bible, my friend archie the cockroach, and here is what archie said about the arts.

"They are instinctively trying to hand the public some kind of stuff that wins the audience away from the often sordid surface of existence. They may do it badly, they may do it obviously, they may do it crudely, but they do have the hunch that what the millions want is to be shown that there is something possible to the human race besides the dull repetition of the triviality which is so often the routine of common existence. . . . And every now and then they have blundered into doing something with the touch of the universal in it."

That, to me, is what is so great about this little program. I do not much care about what this program does for the big cities in this country. I do not represent a city over 40,000. What I care about is what these programs help to deliver by way of cultural experiences, door-opening experiences for kids and for working families who, in the rural parts of this country and the small towns of this country, would otherwise never be exposed to it. And sometimes it may not be perfect, but a lot of times it is awfully good and it has a profoundly enriching experience on young people's lives. That is why this amendment ought to be passed.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me just tell my colleagues why we are introducing this amendment that I am a coauthor of. The National Endowment for the Humanities will get 5 million more dollars because they carry enormously important national

responsibilities, like dealing with brittle books and the problem of documents that are critical to our heritage and to future generations, needing a lot of care and a lot of restoration.

They are also in libraries in very small towns, bringing experts on poetry to do readings and workshops, and provide inspiration and guidance for those who want to learn to write poetry or short stories or get acquainted with the body of literature that has developed the culture of the Western world.

In the arts, we put \$10 million more into the Challenge America program. That is the grassroots. Let me tell my colleagues what grassroots sounds like and looks like in my district.

I walked into a HOT school the other day. Now, HOT schools are funded by national NEA money flowing through our Connecticut Commission on the Arts. And I asked this young girl who was touring me around, a 5th grader, I said, what is a HOT school? She said, well, it is a Higher Order of Thinking School. And as we went through the school, there was a kid who was drawing everything we did, and there were several kids who were scribing down everything we did so they could do a report.

We saw the exhibition of art, portraits done by the kindergartners in the style of Miro. How wonderful for these kids to see the abstraction of portraiture done in that very modern style, so they could begin to think about who they really were, who the next person was, and how do we conceptualize the world around us.

There is just overwhelming evidence that strong arts develop higher test scores on math and reading. Why? Because it develops the mind, not just the tables, but the abstraction of mathematics.

Then we went on to the older grades where they had studied the Lascaux caves and how those drawings in the caves represented the history and the way people lived in that era, and they thought about it. They thought about not only the substance of life, but the artistic expression and how we communicate.

Then, every month, they have an assembly in which they have a competition for the best poetry, the best drawing. This has changed the lives of these inner-city children. It changed their lives and elevated their thinking. It has made them think that education is fun and powerful. So let us not neglect to fund the arts.

My Governor, a Republican in Connecticut, put more money into the arts than had ever been invested because the arts help revitalize our cities economically. So this is about education, it is about achievement, it is about excellence, it is about communication, it is about history, it is about culture, it is about inspiration, and it is about the dollars and cents of a strong economy. Support the amendment to increase funding for the arts.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of restoring funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

While the proposed increases still will not return the support we knew in 1995, it is so important to the children of our country that we make this progress.

I want to cite what many of my colleagues have talked about today. Many people think of the NEA and the NEH grants as large grants to communities, but, actually, what we have are a number of grants that go to small organizations. I think even the fact that they are out there really inspires many, many organizations to put forth initiatives that they otherwise would never have put together, would never have explored.

In San Diego, we have many, many connections and many, many links. The National Endowment for the Arts supports major organizations in my area, like the San Diego Opera Association in its symphony outreach to students and the Old Globe Theater in their Teatro Meta program.

We also have a Challenge America grant, which enabled the San Diego Youth & Community Services to artist-led activities that link students in the Teen Connection program with actors from the La Jolla Playhouse and the Diversionary Theater.

Another grant enabled a partnership with the Metropolitan Area Advisory Committee on Anti-Poverty for the Teen Producers Project, and that provides after-school media arts education to young people living in public housing.

There are many, many of these grants, and all children deserve this opportunity to explore new arts interests and develop their talent, the kind of opportunities that the NEA and the NEH grants offer to enrich their lives.

My colleagues, if looking into the eyes of children who become inspired by the arts is not sufficient, I would point out, as my colleagues have, that the multiplier effect on the economy of every dollar spent on the arts also enriches all of our communities.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and as I sit here and listen to this bill, now going close to 24 hours, I am reminded of a Dr. Seuss character that I think was called a Push Me-Pull You. I do not really remember what it was all about, but it seemed to me that the character was unwilling to be pushed, unwilling to be pulled.

I think that must be the description of the Interior bill; that it is a very

delicately balanced bill, and we can push it one way, but it is not going to pass; or we can pull it another way, and it is not going to pass. That is why this is kind of a thin-ice situation here. There are a lot of good arguments for this, but put one more straw on the camel's back, and then we lose on our side 24 votes. Same way on the other side; they lose 25 votes. That is why I think it is important that we leave the language and the numbers where they are in this particular bill on this amendment.

I support the arts, and I think everybody in Congress supports the arts. That is why it is very important to not confuse the NEA with the arts. We in Congress provide a \$10 billion tax credit that is authorized for people who donate to art galleries and to art-related theaters and so forth. That is \$10 billion. The Democrats are fond of saying how much is this costing? Well, \$10 billion.

What about all the art that the Federal Government purchases, the paintings in this Capitol? We just underwent a renovation of the rotunda. That is in support of the arts. What about art education? All the programs on the State level, on the local level, on the Federal level that we as taxpayers of America support the arts on? We are very pro art in America. But to confuse the NEA with the art statement of America is truly misleading.

I believe that art is magical. I heard a songwriter say a good song takes you someplace else. And that is true, because, doggone it, I cannot drive my car without the radio going, because, Mr. Chairman, I do not always want to go to work. I like to hear the song about, I miss the planes out in Africa or the land down under in Australia. I think that is why we listen to music, because it does take us to a different place.

When we look at this picture of Lafayette over here, and think about the inspiration of a great Frenchman who comes over here and fights for America during the Revolutionary War. We get inspired when we look at the portrait of George Washington with the sword carefully painted out to show that this is not an institution that uses violence but that we use the weapons of words to clash our ideas together.

It is inspirational, as we look at the dynamics of both of these people, and to look up to the ceiling in the rotunda, and to think about a good drama that we all get invited to every now and then at JFK. It is truly inspirational. We need to all be protective of art.

And I want to say that I think the NEA has gone a long way in kind of cleaning up their act. The NEA, I think, has come a long way. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has cited it well. And I can say that on our side of the aisle, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) knows, some of the strong offended feelings, and I saw it was included in this regarding some of the

shenanigans of the NEA in the past, I have to say that, actually, it was cleaned up probably more by the Supreme Court than by Congress.

I will yield to my friend in a minute, but as the gentleman remembers, it was the famous case of a woman who was dipped in chocolate, and the question was is that a proper use of the taxpayer dollars or should it be artistic freedom. I believe in artistic freedom, but let her leap in a whole vat of chocolate. I am all for it. A new definition of Hershey's Kisses. But when I am paying for it, or I am asking a guy who is driving a truck for \$6 an hour back in Georgia, maybe we should not do that. Maybe we should just stick with the picture of the cow standing by the mill stream.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the point we tried to make before, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) did a good job, as has the gentleman from Georgia, in going back to those issues, but we reformed those things. We put provisions in the bill that emphasized quality, and those have all been adopted.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman. That is exactly why I bring it up, is to acknowledge the changes that have been made. And the gentleman and I have both sat through hearings, through Democrat and Republican administrators over there, and I think they have cleaned it up, and I am glad. Some of it has been with a hammer, some of it has been more willing, but a lot has gone on.

I would also like them to continue to decentralize the NEA. I do think, and if I were the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) I would be pushing it hard, because so much of the money is concentrated in New England, but there is a lot of art outside of New York City. When these theater groups come down and they do a little ballet for the rural folks down home, and they say, well, we kept the hicks from the sticks happy, now we can go home, I do not think it is anything that great and wonderful. I would love to see the NEA have a distribution formula where they say we have to push that stuff out and distribute it more in Idaho, Montana, and Mississippi.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, my point is NEA, I think, has moved forward in a good direction. Unlike years past when I have voted to cut the NEA, I will vote to support the NEA. But I know as the vice chairman of this committee, to put more money in it means that we are going to lose votes, so I must oppose this amendment.

On the NEH, I am a big NEH supporter. I would support the NEH increase, but I cannot do it on the floor of the House because that is going to run off votes. I think there are some

things to talk about in the process which I look forward to engaging in as the months go by.

Right now, all of the issues that we have gotten together with the Westerners and the Easterners and the folks on Native American issues, we need to keep the precarious balance of this bill where it is because it is a Push Me-Pull You.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY).

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

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter-Dicks amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson-Morella amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill to give the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) additional appropriations of \$10 million and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) an additional \$5 million. The value of the NEA lies in its ability to nurture the growth and artistic excellence of thousands of arts organizations and artists in every corner of the country, making the performing, visual, literary, media and folk arts available to millions of Americans.

Even in this time of fiscal restraint and budget deficits, the value of the NEA cannot be overstated. Additional appropriations are still required, as the NEA is a great investment in the economic growth of every community in the country. A recent study conducted by the Georgia Institute of Technology found that the nonprofit arts industry alone generates \$134 billion annually in economic activity, supports 4.85 million full time jobs and returns \$10.5 billion to the Federal Government in income taxes. While the economic benefit of the arts industry is integral to our Nation's economy, affording children access to the arts through education yields more significant dividends to our society. The U.S. Department of Justice found that arts education reduced delinquency in San Antonio by 13 percent, increased communication skills of Atlanta students by 57 percent, and improved cooperation skills of Portland youth by 57 percent. In addition, the College Board has shown that college bound students who are involved in the arts have higher overall SAT scores than other students.

The National Endowment for the Humanities is the largest single funder of humanities programs in the United States, enriching American intellectual and cultural life through support to museums, archives, libraries, colleges, universities, state humanities councils, public television and radio, and to individual scholars. A small investment through NEH reaps large rewards, providing seed money for high quality projects and programs that reach millions of Americans each year. This money, and NEH's reputation, leverage millions of dollars in private support for humanities projects. NEH is critical to addressing the Nation's future needs in education. More than two-thirds of our Nation's K-12 curriculum is dedicated to the humanities; 2 million new teachers will be needed in our classrooms over the next decade, and 4 out of 5 teachers feel inadequately prepared in their subject area. NEH summer seminars and institutes address these very issues,

and are the catalyst for revitalized teachers for tens of thousands of students each year.

America's creative industries are our Nation's leading export with over \$60 billion annually in overseas sales, including the output of artists and other creative workers in publishing, audiovisual, music and recording and entertainment businesses.

The National Endowment for the Humanities plays an important role in the American arts enterprise. NEH grants provide critical funding for work in art history, theory and criticism, including: university based and independent research projects; professional development seminars for K-12 and college teachers; film and radio programs; museum exhibitions and exhibition catalogs; and material culture preservation.

In my home state of Missouri, our Humanities Council currently is planning an array of public programs for distribution in Missouri during the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition, 2003 through 2006. The planning is supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Missouri Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commission. The NEH planning grant supporting these trial programs is intended to produce program templates that can be deployed successfully with local participation by Native American spokespersons in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa, serving communities within a day-trip's distance of the Missouri River. These programs will provide Missouri youth an important lesson in American history in an entertaining environment.

Mr. Chairman, I commend all arts advocates today on their continued dedication to arts in education. I strongly urge for increased resources for arts education in this year's appropriations process.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this increase, although it is so minimal I hesitate to call it an increase. We have still not recovered from the grave cuts of 1994, but I strongly support this amendment and wish I had time to talk about how important the arts are to New York and this country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my enthusiastic support for the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson amendment.

The \$10 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and the \$5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities will continue the process of restoring Federal funding for the arts to appropriate levels.

It is difficult to call it an increase since the amount is so *minimal*. These organizations have not recovered from the severe cuts of 1994.

NEA funds do more than simply support individual programs, they support entire communities.

NEA funds help encourage private donors to give to a program, so every dollar we spend pays dividends.

When we invest in the arts, entire neighborhoods benefit. Studies show that children who are involved in the arts, concentrate better, learn how to listen and do better in school.

Every community has their own example of a program that has benefitted from NEA grants. I'll give a small example from my district. The New York Ballet Theater received a \$15,000 grant from the NEA last year. They are a terrifically innovative program that teaches young people to dance and introduces children to the ballet.

More importantly, they recruit students from the shelter system, along with their more wealthy pupils. Their work has literally saved lives, taking at risk children and giving them a future.

One student, Steven Melendez, a 15-year-old boy from the shelter system, has literally had his life changed. He is a phenomenally talented dancer who has a future because of the New York Ballet Theater. His dancing received national recognition and he has been offered a place at the world renowned American Ballet Theatre. His story shows what a difference NEA funding can make in the lives of our young people.

I urge my colleagues to support the slaughter amendment, to enable the NEA to reach more programs.

In addition, the nonprofit arts industry generates \$134 billion in economic activity yearly and over \$20 billion in taxes.

Millions of Americans are employed in arts organizations, and they depend on the U.S. Government to continue to fund their industry.

We can help them, help our children, improve our economy, and create an enduring cultural legacy—all by passing this necessary amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, to enable the NEA and NIH to reach more programs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter-Dicks amendment to benefit the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. The arts and the humanities enrich all of our lives; and as the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has pointed out, the arts enrich not just our lives figuratively, they enrich us economically. They not only challenge us to think, they deepen our understanding of the world around us and help us to understand ourselves and each other.

Not surprisingly, they help us in a number of other ways, in building spatial reasoning skills and improving performance in math and science in our children, language development and reading skills. The arts and humanities affect every American. In fact, they are central to being American. Our rights of speech and assembly have fueled works of art.

I ask Members to look around this beautiful Capitol building. This symbol of our democracy is a work of art. The NEA provides tens of millions of dollars, along with State arts agencies for more than 7,000, almost 8,000, arts education programs in thousands of communities all over America, large and small towns. The NEA offers lifetime

learning opportunities through a range of public programs.

This budget-neutral amendment represents a small, but meaningful, increase for the arts and humanities. The arts give back to all of us many times over. This is not enough funding, but at least let us do this much.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to question this amendment, the fact that if we were awash in money, if we were in a surplus, if we had lots of cash to spread around, I think this amendment might be appropriate. But when it really comes down to it, we have gotten by the original NEA debate in this country. A lot of positive changes have happened. A lot of the things that upset the American public have been changed. But is it really a priority in America to have almost a 10 percent increase in the arts when we have an economy that is in trouble, when we have poor people in this country who have lost their jobs, we have people underemployed, unemployed? Is this a prudent expenditure of our funds? When we are in economic trouble, is there no line item that can be level-funded? And this is not level-funded; it is increased. Does it really stand up to a test of almost a 10 percent increase? I think not.

The arts and entertainment community in America is the richest of the rich. I applaud them for what they do. But this is a time that they can step up and help expand the arts to all Americans. I find it interesting that those who are vehemently supporting this 10 percent increase oppose across-the-board tax cuts because some of them go to the more successful Americans.

We all know when we cut taxes across the board, we stimulate the economy because we give American employers more money to invest in their businesses. I think it is the wrong time to ask for a major increase. We have gotten by the debate of the past. Let us stay there. Let us not revive that issue at this time when America is struggling to balance its budget. We cannot willy-nilly hand out 9 and 10 percent increases to nice things.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is an inappropriate amendment. I think it is not well thought out. I think it revives the debate we could get by this year if we do not do it. I urge Members to say "no" to this amendment. It is the wrong time, the wrong place, and sends the wrong message to the poor of America.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is completely offset by a very small cut in administrative expenses. Because of the offset, the money is not going to be taken from here and moved over to some worthy cause. This is a worthy cause because

we have created this enormous industry in this country that have jobs, economic activity surrounding the arts.

We started this endowment back in 1964. My good friend, Livingston Biddle, was the staff person who worked with Senator Pell to get this thing created. Ever since then, we have seen the growth of the arts throughout the country because of the seed money that comes from the endowment. Even with this 10 percent increase, we are still 30 percent below where we were in 1994. If we had inflation, it would be 50 percent below. We are just trying to get back to a reasonable level of funding, and this House supported this amendment last year. I urge a vote for it this year.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for all the gentleman has done over the years. But despite how much I like the gentleman from New Mexico, what an embarrassment. Once again, the House of Representatives is considering a Department of Interior appropriations bill that does not sufficiently fund the arts and the humanities.

Funding for the National Endowment for the Arts was cut dramatically in 1995 by more than 40 percent, and it has never returned to adequacy. Shame on us.

Opponents of this amendment call for fiscal discipline, as if the richest Nation in the world needs to be culturally impoverished. Shame on us.

We all know that it is not the lack of money that keeps funding for the NEA and the NEH so low, because the funding we invest provides a huge economic return on our Federal investment, both in dollars and in jobs. According to a recent study by Americans for the Arts, the nonprofit arts industry generates \$134 billion in economic activity every year, creating more than 4 million jobs. The arts industry is a money maker, not a money taker. Another study, this one by the Arts Education Partnership, provides hard evidence that children who participate in the arts improve their critical learning skills in math, reading, language development, and writing. In addition, NEA funds programs like Positive Alternatives for Youth, which lowers the rate of juvenile crime by creating artist-led after-school programs for our youth.

When we deprive the NEA or the NEH of needed funds, we deprive this entire Nation of an active cultural community. It is a battle that has been going on since the stockades were used to control creativity in Puritan times, and it is absolutely wrong-headed.

The arts teaches us to think, encourages us to feel and see and to look in

different ways. This is a good amendment, and it must be passed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I also rise today in support of the Slaughter-Dicks amendment, which would increase the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by \$10 million and the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million.

In our country, 76.2 million adults attend performing arts events or exhibition events every year. Arts and humanities play a big role in our lives.

This year I had the honor of serving as co-chair with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) for the Congressional Arts Competition. Not too long ago, we had 308 students from across this country come here and exhibit their artwork. We were all very proud to see them here, for them to realize their talents and skills, and to maybe someday think that they could also receive a grant to continue their profession.

I cannot tell Members how heartfelt it was for me to see a student from my district compete in this competition and know that they have a career ahead of them. Coming from a life of poverty, living in a trailer park could somehow be able to actualize their talents and skills. I think we need to support this amendment. We need to continue to increase funding, especially for our young, disadvantaged youth that were discussed earlier. Let us not leave any child behind. Let us give them an opportunity to participate in a civic way in the arts, to give good examples and allow them to extend their talents and share that with the entire world.

NEA funds 249 grants throughout the country called the Challenge American Positive Alternative Youth Program. I am in support of this program. Just remember, Members, when we walk through the tunnel between our buildings and the Capitol, look at the artwork. Think about what young people have been helped, and let us give them a chance to be a part of the artistic discoveries in our country.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, in listening to this debate, Members would think that in fact prior to the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts, prior to the hundreds of millions of dollars that we have taken away from our taxpayers and given to that organization, if we do not pass this amendment, there will be no art.

All of the wonderful things that art has done through our history has been recounted by the supporters of this particular amendment. Of course, who can argue that art is not a good thing?

It is a great thing. It is a wonderful thing. I am all for art. And I can assure Members, if we defeat this amendment, and if we struck all funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, there would still be art.

□ 1415

It actually existed before the National Endowment for the Arts. It actually was able to thrive, to be nurtured by individuals, to somehow find its way into the public life before the National Endowment for the Arts and certainly before this amendment was even thought of.

We have heard over and over again about the effect of art on students, that they learn more. The effect of art on the general population, that we are all somehow made better individually as a result of having art out there. That is probably true. I will not even deny that there is some effect on children's learning, on just the general nature of the population if you have a lot of art available to you. I have heard these things stated so far: It changed their lives, elevated their thinking, improved their test scores. It is about inspiration.

Mr. Chairman, every single one of those things can be attributed to another aspect of our culture, and that is religion. As a matter of fact, children who come from religious households do score better on test scores. It is something that improves all of our lives, at least I believe. So why do we not appropriate \$100 million a year to religion? It does all of the same things that this particular amendment does or that the National Endowment for the Arts says they do, but, of course, we do not appropriate money to religion because we would then argue about whose religion should be centered and identified and given the money. You are right. We should not do that. We should not appropriate money for religion. We should not appropriate money for the arts because it is in the eye of the beholder as to what is art. And to take money away from somebody in my district to determine what somebody in your district thinks is art is, I think, unfair.

This amendment is, of course, unfair. The National Endowment for the Arts, as far as I am concerned, should not be funded at all. Certainly it should not be given the opportunity to have another grab at the apple.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, think about where we stand in the world today with our concentration of wealth and power. It is comparable almost to the great Greek and Roman civilizations.

But what do we remember about those civilizations? It is their art, their striving for their greatest aspirations of the human spirit. We want to leave that to our future generations. Sure, the private sector could do it. But let

me tell you about Denyce Graves, one of the greatest opera singers we have today. She grew up in Washington, D.C., a few blocks away from the Kennedy Center. But if she could, if we allowed it, she would be on the floor today telling us the Kennedy Center might as well have been a world away because she could never have gotten to the Kennedy Center if she had not gotten an NEH grant to be able to perform. It was that grant that was invested in the District of Columbia that gave her the opportunity to show what she was capable of. There are thousands, maybe millions, of people all over the country that have benefited from this ability to leverage money in arts throughout America, in our smallest communities and our largest communities. This is something we will be proud of for generations to come.

Let us better fund the arts. Vote for the Slaughter-Dicks amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I have listened intently to this argument, to this debate, and to this discussion.

I represent a district that is rich in diversity, rich in pluralism, rich in people from different walks of life, different backgrounds. What this program activity does is provide for people to understand each other better, to know what is going on with other people, to know what is in their thoughts and minds and ideas. And so we are not talking about funding a program. We are talking about funding a way of life, to help keep America the diverse, understanding, pluralistic Nation that it is and that is what happens.

The Illinois Humanities Council does an outstanding job of bringing people together throughout our State. I guarantee you that my residents, the people I represent, would want us to fund this amendment. I am pleased to stand and speak in favor of it and urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, as the country becomes more diverse and more pluralistic it is important, necessary, as a matter of fact, it is absolutely essential that we find ways to acquaint each other with cultural contributions, mores and folkways of different groups within our society and although we recognize the economic plight of our nation, we know that inordinate resources must be devoted to anti-terrorism and homeland security measures but we also know that education and the transference of understanding are necessary to maintain and grow our democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I represent an area rich in diversity and rich in understanding of the need to pay attention to not just programs; but also to a way of life, a way of life that keeps alive the American dream and a way of life that keeps music, art, culture and hope ever present in our lives.

Mr. Chairman, the Illinois Humanities Council and others like them throughout the nation do outstanding jobs of dividing and allocating these resources, they spread them around and we get the biggest bang for our bucks; therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, the Slaughter-Dicks amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. All of the civilizations throughout history which we want our children to study and which we admire, every one of them subsidized the arts at the national level. We should do no less. If we have any respect for ourselves and respect for our place in history, we ought to have an understanding of the importance of art in the development of our culture and the expression of ourselves as a people around the world.

A gentleman recently on that side of the aisle said that there was art here in the United States prior to the National Endowment for the Arts. To an extent, that is true. But that art was limited. It was limited to the elites, to small groups of the wealthiest and best situated people. The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities brings the humanities and the arts to people all across this country. The funding that is in this bill and that which would be increased by this amendment goes out to virtually every congressional district across America, thereby benefiting the people, in elementary schools, in secondary schools, and communities all across this Nation.

Finally, if this amendment is passed, the amount of money that it adds to this bill will still not bring us to the level of support that the arts and humanities enjoyed in 1993–1994. We need to pass this amendment. We need to express ourselves as a people in this positive way. We need to show Americans across this country that we appreciate arts, the arts and artists, and show people around the world that we are a human country and appreciate and expound this great expression of ourselves as a people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to refute what was said by a previous speaker, that the NEA does not have a distribution formula. It is very important, I think, that we get this information out to the populace here. As we have said, the NEA serves every nook and cranny of the United States. Forty percent of the total budget is distributed to all of the 50 States through the State arts agencies and distributed at the State level. That is 40 percent of it. The remaining 60 is awarded from the NEA at the Federal level and the distribution formula says that no individual State can get more than 15 percent of the NEA's budget.

I wish that people could understand that because this again comes up year after year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I think this has been a very lively debate today. I want to commend all the speakers who have spoken on support for the arts and I want to even commend the positive attitude of the people who have reservations about this amendment but who also say that they strongly support the arts in our country. I have been on this subcommittee a long time, this is my 26th year. Before that, I worked on the staff of Senator Warren Magnuson, and have followed the National Endowment for the Arts almost from its inception.

The point that I want to make is that this investment has caused a tremendous explosion in private funds in support of the arts. Now we see with this newest study that this has become a \$134 billion industry, providing 4.5 million jobs in this country, at a time when we are in a recession. I think this is a very prudent investment. We are increasing the funding here by \$15 million, \$10 million for the arts, \$5 million for the humanities. It is completely offset by a very innocuous reduction in administrative expenses. If my friend from Washington finds that onerous, we will fix it in conference, okay? So just to make sure, nobody is being hurt here. This is a positive amendment that will do a lot for our country.

I was at the opening of the Museum of Glass in Tacoma, Washington, a facility constructed at the leadership of George Russell. I saw young children in the glass art center creating glass art. We have had kids in Tacoma who used to be juvenile delinquents now are leading a program in creating glass art. This is something that is important for every young person in this country. Education is enhanced by the arts and humanities.

This is a very modest amendment. It is a chance for us to say to the endowments that they have done a good job, have listened to the Congress, have adopted the reforms that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and I and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) have proposed over the years to correct the problems. They are emphasizing quality. This is an administration that is also strongly committed to the arts. I think this is a small amendment but a good one. Let us approve it and let us move on.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5½ minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to close on this debate. It has been a good debate. I appreciate the tone from all parties who spoke very fervently about their belief in the arts and their support of the arts.

I would argue that there is not one person in the House of Representatives who does not support the arts. Period. The question is, does everyone support a \$10 million increase in the National Endowment for the Arts? I think we have to make sure everybody understands that this is an issue of how much can we afford. How much can we spend on different accounts in this particular bill? I would argue, Mr. Chairman, that we have got \$116 million in this bill, about a \$1 million increase over last year, which last year was about an \$11 million increase over the year before. I guess my thinking is, it can never be enough. If you really want to take the arguments of the proponents of this amendment to their logical extension, it will never be enough. I would argue that this is enough at this time, at this place, given the circumstances of this bill, given the circumstances of our economy and our national priorities.

Much has been made of Members saying, well, we have to treat the Federal Treasury like our family budget. I would argue to you that if you got your mortgage and you got your food and your transportation and all the other necessary accounts to run your family, that maybe you say at some point, "Until things get a little better, I'm not going to go to the movies this weekend. In fact, I'm going to stay home and read a book." I think that is what we have to do with this amendment. We have to say, \$116 million is enough. It is enough. And we do not need at this point to spend another \$10 million just to demonstrate our commitment to the arts in this country.

Very few speakers today spoke of the direct relationship between the NEA and their love of the arts. We can love the arts, and we all do. We all appreciate the value of music and artistic expression. It is valuable. But I hasten to point out, we spend 20 percent of the \$116 million on the administrative cost of the NEA. I know this amendment speaks to that, but still we are spending 20 cents, 25 cents out of every dollar spent on the NEA in administrative cost. My argument is in this amendment let us stick to the balance that has been provided by the chairman, by the ranking member, by the entire full Committee on Appropriations when we reported this bill out.

The gentleman from Washington said it is an innocuous reduction in the Department of Interior accounts. I would argue that reduction in land management for fires, for Indian Health Service, for BIA education or other accounts that this will come out of in the land management agencies for us in the West is not the right time to spend more money on arts and less money on the administration of fire suppression and other accounts that this is likely to be taken out of. So I would argue that this is not innocuous. It is not an innocuous addition. It is \$10 million of addition to this account that already has \$116 million.

I would just say this. We can be relatively assured, I will say almost positively assured, that the other body will want to add even more than this. I know that satisfies some Members who want more money. But if we are going to be fiscally responsible and if we are going to keep the balance in this bill and we have relatively, even most likely, the assurance that the money is going to go in in even greater amounts when we get with the other body in conference, I say hold the line.

□ 1430

On this day, at this moment, with these pressures on our economy, with these pressures on our homeland security, on our post-September 11 activity, with the recession that we are trying to come out of in this country, let us not spend money to go to the movies; let us say, let us stay home and read a book. I argue that these Department of Interior accounts that are being cut today are going to have a greater impact on reducing spending and administration of existing accounts for Members of the House of Representatives than will this particular \$10 million increase affect Members in a similar manner.

So I would just say I think again, the argument has been in favor of the arts and we all favor the arts. The challenge that the proponents have to exercise is, is this NEA distribution, the money going to the Federal agency, going to have the same impact that \$10 million might have in other accounts of the interior agencies that are affected by the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from Washington.

I respect their commitment, let there be no mistake. I know they feel strongly about this. But I think the rest of us must feel strongly about protecting the Federal purse, protecting the integrity of the appropriations process, protecting the integrity of the challenge, the pressure that is going to be on the land management agencies as we have droughts and natural disasters and challenges to Indian health service and Indian education and all of the other accounts that are part of the interior bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NETHERCUTT was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I would advise the Chair and the Members that after this series of votes, we will continue with amendments to title I under regular order. Then we will proceed to title II under regular order. Members are asked that if they have amendments to title I and the remainder of the bill, to come to the floor and submit their written amendments to the desk.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to support this critical

amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

A similar amendment passed on the House floor last year and I hope we are again able to demonstrate clear congressional support for arts and humanities funding today.

From the beginning of my political career, I have worked to increase funding for the arts and appreciation for the public value they add to our communities.

As a local county commissioner I crafted the first local government "percent for art" program and saw first-hand the multiplier effect it had on investment in the arts.

In Oregon, the arts and cultural industry has a tremendous economic value. The non-profit arts industry alone employs more than 28,000 people and generates \$64 million annually.

Nationally, the nonprofit arts industry pumps \$134 billion into our economy every year and provides a huge economic return on our small federal investment.

This industry provides 4.85 million jobs; \$89.4 billion in household income; \$10.5 billion in federal income tax revenues; \$7.3 billion in state government tax revenues; and \$6.6 billion in local government tax revenues.

The arts and humanities have more than an economic impact—they enrich our neighborhoods, our schools and our cities;

Each year, NEH grants are awarded in every U.S. state and territory, going to non-profit cultural institutions such as museums, archives, libraries, colleges, universities, research centers, and state humanities councils; to film, television and radio producers; and to individual scholars.

Providing strong federal funding is also what the majority of the American public expects from Congress.

79 percent of Americans believe that "there should be federal, state, and local councils for the arts to . . . provide financial assistance to worthy arts organizations."

Unfortunately Since 1995, when funding for the NEA was reduced by 40 percent, the NEA has had to cut most grants to individual artists, funding for seasonal support, and has had to limit the scope of their focus dramatically.

Yet this is about far more than money and public opinion. The arts and humanities are what make a community vibrant, unique and lively.

Today's modest yet effective increase in the Interior Appropriations bill will help improve our federal commitment and is vital to promoting livable communities where our families are safe, healthy and more economically secure.

I urge my colleagues to support the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson amendment to increase arts funding.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening in support of the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson-Morella amendment to the fiscal year 2003 Interior Appropriations bill. This amendment will give \$10 million to the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and \$5 million to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

Funding from the NEA and NEH leverage millions of dollars each year in private support for arts projects all across the country. We also know that arts education has been proven to increase skills in math, reading, language development and writing.

While New Mexico proudly proclaims itself as the State of many cultures—some call it a

melting pot, others a mosaic—we all have at least one thing in common, and that is keeping together our strong connection to the history and traditions of our State through the arts. Funding through the NEA and NEH have showcased numerous Native American, Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo cultures by artists young and old.

Mr. Chairman, the NEA has approved thousands of dollars in federal funding for several arts organizations located in my Congressional District and throughout New Mexico. I would like to highlight a few of those organizations:

Santa Fe Opera—\$50,000. Funding will support the American premiere of the opera *L'amore de loin* by Finnish composer Kaija Saariaho with libretto by French-Lebanese author Amin Maalouf. Approximately 6,000 persons are expected to attend three performances of the opera at the Santa Fe Opera Theater.

New Mexico CultureNet, Santa Fe—\$30,000. Funding will support a project called InterLAC which links local arts councils throughout New Mexico via web-based services, workshops, and an annual conference.

Taos Talking Pictures—\$7,500. Funding will be used to support the Taos Talking Picture Film Festival. The spring event showcases films by independent filmmakers working in all genres.

Pueblo of Zuni—\$20,000. Zuni Fish and Wildlife Department. Funding will support an architectural design for an eagle aviary compound. In this second phase of the project an eagle breeding ground, visitor facilities, orchards, and landscape features will be added to the existing facility.

When it comes to private partnerships between private, state and federal funding of the arts by requiring that these grant recipients match federal monies dollar for dollar, the NEA set an outstanding example. According to the NEA, one federal dollar attracts \$12 or more from state and regional arts agencies as well as corporations, businesses and individuals.

These are just a few of the many projects that funding through the NEA and NEH go to support. I'm sure that every member of this chamber could share similar project successes in their respective districts. I would like to remind my colleagues that a similar amendment passed the House on June 21, 2001 by a bipartisan margin of 221–193 in last year's Interior bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I support this modest amendment and believe increased funding would have an enormous impact by bringing the arts to underserved communities, like our inner-cities and rural areas, and by encouraging more support for preserving and promoting our cultural heritage.

Federal funding helps symphonies, theaters, musical productions, ballet and educational programs.

I grew up in an arts family. My mom and dad, both performing actors, met in the theater. I know the arts make a significant contribution to our lives.

The arts improve the lives of many people, including children, the elderly and those on a

limited budget, who might not otherwise have the opportunity to see some very beautiful and enriching performances. And federal funding helps enable talented individuals to pursue careers in the arts.

Besides the cultural benefit, the economic impact of the arts is staggering.

I urge you to support the amendment and increase funding for the NEA and NEH.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support today for this modest bipartisan amendment offered by Representatives SLAUGHTER, DICKS, HORN, JOHNSON and MORELLA to increase funds for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

As a Member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I value the tremendous role arts funding and arts education programs play in the lives of our citizens.

Several academic studies demonstrate the connection between music, dance, visual arts, and the development of the human brain. It is well known among researchers that arts education cultivates critical thinking skills so important in our information age economy.

Let me tell you about some of the programs in my community that received NEA and NEH funds this past year.

Artist-in-residence programs in elementary schools to encourage student and teacher involvement. A program in my district that incorporates traditional music and dance from diverse cultures to improve student relations, coordination and memory. An amateur chamber orchestra. A fellowship program at a library and museum for art instructors who will, in turn, teach our artists of tomorrow.

But this debate is not simply about the arts alone. Children who learn to read music or play an instrument show improved proficiency in math.

This increase of \$15 million under the Interior Appropriations for the NEA and NEH will go to fund so many rich programs offered and so many opportunities for us all.

Last month, an economic study, Americans for the Arts, found that America's nonprofit arts industry generates \$134 billion in annual economic activity. This number includes full time jobs, household income and local, state and federal tax revenue. This study includes more than \$80 billion in event-related spending by audiences. This is additional clear evidence that opportunities funded through NEA and NEH continue to bring us to new levels in our economy, culture, language, music, art and life.

By supporting the arts and the humanities, the Federal Government has the ability to partner with state and local efforts to bolster the arts and educational opportunities in our communities.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, today we debate the level of our federal commitment to arts and humanities programs. We have an opportunity to ensure that the children who today dip their hands in pots of fingerprints and sit listening to storybooks will grow up to be active members of a creative nation, rich and beauty and ideas.

We all deserve arts and humanities.

All children and adults deserve the opportunity to learn to create, to express their ideas and their visions. They deserve the opportunity to learn history, languages, philosophy, painting, sculpture, music, and dance.

We all need arts and humanities.

Arts and humanities do more than just offer us entertainment and distraction from turmoil in our lives, they provide insight and perspective, they offer comfort and hope.

Arts and humanities give us ways to understand and find meaning in what is happening in our nation, and what has happened centuries ago. They give us ways to share that meaning with our children.

Last September, we witnessed some use their ability to destroy against our nation. We have endeavored to find ways to honor those who lost their lives in the destruction. I think one way to do so today is to support our nation's ability to create.

I proudly support the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson-Morella amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and I ask my colleagues to do same.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter, Dicks, Horn, Johnson amendment. Funding for the arts is one of the best investments our government makes. In purely economic terms, it generates a return that would make any Wall Street investor jealous. For just a fraction of one percent of the entire federal budget, the National Endowment for the Arts supports a thriving non-profit arts industry which generates more than \$134 billion annually, nearly 5 million full-time jobs and returns \$10.5 billion in federal taxes each year.

With grants that touch nearly every Congressional district in the country, the NEA supports educational programs that teach children valuable life-long skills; allows new and innovative art to find an audience; helps bring the arts to under-served communities; enables organizations to share their exhibitions and performances with the rest of the nation through national tours; and most important, provides crucial seed money for organizations to leverage private donations.

Yet the NEA continues to suffer from the shortsighted decision by Congress to slash its funding back in 1996, after attempting outright elimination. It has been forced to do more with less and despite consistent under-funding, it has been an efficient and productive agency. However, we should at least restore the NEA to its pre-1996 levels and we should be considering an increase over that level, not the paltry funding it has had since then. Only through increased public support can the arts continue to be so vibrant throughout the nation.

The NEH, too, is a crucial agency but without additional funding, the important work of interpreting and preserving our nation's heritage will go unrealized. The NEH is at the forefront of preserving endangered recordings of folk music, jazz and blues; bringing Shakespeare to inner-city youth; promoting research into immigrant life and culture; and helping disseminate this information into communities through technology with the Internet and CD-Rom.

The arts and humanities also provide the emotional and spiritual lift that we have all needed since September, helping us heal in profound ways. In the wake of the attacks on our nation, people flocked to theaters, music halls, and museums for a sense of community and emotional release. The arts and humanities are also a critical tool in promoting cultural understanding, something that is sorely needed in the world today.

In the wake of September 11th, I convened a discussion of the many arts organizations in lower Manhattan that had been devastated after the attacks. At that meeting, an artist named Brookie Maxwell gave a powerful testament to why additional arts funding is needed. She said, "We need funding for the arts so we can process what happened. Art addresses the meaning between the words, and it addresses the mystery of life."

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no better words to sum up why this amendment is so sorely needed and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which provides for a modest increase of funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Mr. Speaker, this year we have spent much time and energy improving our education system with the No Child Left Behind Act. I am proud of the work we have done. Yet we cannot leave the arts behind—exposure and understanding of the arts is vital to our children's development and we must properly fund the NEA and NEH to accomplish this.

The NEA supports local communities in our states and creates many educational outreach programs which enrich the cultural world of our children. The NEH serves to advance the nation's scholarly and cultural life by providing humanities education to America's school children and college students, offers lifelong learning opportunities through a range of public programs and supports projects that encourage Americans to discover their American heritage.

The most important function of the NEA and NEH is their role in education our children. Studies continue to illustrate the positive impact that exposure to arts has on a child's development. A recent study released by the Arts Education Partnership entitled Critical Links, provides hard evidence that the arts improve critical skills in math, reading, language development, and writing. The arts nourish a child's imagination and creativity and help develop collaborative and teamwork skills.

But arts in education is not only important for student achievement. Arts have also been shown to deter delinquent behavior of at-risk youth. The U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention found that arts programs that were geared toward at-risk youth dramatically improved academic performance, reduced school truancy, and increased skills of communication, conflict resolution, completion of challenging tasks, and teamwork.

In a time when we are searching for innovative ways to combat violence in our schools, studies such as the one I just cited demonstrate the positive effects that arts education can have on behavior.

Congress affirmed the critical role of arts education when it passed the No Child Left Behind Act. This landmark education reform legislation recognizes the arts as one of the core subjects that all schools should teach. We must ensure that arts remain a part of our children's educational development. Investing in our children's future is necessary. I commend the NEA and other fine programs for their work to improve the quality of education in America.

A good deal is being said (and circulated) about what some consider the sponsorship of questionable art by the National Endowment

of the Arts. I do agree that the federal government has no business subsidizing works of "art" that are lewd or that depict our religious figures or symbols in an objectionable manner.

But let me remind you that Congress has taken the necessary steps to ensure that the NEA is precluded from funding such offensive projects. For example, in 1996 Congress eliminated most individual grants and prohibited the use of NEA funds for projects that depict sexual activities or denigrate religious objects. In 1990, I served as Republican leader of the subcommittee that re-wrote NEA regulations to establish a new, decency standard and outlawed NEA support for projects with controversial sexual and religious themes.

We have this debate every year. The NEA we debate about today is the reformed NEA—not the NEA of the past. The NEA of today supports good programs that use the strength of the Arts and our nation's cultural life to enhance communities in every state in the nation. However, the NEA is still being punished for its past and is still funded at levels that are significantly lower than the funding levels of a decade ago.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and ensure that arts remain a part of our children's educational development.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter-Dicks amendment to provide increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

These agencies are charged with bringing the history, the beauty, the wisdom of our culture into the lives of all Americans—young and old, rich and poor, urban and rural. We in Congress have said that preserving our national heritage, and bringing the arts into the lives of more Americans, is a goal worthy of our support.

For the past two years, we have made an important investment in the NEA's Challenge America program. This program focuses on arts education and enrichment, after-school arts programs for youth, access education and enrichment, after-school arts programs for youth, access to the arts for underserved communities, and community arts development initiatives. This initiative has helped strengthen America's communities and foster new relationships between communities, state and federal agencies, and national organizations. We make sure that these vital agencies have the resources they need to continue and expand the impact of the arts.

Many years ago, I spent seven years as the chair of the Greater New Haven Arts Council back in Connecticut. I know first hand that the arts not only enrich lives, but contribute to the economic growth of the community.

Federal investment in the arts is not the only means of support for this endeavor. Rather, our dollars—which represent only a small fraction of our annual budget—are used to leverage private funding and fuel what is really an arts industry. This industry creates jobs, increases travel and tourism, and generates thousands of dollars for a state's economy.

In addition, the NEA is an important partner in bringing arts education to more American students. Arts education is critical in planting seeds of art appreciation and in cultivating the talent that may have yet to be discovered in these young minds. The Endowment, in partnership with state arts agencies, provides \$37 million of annual support for Kindergarten

through 12th grade arts education projects in more than 2,600 communities across the country. It also funds professional development programs for art specialists, classroom teachers, and artists.

Recent studies have shown that the arts have real value in restoring civility to our society and providing our children and communities real alternatives. Participation in arts programs helps children learn to express anger appropriately and enhance communication skills with adults and peers. Students who have benefitted from arts programs have also shown better self-esteem, an improved ability to finish tasks, less delinquent behavior, and a more positive attitude toward school. We must continue to support this effort to bring the arts and humanities into the lives of our young people.

We know that the arts build our economy, enrich our culture, and feed the minds of adults and children alike. The NEA and NEH need this increase to fulfill their missions, and it's time we gave them this support. Vote for this amendment. Preserve our heritage and make it accessible to all.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson-Morella Amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for Humanities. The arts and humanities are important both socially and economically to our Nation as a whole.

Studies have shown students benefit from exposure to both the arts and humanities. They gain not only a better cultural appreciation but are able to translate their positive experiences into skills that are essential for their academic future and their future in the American workforce.

Arts and humanities funding are increasingly allocated to state agencies for grant programs that reach out to underprivileged and smaller suburban and rural areas that do not have the benefits of big city art programs. In correlation, seventy-nine percent of businesses believe it is important to have an active cultural community in the locale in which they operate. Businesses in Delaware work hand-in-hand with the arts and humanities communities. This partnership makes my State a stronger community than it otherwise would be.

I have witnessed in Delaware firsthand how rewarding arts and humanities programs can be to our Nation's youth. For example, the Possum Point Players in Georgetown, Delaware, is funded through the NEA's Challenge American Program. This organization provides positive alternatives for youth in Sussex County high schools through the creation of theater programs for rural and low-income students. Many of these students would not have the opportunity to participate in such programs without the Challenged American Program. These students have better chance to increase their SAT scores, develop increased self-confidence, and are more likely to create multiple solutions to problems and work collaboratively with one another.

Furthermore, the Delaware Humanities Forum, through NEH funding, has played an essential role in bringing humanities to all corners of the state with programs available at schools, businesses, and other community groups. Each year the Humanities Forum presents an annual living history event bringing education and entertainment together. Past events have centered around the Old West and the Gilded Age in American History.

It is important for us to remember, the collective benefits gained by not only our districts but also by the Nation as a whole and that is why I rise today in strong support of increased funding for the NEA and the NEH.

Mr. GILMAN. I rise in support of the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson-Morella amendment which calls for increases of \$10 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and \$5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Throughout the last 30 years our Nation has been enriched by the Arts. Sophocles wrote: "Whoever neglects the arts when he is young has lost the past and is dead to the future." When Congress supports and appropriates Federal funding for the NEA and the NEH, our Nation's commitment to the future and the freedom of expression is reinforced and reinvigorated.

The NEA and NEH create programming that cultivates and fosters achievement in the arts throughout our Nation. If this funding is not allocated to these important endowments, the freedom of expression enjoyed by every citizen will be jeopardized and inhibited. Progress in the Arts will be imperiled.

We all take pride in America's contributions in the Arts; however, it is important and essential that we secure the promise of future achievements. In addition to applauding our American spirits, and observing that an energetic life contributes to a strong democracy, we must take action to make the arts a priority. This is what is necessary to maintain and improve upon past standards. As integral as the Arts have been to our American heritage, the younger generations must make a sustained effort to support and aid in maintaining this essential facet of our culture and society.

If we reduce funding for the Arts, our Nation would be the first among cultured nations to remove the Arts as a priority. In my role as Chairman Emeritus of the International Relations Committee, I recognize the importance of the Arts on an international level, as they help foster a common appreciation of history and culture that are so essential to our humanity. If we do not meet the needs of the NEA, we would be erasing part of our civilization and breaking possible bonds to others.

Moreover, I understand the importance of the Arts on our Nation's children. Whether it is music or drama or dance, children are drawn to the Arts. Many after school programs provide children with an opportunity to express themselves in a positive environment, removed from the temptations of drugs and violence. Empowering children with pride and passion, they are better able to make good choices and avoid following the crowd down dark paths. However, many children are not able to enjoy the feeling of pride that comes with performing or creating because their school are cutting arts programming or not offering it altogether. We need to ensure that this does not continue to happen. Increasing children's access to the Arts only benefits our Nation and its future.

It is our responsibility to ensure that our children have access to the Arts. Accordingly, I strongly support increased funding for the NEA and NEH. I urge my colleagues to oppose any amendments which seek to decrease NEA funding, and to support the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson-Morella amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Public investment in arts and humanities benefits society in countless ways, including enhancing individual creativity, increasing skills in math, reading, language development and writing, and expanding global relationships and understanding.

President Bush has recommended FY 2003 funding for NEA and NEH at \$116 million and \$126 million, respectively. It is important to note that NEA's amount is \$46 million below its 1995 level. However, the payoff from even this meager public investment is still enormous. In addition to the aforementioned benefits of public funding for arts and humanities, a recent study found that arts groups generate at least \$134 billion in economic activity each year, 4.85 million full-time equivalent jobs, \$89.4 billion in household income, and \$24.4 billion in government taxes. Although NEA and NEH are the sole source of arts funding in some communities, in others, grants from NEA and NEH leverage millions of dollars each year in private support for arts projects.

Last year in Michigan's 16th District alone, NEA awarded two grants totaling \$40,000. One of the grants was awarded to the Sphinx Competition in Dearborn, Michigan, an outstanding program that gives young, primarily African American and Latino students, the opportunity to improve their craft, and perform with their peers and professional musicians. I can think of few programs that are more deserving of NEA funding, or that have been as effective in expanding access to classical music opportunities for minority students. Last year, NEH funding was awarded to 13 organizations in my district, mostly to elementary schools which brought live cultural presentations to the students. These programs consisted of a wide diversity of cultural programs from school assembly musical performances to library storytellers. Without these funds, many of these students would not have had the opportunity to be exposed to these culturally enriching activities.

Currently, Americans pay about the cost of a postage stamp to fund these two important programs. Given the important and measurable benefits of exposure to arts and cultural activities, Congress must step up and increase public funding for NEA and NEH.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill to increase funding for the Endowment of the Arts and the National Endowment of the Humanities.

Increased funding for NEA and NEH is essential to the Government's role in ensuring the beauty and diversity of the arts are accessible to all our citizens. The arts help children to develop fundamental skills and provide the opportunity for students to excel in academic and social areas. More specifically, the effects of early arts exposure can help to increase a child's motivation to learn about all subjects.

In Venice, CA, which I represent, the Los Angeles Theatre Works stands as an example of what NEA funding can accomplish. The LA Theatre Works not only produces plays but also takes an active role in the Venice community to bring the arts to children in need. Their "Arts and Children" program provides hands-on workshops to at-risk youth, encouraging them to develop their talents and channel their energies into the arts.

It is through the funding from NEA and NEH that organizations such as the Los Angeles Theatre Works are able to reach out into communities and touch the lives of children and, in turn, the lives of the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment to ensure that the NEA and NEH continue to provide enrichment to citizens across the country.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support for this amendment to the FY03 Interior Appropriations bill (H.R. 5093), which would reaffirm our commitment to enriching the education of our children. The Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson amendment would increase funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million and the National Endowment for the Arts by \$10 million. These small increases in funding will have a tremendous impact on the quality of education for all children.

As a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus and a former teacher, I understand the importance of the arts and humanities in our education system. More than two-thirds of our Nation's K-12 curriculum is dedicated to the humanities. As the largest supporter of the humanities in the country, the Federal Government, through the NEH, provides access to high-quality educational programs and resources through grants to non-profit cultural institutions such as museums, universities, and State humanities councils. These grants strengthen teaching, facilitate research, and provide opportunities for lifelong learning. It is incumbent upon the Federal Government to maintain its commitment to the humanities if we are to maintain a high level of excellence in our public schools.

The arts create an environment of creativity, expression, and success for children. The NEA nurtures the growth and artistic excellence of thousands of arts organizations all over the country by making the performing, visual, literary, media and folk arts available to millions of Americans. Programs, such as the Arts Learning grants, support projects for children and youth, in school and outside the regular school day and year, in pre-K through grade 12 and in youth arts areas. This project, which partners public education and nonprofit arts organizations, helps to contribute to the incredible economic success of the arts industry. The nonprofit arts industry generates \$36.8 billion annually in economic activity and supports 1.3 million jobs.

In my district, the Connecticut's Commission on the Arts uses NEA funding to support its Higher Order Thinking (HOT) Schools Program. The HOT Schools Program is designed to transform entire school communities. The arts, especially writing, play a central role in this change process. School culture focuses on student needs and celebrates each child's accomplishments by sharing them with the larger school community. The program began in 1994 with only six schools and has grown to include over twenty-four schools from across Connecticut involving over 5,000 students and 500 educators.

In recent years, funding for the NEA and the NEH has been slashed—leaving many arts and cultural programs scrambling for funding. For example, in my state of Connecticut, Federal grants dropped from \$10 million in 1994 to an average of only \$3 million. Such reductions serve as an impediment to accessing and unearthing the country's rich cultural and

educational infrastructure. The modest increases proposed in this amendment would help to close the gap created by revenue shortfalls in many states.

The Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson amendment will serve to only improve the NEA and the NEH. With additional funding, we will be able to preserve programs already in place like the HOT Schools Program, and build upon their successes to create new programs, which will enhance the education of more children.

The NEA and the NEH are integral to our children's educational development. The NEA and the NEH have already suffered from cuts and reductions over the years. It is time to reinvest in these extremely successful agencies and provide America's children with a complete cultural and artistic education. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Slaughter-Dicks-Horn-Johnson Amendment to the Department of Interior Appropriations bill to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities by fifteen million dollars.

The value of supporting the arts is widely accepted. Art provides a venue for expression and understanding of human thought and emotion. Educators have argued that there are many educational benefits to students enrolled in the arts. Some institutions looking to bridge the gap of understanding between different cultures use art as a universal means of communicating concerns and developing understanding.

The National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities consistently work to give artists across the country the opportunity to participate in the arts. In fact, forty percent of the money allocated to the national endowment is transferred directly to states so that they are able to fund local programs. In Colorado, money from the National Endowment of the Arts is used to fund the Arts and Education Learning Network which teaches arts organizations how to work with schools, and the Online Poetry Project to help schools address poetry related questions on standardized CSAP exams. The bulk of funding requested in the amendment will go to the Challenge America Program that works to start arts and humanities programs in communities that have yet to receive funding from the Endowment.

Along with the immeasurable value of the contribution of the arts and the humanities as an expression of our culture and of the individual, the arts have proven to have a quantifiable value as well. A study recently conducted by an economist at the University of Georgia of ninety-one communities nationwide showed that communities that spend money on the arts, make money from the arts.

One of the communities in the study was Boulder, CO. It was calculated that just over nineteen million dollars in spending by the nonprofit arts industry in Boulder generated over thirteen million dollars in revenue and income for Boulder businesses, residents and local government, and supported five hundred and ninety-four full time jobs. The arts and humanities bring money and jobs to communities in today's difficult economic environment.

This amendment would allocate necessary funding to a grossly underfunded national arts

program. Support of the amendment is necessary so that arts can continue to bring all of the benefits that come from encouraging and supporting development of the arts.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, today's vote by the House to increase funding for the NEA and NEH is a victory of imagination over ideology.

In recent years, we have worried a great deal about the digital divide—a lack of access to technology that could limit opportunity for lower-income Americans. We should be equally concerned about a creativity crisis.

Studies have proven that arts education is not just a frill tacked on to the vital work of learning reading, writing and arithmetic. Art education increases skills in all of these subjects, as well as in language development and writing and spatial reasoning.

Grants from the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities leverage millions of dollars each year in private support for arts projects. In many communities, they are the sole source of arts funding.

This amendment would provide an additional \$10 million for the NEA's "Challenge America" initiative, which is specifically designed to provide access to the arts for underserved communities. According to the Georgia Institute of Technology, the arts industry generates millions of jobs and \$134 billion in economic activity every year.

The amendment also provides \$5 million for the NEH—the nation's largest source of support for research and scholarship in the humanities.

I want to make it very clear that this amendment is not an increase in funding, but an attempt to recoup some of the cuts that NEA faced in 1995 when its budget was slashed by 40 percent. There is strong, bipartisan consensus now that those cuts were felt too deeply by some of our most vulnerable young people.

Exposure to the arts through the NEA helps children build confidence in their class work, honors their creativity, and unleashes the power of their imagination. The poet, Shelley, once wrote that the greatest force for moral good is imagination. With the challenges that we face today, we need all the imagination we can muster.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by Congresswoman SLAUGHTER to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million and for the National Endowment for the Arts' Challenge America Initiative by \$10 million.

The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) provides grants to every state and territory in the United States to support programs in our museums, libraries, colleges, research centers, and state humanities councils, and to support the work of individual scholars. I have been extremely impressed by the products of the grants awarded in my State, particularly support for Hawaii History Day and National History Day.

NEH grants help to bring the humanities to Americans throughout our nation. NEH grants are also used to improve teaching, support research and scholarship, preserve our nation's historical and cultural heritage through conservation of precious documents and artifacts, and provide access to the humanities through public programs.

The Challenge America Initiative of the National Endowment for the Arts is specifically

designed to provide underserved communities with access to the arts. The Initiative supports arts education, youth-at-risk programs, cultural heritage preservation, and community arts partnerships.

Student involvement in the arts has been proven to increase skills in mathematics, reading, language development, and writing. And students who play certain musical instruments demonstrate enhanced development of spatial reasoning skills. The arts have also shown success in improving outcomes for at-risk youth.

Grants from NEH and NEA leverage millions of dollars in private support for the arts and humanities. America's nonprofit arts industry generates some \$134 billion in economic activity each year, including 4.85 million full-time equivalent jobs, \$89.4 billion in household income, \$6.6 billion in local government tax revenues, \$7.3 billion in state government tax revenues, and \$10.5 billion in federal income tax revenues.

These valuable programs help to promote the arts, humanities, and education in our communities. The relatively small investments made by the federal government in these programs greatly enrich the lives of all Americans.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter-Dicks Amendment, to make important increases to the NEA and NEH.

Before I continue, I must relay my hesitation to use the term "increase" when referring to the modest funding this amendment would provide. After all, the NEA and NEH have yet to fully recover from the more than 40 percent cut they suffered in 1995.

We know that the arts are crucial to the development of our culture and our economy, and beneficial to all our citizens. In fact, a recent study showed that the nonprofit arts industry generates \$134 billion in economic activity and \$24 billion in tax revenue in the U.S. annually. The arts are especially important to New York.

As a former member of the National Council on the Arts, I have seen first-hand the grant selection process, and I applaud the NEA for successfully increasing all Americans' access to the arts, through programs such as "Challenge America." It is vital that we continue to fully support these extraordinary programs.

We must recognize, however, that last year's funding increase was not the conclusion of a struggle, but rather, a first step toward funding the arts and humanities at levels appropriate to them. A \$10 million increase to the NEA budget would not only support magnificent artistic work, but would also generate federal revenue and foster local economic activity. Let's use this opportunity to get back to providing a level of resources to the NEA and the NEH of which we can all be proud.

My colleagues, I urge you to support the Slaughter-Dicks amendment.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill offered by my colleagues, Representatives SLAUGHTER and DICKS, to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by \$10 million and the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million. There is no question that education about the arts and humanities not only creates well-rounded human beings, but more responsible citizens who contribute to the richness of our cultural heritage.

For many years, under the wise guidance and leadership of my predecessor, Congressman Sydney Yates, Congress understood the cultural and economic importance of federal funding for arts. Yates almost single-handedly protected the arts, and was awarded for his tireless efforts by President Clinton in 1993 with the Presidential Citizens Medal.

Unfortunately, NEA funding was cut by more than 40 percent in 1995 and, for the most part, has yet to recover, despite overwhelming evidence that the arts contribute greatly to our society and culture. A recent study released by the Arts Education Partnership provides hard evidence that exposure to the arts improves students' critical skills in math, reading, language development, and writing. Furthermore, other studies suggest that for certain populations, including students from economically disadvantaged circumstances, students needing remedial instruction, and younger children, arts education is especially helpful in boosting learning and achievement.

The humanities play an equally valuable role in the education of children and adults. In particular, state humanities councils, which receive NEH funding, have been working for nearly 30 years to educate citizens about our history and culture and stimulate dialogue about contemporary issues of concern. Collaborating with libraries, museums, religious institutions, schools, senior centers, historical societies, and community centers, state humanities councils have served as the single most reliable source of local support for programs that educate citizens for civic life, thereby strengthening the fabric of our democracy.

My district in Illinois greatly benefits from NEA and NEH funding. In 2001, the 9th Congressional District received over \$180,000 from NEA through a wide variety of grants. That same year, Illinois received \$4.6 million in NEH funding, making Illinois the fourth largest recipient of NEH funds in the country. My constituents reap the benefits of this.

If we are to preserve these programs, and other similar programs all over the country, it is critical that we provide adequate funding for the NEA and NEH. I strongly support increasing the NEA and NEH funding levels by a total of \$15 million, and urge my colleagues to support the amendment to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, this 15-minute vote on the Slaughter amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes, if ordered, on the Rahall and Hayworth amendments, in turn.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

AYES—234

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen

Andrews
Baca
Baird

Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger

Barrett Hastings (FL)
 Becerra Hill
 Bentsen Hilliard
 Bereuter Hinchey
 Berkley Hinojosa
 Berman Hoeftel
 Berry Holden
 Biggert Holt
 Bishop Honda
 Blumenauer Hooley
 Boehlert Horn
 Bono Houghton
 Borski Hoyer
 Boswell Inslee
 Boucher Israel
 Boyd Jackson (IL)
 Brady (PA) Jackson-Lee
 Brown (FL) (TX)
 Brown (OH) Jefferson
 Capito Johnson (CT)
 Capps Johnson (IL)
 Capuano Johnson, E. B.
 Cardin Jones (OH)
 Carson (IN) Kanjorski
 Carson (OK) Kelly
 Castle Kennedy (RI)
 Clay Kildee
 Clayton Kilpatrick
 Clyburn Kind (WI)
 Conyers Kirk
 Costello Kleczka
 Coyne Kolbe
 Cramer Kucinich
 Crowley LaFalce
 Cummings LaHood
 Davis (CA) Lampson
 Davis (FL) Langevin
 Davis (IL) Lantos
 Davis, Tom (WA)
 DeFazio Larson (CT)
 DeGette LaTourette
 Delahunt Leach
 DeLauro Lee
 Deutsch Levin
 Dicks Lewis (GA)
 Dingell Lipinski
 Doggett LoBiondo
 Dooley Lofgren
 Doyle Lowey
 Edwards Luther
 Ehlers Lynch
 Engel Maloney (CT)
 English Maloney (NY)
 Eshoo Markey
 Etheridge Matheson
 Evans Matsui
 Farr McCarthy (MO)
 Fattah McCarthy (NY)
 Ferguson McCollum
 Filner McDermott
 Ford McGovern
 Fossella McKeon
 Frank McKinney
 Frelinghuysen McNulty
 Frost Meehan
 Gephardt Meek (FL)
 Gilman Meeks (NY)
 Gonzalez Menendez
 Gordon Millender-
 Graham McDonald
 Green (TX) Miller, George
 Greenwood Mink
 Grucci Mollohan
 Gutierrez Moore
 Hall (OH) Moran (KS)
 Harman Moran (VA)

NOES—192

Aderholt Callahan
 Akin Calvert
 Armev Camp
 Bachus Cannon
 Baker Cantor
 Barcia Chabot
 Barr Chambliss
 Bartlett Clement
 Barton Coble
 Bass Collins
 Bilirakis Combust
 Blunt Condit
 Boehner Cooksey
 Bonilla Cox
 Boozman Crane
 Brady (TX) Crenshaw
 Brown (SC) Cubin
 Bryant Culberson
 Burr Cunningham
 Burton Davis, Jo Ann
 Buyer Deal

Morella Murtha
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Northup
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Quinn
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Roemer
 Rogers (MI)
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sabo
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sawyer
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Scott
 Serrano
 Shays
 Sherman
 Simmons
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Spratt
 Stark
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Sweeney
 Tauscher
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thurman
 Tierney
 Towns
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Velazquez
 Visclosky
 Walsh
 Waters
 Watson (CA)
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (PA)
 Wexler
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn

DeLay
 DeMint
 Diaz-Balart
 Doolittle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Emerson
 Everett
 Flake
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Forbes
 Gallegly
 Ganske
 Gekas
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Goode
 Goodlatte

Goss
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (WI)
 Gutknecht
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hart
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Herger
 Hilleary
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hostettler
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Issa
 Istook
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Keller
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kerns
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Knollenberg
 Latham
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (CA)
 Linder
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Manzullo
 McClery
 McInnis
 McIntyre

Blagojevich
 Bonior
 Ehrlich

Mica
 Miller, Dan
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, Jeff
 Myrick
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Osborne
 Ose
 Otter
 Oxley
 Paul
 Pence
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Portman
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Riley
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Saxton
 Schaffer
 Schrock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Sherwood

NOT VOTING—8

Kaptur
 Mascara
 McHugh

□ 1456

Messrs. SULLIVAN, CALVERT, COX, and PICKERING changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. PAYNE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, 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 each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will state his point of order.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, is this the Rahall amendment coming up?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would tell the gentleman that it is, yes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 281, noes 144, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—281

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Allen
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baird
 Baker
 Baldacci
 Baldwin
 Barcia
 Barrett
 Bartlett
 Becerra
 Bentsen
 Bereuter
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Bono
 Boozman
 Borski
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brown (OH)
 Burr
 Calvert
 Camp
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carson (IN)
 Carson (OK)
 Chambliss
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clement
 Clyburn
 Collins
 Condit
 Conyers
 Cooksey
 Costello
 Coyne
 Crane
 Crowley
 Cubin
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dooley
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Engel
 English
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Farr
 Fattah
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Foley
 Ford
 Fossella

Frank
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Gephardt
 Gibbons
 Gonzalez
 Graves
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Grucci
 Gutierrez
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hill
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hoeftel
 Holden
 Honda
 Hooley
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Istook
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kelly
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kleczka
 Knollenberg
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 LaTourette
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Luther
 Lynch
 Maloney (CT)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McClery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McInnis
 McIntyre

McKeon
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller, George
 Mink
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (VA)
 Murtha
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Ney
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Oberstar
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Otter
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Quinn
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (MI)
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Scott
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shaw
 Sherman
 Shows
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Spratt
 Stark
 Strickland
 Stump
 Stupak
 Tanner

Tauscher	Turner	Waxman
Tauzin	Udall (CO)	Weiner
Taylor (MS)	Udall (NM)	Weller
Terry	Velazquez	Wexler
Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	Wilson (NM)
Thompson (MS)	Walden	Woolsey
Thune	Waters	Wu
Thurman	Watkins (OK)	Wynn
Tierney	Watson (CA)	Young (AK)
Toomey	Watt (NC)	
Towns	Watts (OK)	

NOES—144

Aderholt	Goode	Platts
Akin	Goodlatte	Portman
Armey	Gordon	Pryce (OH)
Bachus	Goss	Putnam
Ballenger	Graham	Radanovich
Barr	Granger	Regula
Barton	Gutknecht	Reynolds
Bass	Hansen	Riley
Biggert	Hart	Roemer
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Boehner	Hayes	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Boyd	Hobson	Ryun (KS)
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Sabo
Brown (SC)	Horn	Schaffer
Bryant	Hostettler	Schrock
Burton	Hulshof	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Isakson	Shadegg
Callahan	Jackson (IL)	Shays
Cannon	Jefferson	Sherwood
Cantor	Jenkins	Shimkus
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Shuster
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Skeen
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Smith (MI)
Coble	Jones (NC)	Smith (TX)
Combest	Keller	Souder
Cox	Kennedy (MN)	Stearns
Cramer	Kerns	Stenholm
Crenshaw	Kingston	Sullivan
Culberson	Kirk	Sununu
Davis (FL)	Kolbe	Sweeney
DeLay	LaHood	Tancredo
DeMint	Latham	Taylor (NC)
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Thomas
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Thornberry
Dunn	Miller, Dan	Tiahrt
Ehlers	Miller, Gary	Tiberi
Emerson	Miller, Jeff	Upton
Everett	Moran (KS)	Vitter
Flake	Morella	Walsh
Fletcher	Myrick	Wamp
Forbes	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Weldon (PA)
Ganske	Obey	Whitfield
Gekas	Ose	Wicker
Gilchrest	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Gillmor	Peterson (PA)	Wolf
Gilman	Pitts	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Blagojevich	Holt	McHugh
Bonior	Kaptur	Nadler
Ehrlich	Mascara	Trafficant

□ 1505

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from “no” to “aye”.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 311, I inadvertently voted “aye.” I meant to vote “no”.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HAYWORTH

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) 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.

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 273, noes 151, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—273

Abercrombie	Gallegly	Moore
Ackerman	Gekas	Morella
Allen	Gephardt	Murtha
Baca	Gillmor	Napolitano
Baird	Gilman	Neal
Baker	Gonzalez	Nethercutt
Baldacci	Graves	Ney
Baldwin	Green (TX)	Oberstar
Balleanger	Greenwood	Oliver
Barcia	Grucci	Ortiz
Barrett	Gutierrez	Otter
Barlett	Gutknecht	Owens
Becerra	Hall (TX)	Oxley
Bentsen	Harman	Pallone
Bereuter	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Berkley	Hastings (WA)	Pastor
Berman	Hayworth	Paul
Berry	Hill	Payne
Bishop	Hilleary	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Boehlert	Hinchee	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hinojosa	Pombo
Bono	Hoeffel	Pomeroy
Borski	Holden	Price (NC)
Boswell	Holt	Quinn
Boyd	Honda	Radanovich
Brady (PA)	Hooley	Rahall
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Ramstad
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Inslee	Reyes
Burr	Isakson	Reynolds
Buyer	Israel	Rivers
Callahan	Issa	Rodriguez
Calvert	Jackson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Camp	Jackson-Lee	Rohrabacher
Capito	(TX)	Ross
Capps	Jefferson	Rothman
Capuano	Jenkins	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	John	Royce
Carson (OK)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Sabo
Clay	Kanjorski	Sanchez
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clyburn	Kildee	Sandlin
Coble	Kilpatrick	Sawyer
Condit	Kind (WI)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kirk	Schiff
Cooksey	Knollenberg	Scott
Costello	Kolbe	Serrano
Coyne	Lampson	Sessions
Cramer	Lantos	Sherman
Crane	Larsen (WA)	Shows
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shuster
Cubin	LaTourette	Simpson
Culberson	Lee	Skeen
Cummings	Levin	Skelton
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (MI)
Davis (IL)	Linder	Smith (WA)
Deal	Lipinski	Snyder
DeFazio	Lofgren	Solis
DeGette	Lowey	Spratt
Delahunt	Luther	Stark
Deutsch	Lynch	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
Dicks	Markey	Stupak
Dingell	Matheson	Sweeney
Doggett	Matsui	Tanner
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Tauzin
Dreier	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	McDermott	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	McGovern	Terry
Edwards	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McKeon	Thompson (MS)
English	McKinney	Thune
Etheridge	McNulty	Thurman
Evans	Meehan	Tiahrt
Farr	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Filner	Menendez	Turner
Flake	Mica	Udall (CO)
Foley	Millender-McDonald	Udall (NM)
Ford	Miller, Gary	Velazquez
Fossella	Miller, George	Walden
Frank	Mink	Waters
Frost		Watson (CA)

Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller

Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—151

Aderholt	Hansen	Pickering
Akin	Hart	Pitts
Andrews	Hayes	Platts
Armey	Hefley	Portman
Barr	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hobson	Putnam
Bass	Hoekstra	Regula
Biggert	Horn	Riley
Bilirakis	Hulshof	Roemer
Blunt	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Bonilla	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Istook	Roukema
Boucher	Johnson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Bryant	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (KS)
Burton	Jones (NC)	Saxton
Cannon	Keller	Schaffer
Cantor	Kelly	Schrock
Cardin	Kennedy (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Kerns	Shadegg
Chambliss	King (NY)	Shaw
Clement	Kingston	Shays
Collins	Klecza	Sherwood
Combest	Kucinich	Shimkus
Cox	LaFalce	Simmons
Crenshaw	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Davis (FL)	Langevin	Smith (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Souder
Davis, Tom	Leach	Stearns
DeLauro	Lewis (KY)	Stump
DeLay	LoBiondo	Sullivan
DeMint	Lucas (KY)	Sununu
Doolittle	Lucas (OK)	Tancredo
Ehlers	Maloney (CT)	Thomas
Emerson	Manzullo	Thornberry
Eshoo	McCrery	Tiberi
Everett	McInnis	Toomey
Ferguson	Miller, Dan	Upton
Fletcher	Miller, Jeff	Visclosky
Forbes	Mollohan	Vitter
Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)	Walsh
Ganske	Moran (VA)	Wamp
Gibbons	Myrick	Watkins (OK)
Gilchrest	Northup	Watts (OK)
Goode	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Goodlatte	Nussle	Weldon (PA)
Gordon	Obey	Wexler
Goss	Osborne	Wicker
Graham	Ose	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Pence	Wolf
Green (WI)	Petri	
Hall (OH)	Phelps	

NOT VOTING—10

Bachus	Jones (OH)	Nadler
Blagojevich	Kaptur	Trafficant
Bonior	Mascara	
Ehrlich	McHugh	

□ 1514

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1515

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

Mr. Chairman, at this point, we will proceed under regular order with title I. Following that, we will turn to title II under regular order. I ask that Members who have amendments to the remainder of the bill bring them to the floor and file them at the desk if they have not done so already.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the Chair of the subcommittee and with the ranking member about an inequity that I believe must be addressed.

In 1985, Congress passed PL 99-239, the Compact of Free Association with the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia.

Under the terms of the compact, the United States gained critical strategic access and exclusive military privileges in these Freely Associated States, referred to as Micronesia. In return, the Compact Nations received financial assistance and their citizens received the right to freely migrate to the United States for purposes of education, employment, and residence.

In recognition of the likely impact of this national policy, Congress authorized appropriations to cover the costs that may be incurred by the State of Hawaii, the territories of Guam, Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas.

In the 16 years between 1986 and 2001, Hawaii has incurred about \$100 million in expenses in education and social services for the compact migrants. Despite the intent of Congress, Hawaii has not received any appropriations until last year, when we finally received \$4 million. We spend approximately \$17 million on compact migrants each year.

My colleague from Hawaii is here and is certainly in support of this request, and both of us sent a letter to the committee requesting an appropriation of \$10 million to be included in this bill. We know that the situation is very tight and the needs are many, and therefore, the amount of money that we requested was not included.

Our economy is suffering. It had been even before September 11, but certainly after September 11 the situation has been very tight. So the fact that we were able to reserve the request until last year should not penalize the fact that the law entitles us to come under consideration for reimbursement for the funds.

I would like to ask the chairman to consider Hawaii's case to support the appropriations that we have requested and to reimburse Hawaii at least part of the \$100 million that we have spent thus far in this national defense program.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. We thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii and recognize the many years she has worked to obtain this funding. We promise, the subcommittee, to give the gentlewoman's request full consideration during our conference with the Senate.

We also point out that the tiny territories of Guam and Northern Marianas have a very similar financial impact from the compacts, and they have far less ability to cover these expenses. In 2001, Guam had about \$20 million in expenses, Hawaii about \$17 million, and the Commonwealth of Northern Marianas about \$9 million.

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I know that this is a major concern in Hawaii, and I want to work with the gentlewoman on this issue and will work with our friends in the other body to seek a solution. I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this to our attention.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for their replies in this colloquy and thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for pointing this out.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that Members would note we are approaching the membership for consideration under something that should actually be taken up, in my judgment, in the Department of Defense and should be included in that budget. Nonetheless, we are here today under the present rules asking merely for the compensation that is due us under the treaty obligation of the United States.

It is not fair to ask a State of the Union to undertake expenditures that are engendered as a result of the actions of the United States of America, nor is it fair to ask any of the territories or the Commonwealth of Marianas to assume the same costs. This is particularly true when the three entities are suffering from the decline in tourism dollars and revenue that has come in. The fact that we have borne this burden for this time should not give rise to any consideration or thought that this has been something that is equitable.

So I would hope that the membership would understand, as we conclude our deliberations on the bill, that this is an amount of money that is but a minuscule portion of that which is due Guam, American Samoa, the Marianas and the State of Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, \$252,000,000 to remain available until expended.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management including treatments of pests, pathogens and invasive or noxious plants, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities and conducting an international program as authorized, \$279,828,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law, of which \$60,000,000 is for the Forest Legacy Program, to be derived from the land and water conservation fund; \$36,235,000 is for

the Urban and Community Forestry Program, defined in section 250(c)(4)(E) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for the purposes of such Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands shall be available until the Forest Service notifies the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in writing, of specific acquisition of lands or interests in lands to be undertaken with such funds: *Provided further*, That each forest legacy grant shall be for a specific project: *Provided further*, That a grant shall not be released to a State unless the Secretary determines that the State has demonstrated that 25 percent of the total value of the project is comprised of a non-Federal cost share.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, \$1,370,567,000, to remain available until expended, which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, in accordance with section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)): *Provided*, That unobligated balances available at the start of fiscal year 2003 shall be displayed by budget line item in the fiscal year 2004 budget justification: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of such sums as necessary to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management for removal, preparation, and adoption of excess wild horses and burros from National Forest System lands.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. HOEFFEL:

Under the heading "NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE", insert after the dollar amount on page 76, line 13, the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add \$5 million to the grazing management account of the forest service from the general account of the forest service.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us would allow the forest service to automatically renew expiring livestock grazing permits without completing the required environmental assessments. I think that this blanket waiver proposed under the terms of the bill is, from a policy point of view, a bad idea; but I understand the practical reasons for doing this waiver, for proposing this waiver.

The problem is the forest service does not have the resources to do all of the environmental assessments that it should do when it renews livestock grazing permits. Everybody agrees that abuse of grazing can be bad for the land. It can jeopardize endangered species. It can pollute streams and lakes, and it can lead to soil erosion; and everybody understands the environmental assessments are a positive step to working cooperatively with the ranching community and with the environmental community through the

good offices of the forest service to protect the land, to allow it to be used appropriately for grazing, which is a necessary activity in the West, necessary for the economic stability of the West.

In our efforts to be good stewards of the land, the forest service needs the resources to conduct these environmental reviews, and they have at the forest service a huge backlog.

In 1995 in the rescissions act, Congress allowed them to waive these environmental assessments, but they were supposed to follow a self-determined schedule for trying to do those assessments as best they could. By their own acknowledgment, they are 55 percent behind even their own schedule of assessments.

The system is not working. I think a blanket waiver alone is not the right answer, nor is it the right answer to oppose the waiver because such a block of the waiver might also have unintended consequences, bad for the ranching community and not helpful to environmental protection.

So I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, for already recognizing this problem. The underlying bill would add \$6 million to the grazing management account in the forest service.

My amendment would add an additional \$5 million to the grazing management account. It would help the forest service complete these assessments; and I have received a commitment only verbally, I am afraid, not in writing, from the forest service that it will use these additional funds, the funds that the committee has already earmarked and the additional funds represented by this amendment, to catch up on the backlog of environmental assessments that go back to 1999 all the way through 2002 and to work to do as many environmental assessments in 2003 as they possibly can.

The more money we give them, the better job they can do. I thank the Chair and his staff and the ranking member and his staff for coming together for this good idea in this cooperative way, and I hope we can agree to do the proper oversight of the forest service to make sure that they live up to their commitments to do the very best job with these environmental assessments as possible.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEFFEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment on this. I have spoken with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL); and first of all, I want to congratulate him on his leadership and his looking out for forest service lands. I know that he cares a lot about these lands and has worked on them and worked on these issues; and I think that the \$5 million additional in these accounts is really going to make a difference in terms of moving us along.

It is a win-win situation for both of us, and so I look forward to supporting the amendment and urge all of my colleagues to do so; and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) on this and for their leadership.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to just commend the gentleman on his creative work here. This is an important issue. I think the way he has handled it will produce a real result, and we can help the gentleman if the forest service does not keep its word. The gentleman needs to make sure he lets us know. We will be following it, too.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his kind words and for his support and his staff's support on this important amendment.

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

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment. We commend his work. As he knows, the chairman of our subcommittee is very committed to the ranchers and wants the grazing plans to get updated more quickly himself. This is why our committee mark did have the \$5 million increase for grazing plans. We are willing to increase this further in order to see that proper environmental clearances get done and that ranchers are not harmed.

We commend all of the partners in a bipartisan way for doing what is right.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, and I thank the gentleman who spoke for their comments. I ask for support for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Earlier under section 1, I had planned to offer an amendment to the appropriations bill to increase by \$5 million compact impact aid for Guam. I commend the progress of the committee on this particular issue, which is a very important issue to the people of Guam, in order to make sure that there is adequate compensation for migration from the Freely Associated States, mostly from the Federated States of Micronesia to Guam.

□ 1530

I am pleased to note that today's bill is a big step in the right direction, as it includes a \$1 million increase above the President's budget, a proposal of \$4.58 million in Compact Impact Aid,

bringing Guam's total amount to \$5.58 million. This amount still does not reach last year's final amount, and my amendment would have increased Compact Impact Aid by \$5 million.

Even the GAO recognizes that the actual impact to Guam is over \$12 million. The Government of Guam thinks it is a little bit closer to \$19 million. But in any event, it is clear that the Compact Impact assistance that Guam is receiving under this Interior appropriations bill is clearly inadequate.

It is particularly critical at this time because Guam has just undergone the impact of two storms, Chata'an and Ha Long. As we speak today, power and water have been out on Guam for nearly 3 weeks. So we were hoping that if we could get some recognition of this fact, that we would use the proposed increase in Compact Impact assistance to ready the schools, which will be opening next month, and also to ensure that the hospitals be open.

I know that there has been an effort here on the part of both the majority and the minority to recognize that there is a need for some increased funds for Guam.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, clearly this is another issue we plan to take up in conference and we will give the gentleman and his constituents the highest consideration in the conference. We appreciate his raising this issue yet again today on the floor, and I am sure we will do all we can within our power to address this satisfactorily.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his assurance on that, and I thank also the chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), for his understanding of this issue during the course of his work.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we certainly appreciate the gentleman's leadership, and we are very sympathetic to the problems that the gentleman is facing in Guam. We know the gentleman has done a terrific job in representing his area, and we will do everything we can to help him as the process moves forward.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, once again reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Washington very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence